

Company Name Teck Resources
Industry Extractive
Overall Score (*) 35.0 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
4.9	10	A. Governance and Policies
7.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
2.9	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
8.1	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
7.0	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
5.0	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	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: The Company states in its Human Rights Policy that it is committed to respecting and observing all human rights, as articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the ILO Core Conventions. [Human Rights Policy: teck.com] Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact since 2007. UN Global Compact provides a framework for businesses committed to aligning their operations and strategies with 10 principles spanning human rights, labour, the environment and anti-corruption. [Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com & UN Global Compact: unglobalcompact.org] Met: UDHR: See as above [Human Rights Policy: teck.com] Not met: International Bill of Rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: UNGPs: The Company states that its external standards and commitments include UNGPs. Furthermore, the company states "we recognize our obligations under the United Nations Guiding Principles to respect human rights and provide access to remedy for human rights impacts." [Memberships and Partnerships: teck.com & Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: OECD: The Company states that it applies the OECD Guidelines to inform its research on international best practices. However, it is not clear if the company has a formal statement of commitment to the OECD. [Memberships and Partnerships: teck.com]
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: ILO Core: The Company states in its Human Rights Policy that it is committed to respecting and observing all human rights, as articulated in the ILO Core Conventions. [Human Rights Policy: teck.com] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact. Its commitment includes no discriminatory conduct, no forced labour or child labour occurs in the workplace. It also upholds freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for its workforce. [Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com & Code of Sustainable Conduct, 04/2018: teck.com] • Met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company indicates in its Expectation for Suppliers document that 'Teck's expectations for Suppliers and Contractors ("Supplier Expectations") have been established to clearly communicate Teck's expectations for suppliers of goods and contractors performing services ("suppliers" for or on behalf of Teck'. Although this document does not cover all ILO core areas, the policy also indicates that: 'The Supplier Expectations supplement the requirements, guidelines and standards of conduct described in Teck's other internal and external policies. This includes Teck's Code of Ethics, [...], Code of Sustainable Conduct, Health, Safety, Environment and Community Management Standards, Indigenous Peoples Policy, Human Rights Policy [...] amongst others'. As indicated below, the Code of Sustainable conduct covers each ILO core area, including the provision to 'Uphold freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for our workforce'. [Human Rights Policy: teck.com & Teck's Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors, 01/2016: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company states in its Code of Sustainable Conduct that it ensures that no discriminatory conduct, no forced labour or child labour occurs in the workplace. It also upholds freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for its workforce ('uphold freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for our workforce, and provide fair living wages and working hours'). [Code of Sustainable Conduct, 04/2018: teck.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states in its Health & Safety Policy that it is responsible for providing a safe workplace, effectively managing workplace risk and is committed to providing leadership and resources for managing health and safety. [Health & Safety Policy: teck.com] • Met: H&S applies to EX BPs: The Company states in its Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors that suppliers should establish, maintain and rigorously enforce practices that are protective of worker health and safety. [Teck's Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors, 01/2016: teck.com]
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	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"> • Not met: Based on UN Instruments • Not met: Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant: The company states that it has "third-party security personnel at some of our sites [...] and where we have security personnel, contracts require adherence to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights.". However, no evidence found of the Company committing itself to the voluntary principles (being a participant in the initiative) [Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com] • Not met: Uses only ICoCA members • Met: Respecting indigenous rights: The Company states in its Indigenous Peoples Policy that it respects the rights, cultures, interests, and aspirations of Indigenous Peoples. [Indigenous Peoples Policy: teck.com] • Met: ILO 169: The Company states "Teck is committed to responsible resource development and we recognize that building relationships with Indigenous Peoples is fundamental to our success. We are guided by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, and the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) Position Statement on Indigenous Peoples and Mining." [Indigenous Peoples Policy: teck.com] • Met: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP): See as above [Indigenous Peoples Policy: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expects BPs to respect these rights: The Company expects suppliers to understand and support its engagement with Indigenous Peoples and other