

**Company Name** TATNEFT  
**Industry** Extractive  
**Overall Score (\*)** 9.0 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.5	10	A. Governance and Policies
1.6	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
1.7	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
2.5	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
1.0	10	F. Transparency

(\*) Please note that any small differences between the Overall Score and the added total of Measurement Theme scores are due to rounding the numbers at different stages of the score calculation process.

Please note that Occidental Petroleum and Anadarko Petroleum merged as the assessment process was taking place and as such most of the assessment is based on pre-merger reporting by Occidental Petroleum.

Please note also that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2019 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

## Detailed assessment

### A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

#### A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: General HRs commitment</li> <li>• Not met: UNGC principles 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• Not met: UDHR: The Company discloses in its Human Rights policy that recognizes the importance of respect and observance of fundamental human rights enunciated in the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, to just recognize the importance does not meet the criteria. [Annual Report with ESG, Human Rights section, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: International Bill of Rights</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: UNGPs</li> <li>• Not met: OECD: The Company discloses that it is connected and complies with OECD Guideline. However, it did not state explicitly its commitment. [Connection with OECD Guideline, 2011: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: ILO Core: In its website section about Human Rights, the Company states: 'The Company recognizes and respects the rights of trade unions, including those proclaimed in the ILO core conventions: the right of every worker to be represented by a trade union of his/her own choice, and the fundamental trade-</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>union rights relating to freedom of association, and the right to unite workers into trade unions, as well as the right to collective bargaining; exclusion of any form of forced or compulsory labor; actual exclusion of child labour; promoting and ensuring equality of opportunity and treatment of employees, including equal remuneration of women and men for equal work, and non-discrimination in employment.' [Annual Report with ESG, Human Rights section, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a> &amp; Sustainable Development and Social Responsibility Report 2013, 2013: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: As indicated above, in its website section about Human Rights, the Company states: 'The Company recognizes and respects the rights of trade unions, including those proclaimed in the ILO core conventions: the right of every worker to be represented by a trade union of his/her own choice, and the fundamental trade-union rights relating to freedom of association, and the right to unite workers into trade unions, as well as the right to collective bargaining; exclusion of any form of forced or compulsory labor; actual exclusion of child labour; promoting and ensuring equality of opportunity and treatment of employees, including equal remuneration of women and men for equal work, and non-discrimination in employment.' [Sustainable Development and Social Responsibility Report 2013, 2013: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a> &amp; Annual Report with ESG, Human Rights section, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Respect H&amp;S of workers: Tatneft discloses that it recognizes the right to safe working conditions and a healthy environment. In addition, the Company recognizes it must ensure safe working conditions and protect the health of personnel and population that lives in areas where the Company operates. [Policy in Industrial Safety, Labour and Environmental Protection, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: H&amp;S applies to EX BPs</li> </ul>
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Based on UN Instruments</li> <li>• Not met: Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant</li> <li>• Not met: Uses only ICoCA members</li> <li>• Not met: Respecting indigenous rights</li> <li>• Not met: ILO 169</li> <li>• Not met: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP)</li> <li>• Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: FPIC commitment</li> <li>• Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights</li> <li>• Not met: IFC performance standards</li> <li>• Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs</li> <li>• Not met: Respecting the right to water</li> <li>• Not met: Expects BPs to commit to all these rights</li> </ul>
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: Tatneft states that the success of the Company's activity primarily depends on the Company's ability to understand, as well as to satisfy, current and future needs and expectations of its stakeholders. The Company accentuates the necessity to maintain an open constructive dialogue with stakeholders. [Sustainable Development and Social Responsibility Report 2013, 2013: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design</li> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement</li> </ul>
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to remedy</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies</li> <li>• Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives</li> <li>• Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts</li> </ul>
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs)</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Expects EX BPs to reflect company HRD commitments</li> </ul>

## A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: CEO or Board approves policy</li> <li>• Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO</li> </ul>
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs</li> <li>• Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both examples and process</li> </ul>
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Incentives for at least one board member</li> <li>• Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&amp;S</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Performance criteria made public</li> </ul>

