

Company Name Vulcan Materials
Industry Extractive
Overall Score (*) 7.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.1	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
1.3	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
3.1	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.6	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
0.7	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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: The company indicates that "We use our management systems at Vulcan to guide our business conduct as well as our social, environmental and economic activities. These systems provide sustainable value by: Understanding, promoting and upholding fundamental human rights within our sphere of influence, respecting the traditional rights of indigenous peoples and valuing cultural heritage" [COMMITTED TO SUSTAINABILITY, 05/04/19: vulcanmaterials.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs Not met: OECD
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"> Not met: ILO Core Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core Met: Respect H&S of workers: The company indicates that "as an employer Vulcan provides: A firm commitment to employee health and safety."

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Furthermore, the company indicates in the Mission and Values webpage that "We will maintain a firm commitment to employee health and safety." [COMMITTED TO OUR PEOPLE, 05/04/2019: vulcanmaterials.com & Mission and Values, 04/04/2019: vulcanmaterials.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: H&S applies to EX BPs
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"> • Not met: Based on UN Instruments • Not met: Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant • Not met: Uses only ICoCA members • Not met: Respecting indigenous rights: The company indicates that it has management systems that provide sustainable value by "Understanding, promoting and upholding fundamental human rights within our sphere of influence, respecting the traditional rights of indigenous peoples and valuing cultural heritage". However no evidence has been found of a clear commitment to respect indigenous peoples rights [COMMITTED TO SUSTAINABILITY, 05/04/19: vulcanmaterials.com] • Not met: ILO 169 • Not met: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FPIC commitment • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water: Despite the multiple references to water in the annual report and other documents and the efforts made by the company to re-use and recycle water to reduce the impacts on communities no evidence has been found of a clear commitment to respecting the right to water [ANNUAL REPORT 2018, 2019: s1.q4cdn.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: The company indicates that it has management systems that provides sustainable value by "Encouraging and supporting open, honest and regular engagement with the communities we serve, and considering their views in our decision making". The company also indicates that part of their shared cultural values is "Engage constructively with our neighbours and help them build stronger communities." [COMMITTED TO SUSTAINABILITY, 05/04/19: vulcanmaterials.com & ANNUAL REPORT 2018, 2019: s1.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
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"> • Not met: Commits to remedy: The company indicates that "We will maintain a steadfast commitment to minimize any adverse impacts our activities have on the environments in which we operate." However, a commitment to minimize the impacts does not count as formal commitment to remedy adverse impact the company may cause or contribute to. [Mission and Values, 04/04/2019: vulcanmaterials.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) <p>Score 2</p> <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: CEO or Board approves policy Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
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"> Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both examples and process
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"> Not met: Incentives for at least one board member Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 Not met: Senior responsibility for HR Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Day-to-day responsibility Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
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"> Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Performance criteria made public
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"> Not met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
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"> Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company indicates that "Our Safety, Health and Environment Excellence Team evaluates existing successful practices across the Company and makes recommendations to standardize them. [...] Our training includes behaviour-based safety programs that incorporate senior management participation and commitment" However no evidence has been found of a description of how the company communicates its policy commitment to all workers. [Safety, Health & Environment, 05/04/2019] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 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"> Not 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 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: Evidence has been found that the company trains its employees in safety and health issues or in leadership and supervisory matters. "At Vulcan, we invest in our people, giving the essential training, guidance and supportive environment they need to develop, advance and excel." However no evidence has been found of training to all workers on human rights. [ANNUAL REPORT 2018, 2019: s1.g4cdn.com & CAREERS, 05/04/2019: vulcanmaterials.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant EX managers including security personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of EX supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects selection EXs business partners • Not met: HR affects on-going EX business partner relationships Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners workers • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners communities Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs • Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	taking appropriate action		
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including EX business partners Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company has an ethics point available online where there are different possibilities to make a report. [EthicsPoint, 05/04/2019: secure.ethicspoint.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company only operates in the USA, Mexico and The Bahamas, however no evidence found of a Channel available in Spanish or any other language than English. [MAP, 05/04/2019 & EthicsPoint, 05/04/2019: secure.ethicspoint.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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The non-retaliation policy in Ethics Point webpage indicates that "No employee using the Helpline will be punished for making a legitimate report. If you request it, you may remain anonymous and your report will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law and consistent with enforcement objectives." However, no evidence found on whether external stakeholders are allowed to use the ethics point. [EthicsPoint, 05/04/2019: secure.ethicspoint.com] Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: As mentioned above, the company indicates that "If you request it, you may remain anonymous and your report will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law and consistent with enforcement objectives." [EthicsPoint, 05/04/2019: secure.ethicspoint.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 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 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: The Company indicates that "Our compensation continues to be highly competitive and responsive, with an hourly wage well above the average. We continually seek new ways to reward and incentivize our employees." However this do not imply that the company has determined or calculated a living wage for the regions where it operates or that it's paying its employees a living wage. [ANNUAL REPORT 2017, 2018: s1.q4cdn.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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Member of EITI Not met: Reports of taxes and revenues beyond legal minimums Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Reports taxes and revenue by country Not met: Steps taken re non EITI countries
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"> Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: The company indicates that "As of December 31, 2018, a total of 8.5% of our domestic hourly labor force was covered by collective-bargaining agreements. Of such employees covered by collective-bargaining agreements, 7.5% were covered by agreements that expire in 2019. We also employed 332 union employees in Mexico who are covered by a collective-bargaining agreement that will expire in 2019. None of our union employees in Mexico participate in multiemployer pension plans." [ANNUAL REPORT 2018, 2019: s1.q4cdn.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)	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: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company discloses information about the injury rate "Our 2018 safety record was even better than our world-class 2017 performance, remaining at less than one injury per 200,000 employee-hours worked. Our goal is zero injuries in the workplace. We believe that is achievable. In fact, in the past 12 months, 94 percent of our facilities have not had an employee lose a single hour of work due to an injury. It's a well-earned achievement, the outcome of a relentless focus on the safety and well-being of our people." Furthermore the company shows some charts with information in comparison with the aggregate injury rate of the industry. [ANNUAL REPORT 2018, 2019: s1.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Met: Fatalities disclosures: "During the twelve months ended December 31, 2018, none of our operations: [...]had any mining-related fatalities." [ANNUAL REPORT 2018, 2019: s1.q4cdn.com] • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: See above; "Our goal is zero injuries in the workplace. We believe that is achievable. [...]" [ANNUAL REPORT 2018, 2019: s1.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (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: Process to identify indigenous rights holders • Not met: How engages with communities in assessment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM) • Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal
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 • 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 • 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) • 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)	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: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors: The company indicates that "Every site Vulcan operates has unique environmental characteristics that call for a tailored, site-by-site stewardship strategy that includes a strong focus on water re-use and recycling". Although the company is committed through different statements to water stewardship it is not clear whether these statements include a commitment to improve communities' right to access to water.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			• Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows trends in progress made

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 6.21 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.55 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	0.74 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Vulcan Materials made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 7 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.74 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 • Not met: Company reports on GRI • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Vulcan Materials 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 • 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 • 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 • 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) • Not 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.