communities as described in the Indigenous Peoples Policy. Suppliers should be aware of how their activities, goods and services may positively or negatively impact communities, including Indigenous communities, and respond to issues that may arise with respectful dialogue and in recognition of local culture, heritage and traditions. In addition, as indicated above, the Company requires to security contracted personnel adherence to the Voluntary Principles. The Company includes within suppliers "contractors performing services ("Suppliers") for or on behalf of Teck". [Teck's Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors, 01/2016: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: FPIC commitment: The Company is committed to fostering open and respectful dialogue with communities of interest throughout the mining life cycle, and working to achieve free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples. [Code of Sustainable Conduct, 04/2018: teck.com] • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights • Met: IFC performance standards: The company is a member of ICMM. "We implement the ICMM 10 Principles and position statements on sustainability practices across our business." [ICMM: teck.com] • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Met: Respecting the right to water: The Company states "Teck recognizes that access to water is a human right and water is essential to stakeholders in the watersheds where we operate. Teck is committed to protect water and the life it sustains by being an industry leader in water stewardship." [Water Policy: teck.com] • Not met: Expects BPs to commit to all these rights
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"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: "Guided by our Health, Safety, Environment and Community (HSEC) Management Standards and our Social Management and Responsibility at Teck (SMART) Framework, we require all 13 (100%) of our operations, all (100%) of our projects, and all of our exploration activities to engage and consult with stakeholders and communities to address current and emerging issues and to maximize opportunities that provide strategic value for both Teck and those communities." [Engagement Reporting: teck.com & 2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states that its direct engagement of stakeholders is organized into three broad levels: information disclosure, dialogue and participation. Its corporate teams also carry out direct engagement on an ongoing basis. The Company also carries out indirect engagement through the application of externally developed standards and frameworks that reflect stakeholder expectations. Its engagement with stakeholders is guided by HSEC Management Standards and Social Management and Responsibility at Teck (SMART) tools, and engagement outcomes are reported to the Safety and Sustainability Committee of Board of Directors and to HSEC Risk Management Committee. In 2018, the company has held several engagement activities with indigenous communities as for example, 'Socio-Economic/Environmental: potential new project development in the region.' [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & 2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company states that it is committed to engaging with communities of interest on its human rights impacts and to reporting on its performance. However, it is not clear if the company engaged these stakeholders in the design of the company's HR approach. [Human Rights Policy: teck.com & 2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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"> • Met: Commits to remedy: The Company states that its external standards and commitments include UNGPs. Furthermore, the company states 'we recognize our obligations under the United Nations Guiding Principles to respect human rights and provide access to remedy for human rights impacts.' On the other hand, in its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'In 2018, we worked to ensure appropriate management and remedy of negative feedback and significant incidents, through continual improvement of our feedback mechanisms and the reporting and management of incidents. This included a specific focus on improving

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			tracking and reporting of grievances through reporting technologies and practices.' [Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com & Memberships and Partnerships: teck.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs): The Company has provided an external source including an article on human rights defenders. However, no formal commitment found from a Company's formal documents to not tolerate nor contribute to threats to people defending human rights. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects EX BPs to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: CEO or Board approves policy: The Policy is approved by its President and CEO. [Human Rights Policy: teck.com] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: 'The Safety and Sustainability Committee of the Board is established by the Board of Directors to assist in its oversight responsibilities with respect to ensuring that appropriate policies, systems and personnel are in place to support safe and sustainable business practices in the conduct of company activities, and to maintain high standards of practice. [...] The Safety and Sustainability Committee shall: (a) review and report to the Board of Directors on corporate policies, codes of conduct, procedures and practices with respect to managing the risks and opportunities associated with: worker health and safety; environmental matters including water, waste, biodiversity and air quality management; emissions and climate change; engagement with communities and Indigenous Peoples; labour relations, diversity and human rights; and related matters (collectively "Sustainability Matters"); [...]' [Sustainability and Safety Committee Charter, Feb 2018: teck.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: The Company states that if salient human rights issues or new risks are identified, they are brought to the attention of senior leadership through HSEC Risk Management Committee and Safety and Sustainability Committee of the Board. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion: No evidence found in relation to how specifically the board/relevant committee of the board includes human rights topics of discussion in its meetings. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Incentives for at least one board member: In its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'Incentive compensation of the CEO and senior officers is performance-based and includes several sustainability performance indicators. In addition, the personal component of executive bonus ratings often includes specific objectives related to sustainability matters.' Sustainability matters include human rights issues, however CHRB could not find further information describing the indicators. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S: See above. Although the CEO incentive compensation includes sustainability indicators, and these includes human rights, no further evidence found. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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	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"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [Human Rights Policy: teck.com] • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its Approach to Human Rights document, the Company indicates: 'The following senior leaders are involved in implementing the management of human rights: The Senior Vice President, Sustainability and External Affairs reports directly to our CEO and is responsible for sustainability, health and safety, environment, community, and Indigenous affairs; The Vice President, Community and Government Relations leads activities related to social management and responsibility, community engagement and community investment, and Indigenous affairs Teck has an internal Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) to align and focus efforts across the organization in support of Teck's Human Rights Policy.' [Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition, the Company states: 'Members of HRWG work together to enhance Teck's human rights management and reporting, to increase awareness and internal alignment on human rights, and to strengthen the network of human rights practitioners at Teck.' [Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com] • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs: In its Sustainability Report 2018, the Company summarizes the day-to-day responsibilities for Supply Chain Management, including human rights issues: 'Through responsible supply chain management, our objective is to ensure that we minimize our potential impacts on people and on the environment, and that we manage business and reputation risks while capitalizing on opportunities. [...] Supply chain management is a multidisciplinary function at Teck involving several departments: [...] Community and Government Relations group administers the Human Rights Policy, which is overseen by our Legal department; these groups work together to embed human rights considerations into our supply chain management practices. [...] Corporate Risk and Legal groups support our Supply Management, Logistics and Transportation, and Operations and Exploration groups. The Corporate Risk group identifies and manages supply chain risks through the corporate risk assessment processes while the Legal group manages commercial contract development and compliance with Teck's policies related to our supply chain.' Although the Report states that its scope 'covers all of the operations managed by Teck and also, where appropriate, key issues at exploration and development projects and at joint venture operations.', it is not clear whether the described supply chain responsibilities include extractive business partners / joint ventures. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	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"> • Met: Senior manager incentives for human rights: In its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'Incentive compensation of the CEO and senior officers is performance-based and includes several sustainability performance indicators. In addition, the personal component of executive bonus ratings often includes specific objectives related to sustainability matters.' Sustainability includes human rights issues. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S: See above. No further information describing sustainability matters included in its incentive mechanism for senior officers linked to human rights in public sources.. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	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"> • Met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The Company states that in its integrated risk management, major risks include indigenous peoples and labour relations. It accesses, manages, and mitigates risks in several ways including human rights impact assessments. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment: The Company provided sources to CHRB in relation to this indicator. However, it is not material to this

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			indicator, as it refers to conducting audits including social and human rights risks. Not an evaluation of the system to determine whether the current systems to manage human rights risk are adequate. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]
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"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [Human Rights Policy: teck.com & Code of Sustainable Conduct, 04/2018: teck.com] • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company provided comments to CHRB in relation to this indicator. However, these couldn't be found in public sources. Policies being available on the website is not considered a proactive communication activity, including local languages where relevant. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [Human Rights Policy: teck.com & Code of Sustainable Conduct, 04/2018: teck.com] • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