## B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence (25% of Total)

### B.1 Embedding Respect for Human Rights in Company Culture and Management Systems (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See A.1.2 [Sustainable Development and Social Responsibility Report 2013, 2013: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Senior responsibility for HR</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility</li> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs</li> </ul>
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights</li> <li>• Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&amp;S</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Performance criteria made public</li> </ul>
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment</li> </ul>
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See A.1.2.</li> <li>• Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: Although the Company discloses that its employees, including services related to personnel management and security activities, are involved in human rights procedures on an ongoing basis, there is no evidence on how the Company communicates its human rights policy to workers. [Annual Report with ESG, Human Rights section, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions</li> <li>• Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder</li> <li>• Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience</li> </ul>
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers: See A.1.2.</li> <li>• Not met: Communicating policy to EX contractors and joint ventures</li> <li>• Not met: Including to EX BPs (removed)</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual</li> <li>• Not met: Including on EX BPs</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2</li> <li>• Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company discloses that its employees, including services related to personnel management and security activities, are involved in human rights procedures on an ongoing basis and receive appropriate trainings on a regular basis. However, there is no further evidence if all employees are trained on human rights issues. [Annual Report with ESG, Human Rights section, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Trains relevant EX managers including security personnel</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2</li> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2</li> <li>• Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The Company states that monitors its implementation of Human Rights policy through observance of legal requirements, internal audits, procedures for assessment of the environmental impact of production activities and the effectiveness of measures on industrial safety and health, interaction with the Trade Union and control of the execution of the Collective Agreement and analysis of feedbacks. In addition, Tatneft discloses that the evaluation of the Company's human rights activities is carried out during the preparation of the sustainable development report. [Annual Report with ESG, Human Rights section, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Monitoring EX BP's</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2</li> <li>• Not met: Describes corrective action process</li> <li>• Not met: Example of corrective action</li> <li>• Not met: Discloses % of EX supply chain monitored</li> </ul>
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: HR affects selection EXs business partners: The Company discloses that one of its principles of interaction with partners is to assess new suppliers on the basis of labor practices, respect for human rights, and impact on society. In addition, Tatneft states that never hires partners that does not act in accordance with Company's principles. [Annual Report with ESG, Stakeholders, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: HR affects on-going EX business partner relationships</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Working with EX business partners to improve performance</li> </ul>
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Stakeholder process or systems: The Company discloses that it is guided by the Stakeholder Engagement Standard AA1000SES in which "when concluding agreements and joint actions with interested parties, the Company conducts a negotiation process, allowing each party to state its position and jointly find a solution that suits both parties. The fulfilment of obligations is accompanied by monitoring, allowing each party to assess the effectiveness of interaction. The results of the implementation of agreements, as a rule, are discussed with interested parties, including at public events. The Company also provides feedback in the form of surveys, round tables, conferences, meetings, feedback channels, which allows to identify the satisfaction of stakeholders with various aspects of the Company's activities, including its products, services, social programs. Indicators for assessing the effectiveness of the system of interaction with stakeholders". Also, the Company indicates that bases its stakeholders engagement and interaction "on a systems approach, joint actions and a balance of interests is one of the key aspects of the Company's responsible business practices [...] using mechanisms and forms appropriate to the scale and content of the tasks to be carried out in the area of mutual interests". In addition, the Company discloses the principles that uses to identify and select its stakeholders and also the regulatory documents used to communicate/interact with each stakeholder group. [Annual Report with ESG, Stakeholders, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement</li> <li>• Met: Engagement includes EX business partners workers: The Company discloses that Business partners are one of its stakeholders groups and in its standards and</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>regulations on interaction with stakeholders describes series of documents that are related to business partners' workers. [Annual Report with ESG, Stakeholders, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them</li> </ul>

## B.2 Human Rights Due Diligence (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company discloses about its integrated corporate risk management system and internal control in its website and explain how it works and how issues are identified and addressed. However, it did not describe its process and triggers for identifying human rights risks. [Annual Report with ESG, Risk Management and Internal Control, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Ongoing global risk identification</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with HR experts</li> <li>• Not met: Triggered by new circumstances</li> <li>• Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)</li> </ul>
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context)</li> <li>• Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks</li> <li>• Not met: Including amongst EX BPs</li> <li>• Not met: Example of Actions decided</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: System to check if Actions are effective</li> <li>• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans</li> <li>• Not met: Including EX business partners</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns</li> <li>• Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications</li> </ul>