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"> • Met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Communicating policy to EX contractors and joint ventures: Teck's expectations for suppliers cover suppliers of goods and contractors performing services for or on behalf of the Company. It also indicates that 'the Supplier Expectations apply to suppliers and all of their parent, subsidiary and affiliated companies and their respective employees, contractors and agents'. The document also states that it 'complements the requirements guidelines and standards of conduct described in Teck's other internal and external policies'. However, it is not clear how this is actively communicated to extractive business partners. [Teck's Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors, 01/2016: teck.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including to EX BPs (removed) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on EX BPs
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: In its 2017 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'In 2017, we worked to further embed the principles in our Human Rights Policy into our procedures and practices, such as social risk assessments, feedback/grievance management, and incident identification and management. We also piloted new training programs and conducted ongoing integration of the policy into project development frameworks. [...] In 2017, we integrated human rights considerations into Health, Safety, Environment and Community (HSEC) risk assessment tools and carried out training with key HSEC staff (approximately 40 people) in Vancouver and Santiago on identifying actual and potential human rights impacts that could occur during community engagement.' However, training for all workers not found. [2017 Sustainability Report, 04/2018: teck.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant EX managers including security personnel Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: In its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates that it conducts 'compliance audits on a three-year rotational basis for all operations, and plans are developed to address the findings based on risk priority criteria. We monitor and report to our HSEC Risk Management Committee on the progress of our assurance program on a quarterly basis.' Internal audits cover: 'Adherence to regulatory and permit requirements, effectiveness of controls based on risk profile, corporate health and safety requirements'; External audits by TSM (Towards Sustainable Mining) cover: 'External verification of site data reported to TSM from sites selected on a rotating schedule'. However, it is not clear that human rights issues, including ILO core topics are covered by these audits. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Monitoring EX BP's: It also indicates: 'The Expectations for Suppliers and Contractors policy includes our requirement that suppliers and service providers

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>will address issues relating to ethics, health and safety, environmental stewardship and human rights, including numerous labour law requirements. In addition, the Expectations integrate stipulations regarding fair working conditions, non-discrimination and the abolition of child and forced labour [...] The qualification of all suppliers involves obtaining and monitoring evidence that a supplier meets or exceeds our minimum standards as a condition to supplying products and services to Teck. This screens out the suppliers who are unable or unwilling to meet our requirements as outlined in our Expectations. [...] Ongoing monitoring and assessment is conducted for all of our suppliers. If an issue is identified during the assessment, work is stopped, an investigation is conducted and a corrective action plan is developed in collaboration with the supplier.' [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process: 'At any time, if higher risk is identified, we may initiate a manual review and vetting process of a supplier (and contractors) to determine whether the supplier meets our standards as a condition to supplying products and services to Teck. The results of the review determine whether work with the supplier will or will not proceed. In 2018, 22 deep-dive reviews were conducted. There were no material social, environmental or economic impacts identified, and no suppliers or service providers were terminated.' However, it is not clear which is the actual corrective action process. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of EX supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	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"> • Not met: HR affects selection EXs business partners • Not met: HR affects on-going EX business partner relationships <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with EX business partners to improve performance
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"> • Met: Stakeholder process or systems: In its 2018 Sustainability Report the Company indicates: 'Stakeholders are identified based on the degree to which they are affected by our activities and relationships, as well as by their ability to influence our achievement of our business objectives. In particular, stakeholder identification helps us to ensure we: Understand the positive and negative impacts of our business; Understand the risks and opportunities — for stakeholders and our business — associated with these impacts; Manage these impacts in a responsible and effective manner; Understand the effectiveness of our management actions. Our direct engagement of stakeholders is organized into three broad levels: information disclosure, dialogue and participation. [...] All of our operations, exploration sites, projects and closed properties identify, prioritize and directly engage local and Indigenous communities. Our work in this area is focused on: Disclosing and appropriately communicating accurate and timely information; Maintaining an open dialogue, so all parties can fully understand each other's views and concerns; Engaging in decision-making around our activities; Collaborating on issues of mutual interest; Securing and maintaining our social licence to operate ' [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: See above. It also reports: 'Our corporate teams also carry out direct engagement on an ongoing basis, which often includes engagement with government, industry associations, peers, shareholders and potential investors. We carry out indirect engagement through the application of externally developed standards and frameworks that reflect stakeholder expectations. Our engagement with stakeholders is guided by our HSEC Management Standards and our Social Management and Responsibility at Teck (SMART) tools [...]'. In addition, in its Approach to Relationships with Communities, the Company indicates: 'We have Communities teams at each of our operations who operationalize the SMART Framework to build and strengthen trust-based relationships with local communities and stakeholders. At our exploration and development projects, exploration geologists and project managers are responsible for implementing the SMART Framework with local communities through all stages of their activities. Teck's corporate Social Management and Responsibility team provides site support and guidance to sites in implementing the SMART Framework, as well as regularly reviewing their performance.' [Approach to

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Relationships with Communities, Mar 2019 & 2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners workers • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners communities: See above. However, it is not clear that the engagement includes extractive business partners local communities. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company states that it proactively identifies areas of highest human rights risk so it can prevent adverse impacts from occurring. During 2018, it undertook human rights assessments at every operation with more than five years of anticipated mine life. The reviews were conducted through a detailed interview with site General Managers and Superintendents. The results of the human rights risk assessments inform Teck's overall salient human rights issues and also identify potential risk areas to integrate into ongoing social risk assessments and management activities at individual sites. The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB in relation to this indicator. However, no further evidence found in public domain. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Approach to Relationships with Communities, Mar 2019] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: As indicated above, in 2018 the Company carried out assessments (seems a process to both identify and assess). • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR): The Company indicates how it assesses social risks: They 'begin with evaluating the geographical range of impact of a site's or project's activities, and developing a tailored social risk profile [...]' Examples of social risks include environmental concerns contributing to erosion of community trust, and disputes around land rights affecting local livelihoods or cultural practices'. On its website, it indicates that it undertook human rights assessments at every operation with more than five years of anticipated mine life'. 'The results of the human rights risk assessments inform Teck's overall salient human rights issues and also identify potential risks areas to integrate into ongoing social risk assessments and management activities at individual sites'. [Approach to Human Rights, Mar 2019: teck.com & Approach to Relationships with Communities, Mar 2019]
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): Teck assesses enterprise-level human rights risks on an ongoing basis and implements policy and practice improvements when possible. [...]. We conduct ongoing due diligence to identify, prevent, mitigate and remedy any adverse human rights impacts through our regular social risk assessments. Identified risks are integrated into management plans and activities as outlined in our Social Management and Responsibility at Teck (SMART) toolkit. Significant risks related to human rights are acted upon and responses, communicating how issues are being addressed, are tracked. The company has identified Security Forces, Resettlement and Human Rights Management at Operations as some of their salient HR risks. However, it is not clear how factors such as social, geographical, economic or other factors were taken into account in determining the saliency of issues during the process. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Human rights on website, 05/08/2019] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company reports that salient risks related with labour were freedom of association, assembly and collective bargaining, right to not be subjected to slavery, servitude or forced labour, right to non-discrimination, and right to safe and healthy working conditions. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Human rights on website, 05/08/2019] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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"> • Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company states that if issues or new risks are identified, they are brought to the attention of senior leadership through HSEC Risk Management Committee and the Safety and Sustainability Committee of the Board. All our operations have preventive control measures in place to minimize the likelihood of incidents and to mitigate potential effects on employees, communities or the environment in case an incident does occur. We apply a hierarchy of controls to strengthen our ability to prevent and mitigate risk. Control measures include facility design considerations, spill containment measures, monitoring systems and alarms, standard operating procedures, training, regular inspections, and the identification of potential issues through internal risk assessments and audits." [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs: No evidence found in public sources of how extractive business partners are included in the Company's system to mitigate risks identified and assessed as part of the due diligence process. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Met: Example of Actions decided: "In the period 2011 to 2017, our Quebrada Blanca Operations (QB) recorded 28 high-potential incidents associated with driving on Pintados Road near the operation. Through their ongoing implementation of the High-Potential Risk Control strategy, QB has implemented a range of control improvements to reduce incidents on this road. In 2018, no high-potential incidents were recorded." [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