## C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company provides a hotline in which any person can call or write and email to make a complaint about abuses, embezzlement, violations of internal regulatory documents and legislation. The company also has a special confidential channel, through which an employee or an outsider can report facts of various violations including human rights. [Hotline: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company describes that in 2017, 790 applications of various nature were received and processed. However, there is no description how many of this complaints were related to human rights issues. [Annual Report with ESG, Hotline, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages</li> <li>• Met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers: The Company states in its Annual Report that 'effectively operates a special confidential channel, through which an employee or an outsider can report facts of various violations related to the Company's activities professional activities, corporate governance, and corporate ethics issues, respect for human rights, work schedule, social aspects, industrial and environmental safety, labor protection, quality of products and services, other issues, including those of a corruption nature – the "Hotline." Receiving calls is carried out by an independent operator'. [Annual Report, 2018: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul>
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Grievance mechanism for community</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages</li> <li>• Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems</li> <li>• Not met: EX BPs communities use global system</li> </ul>
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Engages users to create or assess system</li> <li>• Not met: Description of how they do this</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Engages with users on system performance</li> <li>• Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance</li> <li>• Not met: EX BPs consult users in creation or assessment</li> </ul>
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response timescales</li> <li>• Not met: How complainants will be informed</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level</li> </ul>
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation</li> <li>• Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company discloses in its website that hotline calls shall be accepted from any persons, including anonymous ones. [Hotline: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Has not retaliated in practice</li> <li>• Not met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation</li> </ul>
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms</li> <li>• Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms</li> <li>• Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	grievance mechanisms		
C.7	Remediating adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided</li> <li>• Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition</li> <li>• Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</li> </ul>

### D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Living wage target timeframe or achieved</li> <li>• Not met: Describes how living wage determined</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Pays living wages</li> <li>• Not met: Reviews livings wages definition with unions</li> </ul>
D.3.2	Transparency and accountability (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Member of EITI</li> <li>• Not met: Reports of taxes and revenues beyond legal minimums</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Reports taxes and revenue by country</li> <li>• Not met: Steps taken re non EITI countries</li> <li>• Not met: Disclosures contract terms where not a requirement</li> </ul>
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation: Tatneft discloses in its website that respects the right of workers to freedom of association and collective bargaining. However, there is no description about Company's measures to prohibit retaliation against workers seeking to exercises these rights. [Trade Unions Section: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: Tatneft discloses that the collective agreement is adopted annually and covers all employees of the Company. [Trade Unions Section: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Injury Rate disclosures: In its Annual Report, the Company discloses the number of injury rates pear year for the past five years. [Annual Report, 2018: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company discloses zero number of fatalities for its calendar year of 2018. [Annual Report, 2018: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Set targets for H&amp;S performance: The Company discloses that "implements targeted program activities aimed at preserving life and health, as well as improving the working conditions of employees, reducing accident rates, significant production risks, improving the safety of equipment operation, and improving fire condition of facilities". However, there is no evidence about specific target for health and safety performance. [Annual Report with ESG, Industrial Safety and Environmental Policy, 2017: <a href="http://2017.tatneft.ru">2017.tatneft.ru</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Met targets or explains why not</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders</li> <li>• Not met: How engages with communities in assessment</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM)</li> <li>• Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal</li> </ul>
D.3.6	Land rights (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders</li> <li>• Not met: Describes approach to doing so if no recent deals</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How valuation and compensation works</li> <li>• Not met: Steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals</li> <li>• Not met: Describes approach if no recent deals</li> </ul>
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC)</li> <li>• Not met: Example of respecting HRs in security</li> <li>• Not met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Assesses and involves communities</li> <li>• Not met: Working with local community</li> </ul>
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Water targets considering local factors</li> <li>• Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows trends in progress made</li> </ul>

### E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 7.18 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.79 out of 20 points for theme E.

### F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	0.95 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, TATNEFT made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 9 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.95 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Company reports on GRI: The Company discloses a document with GRI references for its last Sustainable Development and Social Responsibility Report in 2013, however, no recent source has been found indicating that the company still reports on against the GRI. [Sustainable Development and Social Responsibility Report 2013, 2013: <a href="http://tatneft.ru">tatneft.ru</a>]</li> </ul>
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	TATNEFT met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)</li> </ul> Discussing challenges openly



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned</li> </ul> Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management</li> <li>• Not met: Score 1 for D.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for D.3.4 : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)</li> </ul>

## Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2019 Key Findings report and technical annex for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice. The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB Ltd's appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and construed in accordance with English law and submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of England and Wales.

As CHRB Ltd, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.