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"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: No evidence found in public sources of a system showing how the Company tracks and checks if its action plans to mitigate salient risks are effective or not produced the desired results. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Approach to Relationships with Communities, Mar 2019] • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	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"> • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B.2.1. The Company has a process to identify risks. However, further details would be needed. • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B.2.2. The Company has disclosed that it has a system to assess risks and discloses human rights salient issues. However, no details found in public sources how any factors are taken into account to evaluate saliency (social, economic, geographical, etc.) • Met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: See indicator B.2.3. The Company has a system to mitigate risks and provides some examples. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Human rights on website, 05/08/2019] • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: See indicator B.2.4 • Not met: Including EX business partners: Although the Company reports on its assessment and mitigation process, no clarification found in public domain that this approach also integrates extractive business partners. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states that employees can report their concerns to their supervisor or the Company's Senior Vice President & General Counsel, and, if they wish, any report can be made anonymously through the Whistleblower hotline. [Code of Ethics, 23/04/2009: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports that in 2018, that through the hotline they received "31 reports of alleged violations of our

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Code of Ethics in 2018. The areas for which we received the greatest number of reports were in relation to employee relations (52%), theft of money (10%), and safety (10%). Twenty-five of these 31 cases were closed following investigation or were closed on the basis that no investigation was necessary. The remaining six cases are still under investigation." [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The company states that it has a whistle-blower Hotline and web portal that are managed by a third party. According to its Code of Ethics the Hotline is available in English and Turkish. However, it is not clear whether the grievance mechanism is available in all appropriate languages. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Code of Ethics, 23/04/2009: teck.com] • Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system • Not met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	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"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In its Approach to Relationship with Communities, the Company states: 'Teck provides direct feedback mechanisms at every operation and project and in every exploration region to specifically ensure that those who want to provide feedback—whether it's a comment, question, concern, complaint or compliment—are able to do so easily and, if they wish, anonymously. [...] Feedback mechanisms may include dedicated phone lines and in-person or online platforms.' In addition, in its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'All of our operations and major projects and most of our exploration projects have implemented feedback mechanisms, which help us to understand our impacts on communities and take steps to address negative impacts and replicate positive impacts. Feedback received is recorded and categorized into four levels: Level 1: Feedback/donation request; Level 2: Question or concern; Level 3: Issue, concern or grievance; Level 4: Repeated and ongoing concern, or an issue, concern or grievance that is major in nature and may include a breach of law or company policy'. [Approach to Relationships with Communities, Mar 2019 & 2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: See above. Although, there is no specific information about local languages in public sources, channels are set for each operation and exploration region. [Approach to Relationships with Communities, Mar 2019] • Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems: No evidence found in public sources of extractive business partners being required to have grievance mechanisms open for their communities. • Not met: EX BPs communities use global system
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"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: EX BPs consult users in creation or assessment
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"> • Not met: Response timescales: In its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'Teck's practice is that all feedback, which includes grievances, is acknowledged and assessed, and a response is communicated to the complainant, with the goal of providing a satisfactory reply or resolution in a timely manner.' However, no further information found describing the response timescales, how the complainant will be informed or escalation process, including in sources provided to CHRB by the Company. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Relationship with Communities, Ag 2019: teck.com] • Not met: How complainants will be informed <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
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"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The code states that 'Employees have a duty to report violations of the Company's policies and standards including its Code of Business, Environmental, Health and Safety Practices. Any employee making such a report is to be free from any concern about retaliatory consequences. Reprisals or intimidation of employees who draw

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			attention to problems or violations will not be tolerated.' However, the statement focus on employees, it is not clear if this apply to any other stakeholder. [Code of Ethics, 23/04/2009: teck.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company states that employees can make anonymous reporting through a toll-free hotline managed by an independent company. [Code of Ethics, 23/04/2009: teck.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms: No evidence found in relation to commitment to not impeding access to state-based judicial or non-judicial mechanisms or other mechanisms for persons who makes allegations of adverse human rights. [Code of Sustainable Conduct, 04/2018: teck.com & Code of Ethics, 23/04/2009: teck.com] • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying 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"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided: No material evidence found to this indicator in public sources provided to CHRB by the Company [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe or achieved: In its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company indicates: 'Teck is committed to providing a fair living wage to all employees and contractors that is above the local minimum for all of our significant areas of operation.' However, CHRB could not find further information about its target timeframe for paying all workers a living wage, and it is not clear whether its definition of fair living wage consider discretionary income for the worker and their family/dependants. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays living wages • Not met: Reviews livings wages definition with unions
D.3.2	Transparency and accountability (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Member of EITI: The Company states that it engages in and supports the work being done to fight corruption by supporting international frameworks such as the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). The Company participates in the EITI through its ICMM membership. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Memberships and Partnerships: teck.com] • Met: Reports of taxes and revenues beyond legal minimums: The Company discloses information about taxes, royalties and fees by country in its ESTMA [Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act] Report and in its 2018 Economic Contribution Report. [ESTMA - Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act - 2018, May 2019: teck.com & 2018 Economic Contribution Report, May 2019: teck.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: See above [ESTMA - Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act - 2018, May 2019: teck.com & 2018 Economic Contribution Report, May 2019: teck.com] • Not met: Steps taken re non EITI countries • Not met: Disclosures contract terms where not a requirement

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation: In its Code of Sustainable Conduct, the Company states that it 'Uphold freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining for our workforce, and provide fair living wages and working hours.' However, CHRB no evidence found of a commitment to not interfere with the exercise of these rights nor a description of measures put in place to prohibit any form of intimidation or retaliation against workers seeking to exercise their rights. [Code of Sustainable Conduct, 04/2018: teck.com & 2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: The Company reports that in total 57% of its workforce is unionized. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company discloses information about its total recordable injury frequency for the last four years in its 2018 Sustainability Report. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: The Company states that number of lost-time injuries were 75 in 2018. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: The Company states that there were two fatalities in 2018. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company reports that it aims to have zero fatalities and reduce 10% year-over-year reduction in lost-time & disabling injury frequency and total recordable injury frequency in 2018 against 2017. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Met: Met targets or explains why not: The Company reports that it had two fatalities in 2018 and failed to meet the fatality target. It achieved 14% reduction in lost-time & disabling injury frequency and 12% reduction in total recordable injury frequency in 2018. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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"> • Not met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: The Company states that all operations completed social risk assessments and human rights self-assessments, which are contributing to operational risk planning. Through the risk assessments, the Company identifies impact on indigenous people. As an example of how the Company identifies and engage with indigenous communities, the Company quotes its Ktunaxa Nation Interest document, which 'summarizes baseline information and impact assessment information regarding First Nation rights and interests in relation to the Line Creek Operations Phase II Project (the Project). Teck Coal Limited (Teck) and the Ktunaxa Nation Council (KNC) are working collaboratively to conduct an assessment of Ktunaxa rights and interests in relation to the Project. Other First Nations were identified for consultation as summarized in Section C4.' However, that document is dated in 2011, and shows a specific case, not a Company document showing a general approach, moreover no description found of the process to identify and recognise affected or potentially affected indigenous peoples. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & Ktunaxa Nation Interests, 2011: projects.eao.gov.bc.ca] • Not met: How engages with communities in assessment: As indicated above, the Company engaged with the community in carrying out the assessment. However, that document is dated in 2011, and shows a specific case, not a Company document showing a general approach. In its Approach to Relationships with Communities, the Company indicates: 'We organize our engagement with stakeholders into three levels: information disclosure, dialogue and participation. Guided by our HSEC Management Standards and our SMART Framework, our operations, exploration sites, projects and closed properties identify and prioritize local and regional stakeholders, undertaking broad, inclusive and regular engagement activities.' However, no details found on whether participation includes collaboration in carrying out the assessment. [Ktunaxa Nation Interests, 2011: projects.eao.gov.bc.ca & Approach to Relationships with Communities, Mar 2019] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM): The company is a member of the ICMM. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com & ICMM: teck.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal: The Company discloses some information about its Frontier Project on its website: 'Engagement with Indigenous communities and regional stakeholders has been ongoing since the earliest stages of the project, starting in 2008. Input from Indigenous communities was considered during early phases of planning, and we have modified a number of specific project design aspects in response to the feedback received. In addition, Teck has achieved agreements covering all 14 local Indigenous groups potentially affected by the project.' [Profiling Frontier Project, Jul 2019: teck.com]
D.3.6	Land rights (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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"> • Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders: No evidence found in the sources provided to CHRB in relation to how the Company identifies legitimate tenure rights holders. • Not met: Describes approach to doing so if no recent deals <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How valuation and compensation works: No evidence found in the sources provided to CHRB in relation to this indicator. • Not met: Steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals • Not met: Describes approach if no recent deals
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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"> • Not met: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): The Company provided a source as evidence to CHRB, however, no details found in relation to the specific requirements of this indicator. • Not met: Example of respecting HRs in security • Not met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Assesses and involves communities • Not met: Working with local community
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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"> • Met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: In its 2018 Sustainability Report, the Company states: 'Our vision is to contribute to the balance between the social, economic, recreational and cultural benefits of water resources, within ecologically sustainable limits.' It discloses information about its performance in Water Stewardship: 'Quebrada Blanca and Carmen de Andacollo operations worked towards implementing a prioritized list of water projects to meet Teck's fresh water use efficiency target. Highland Valley Copper, Red Dog and Carmen de Andacollo operations made progress towards their watershed-based management plans in collaboration with communities of interest. Highland Valley Copper, Red Dog and Carmen de Andacollo operations assessed groundwater data and knowledge gaps, defined groundwater modelling scope and requirements, and advanced work on conceptual and numerical models. Successfully developed an in situ method to remove selenium and nitrate from mine-impacted water through our new saturated rock fill facility.' [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors: The Company indicates its Water targets in its 2018 Sustainability Report: 'Our new targets for water, established in 2018, are to reduce the consumption of fresh water at our Chilean operations by 15% by 2020 and to achieve zero significant water-related incidents each year.' Not clear, however, if targets have considered water use by local communities and other users in the vicinity of its operations. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows trends in progress made: It also indicates: 'This year, we met our target of zero significant water-related incidents. We also started implementing water projects at our Chilean operations intended to reduce fresh water use to help us achieve our 2020 target.' In addition, it reports on key performance indicators for 2017 and 2018, such as: Water reused and recycled, as a percentage of new water use at mining operations; New water use intensity per tonne of raw coal processed at coal operations (m3); New water use intensity per tonne of ore processed at milling and flotation operations (m3). As indicated above, it is not clear if targets have considered water use by local communities and other users in the vicinity of its operations. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com]

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 28.01 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 7.00 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	2.63 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Teck Resources made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 25 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 2.63 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company reports on GRI: The Company reports on GRI under each of its material topics in its sustainability report. [2018 Sustainability Report, 03/2019: teck.com] • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0.4 out of 4	Teck Resources met 1 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0.4 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 1 for D.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs) • Met: Score 2 for D.3.4 : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)

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.