

**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark
2022 Company Scoresheet**

Company Name Nestle
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score 34.3 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
3.8	10	A. Governance and Policies
11.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
6.0	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
9.8	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
3.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations

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 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 2022 Methodology document for the sector concerned. 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	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 has indicated in its business principles: 'We respect and promote human rights in our operations and entire value chain, in line with the United Nations Guiding Principles and the Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact'. [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Commitment to the UNGPs Met: Commitment to the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises: The Company states in its Corporate business principles that it is 'committed to the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (ILO) and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises'. [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com]
A.1.2.a	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Company has a commitment to the ILO Core: The Company's business principles include the following statement: 'We are committed to the International Bill of Human Rights and the principles concerning fundamental rights set out in the International Labor Organization's Declaration on the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com] Met: Company has a explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: Its Business Principles document reads: 'In particular, we take action against any violations of human rights in our operations and value chain, with zero tolerance to child labor, forced labor and modern slavery. By the same token, we respect the right and freedom of association of our employees, including the organization and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>participation in Associations and Unions'. It also states that 'We do not tolerate any discrimination'. On its Human Resources Policy, it indicates: 'Nestlé not only upholds the freedom of association of its employees and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, but also ensures that direct and frequent communication is established in the workplace'. [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com] & [Human Resources Policy, 09/2012]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company expect suppliers to commit to ILO Core: The Company's Responsible Sourcing Standard covers each ILO Core commitment: discrimination, forced labour, child labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining, as indicated below. The Company's Corporate Business Principles indicates 'We expect all of our suppliers to comply with the Nestlé Responsible Sourcing Standard'. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com] • Met: Company explicitly list All four ILO for suppliers: The Company's Responsible Sourcing Standard covers all four core ILO standards. With respect the rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining the Company sets out alternatives measures where these rights are restricted by law: 'Facilitate and shall not hinder the development of parallel means for independent and free association and bargaining where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is restricted under law'. The Company's Corporate Business Principles indicates 'We expect all of our suppliers to comply with the Nestlé Responsible Sourcing Standard'. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com]
A.1.2.b	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: Health and safety and working hours	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: Commitment to respect H&S of workers: The Human Resources policy states that 'We are committed to providing our employees all over the world with good working conditions, a safe and healthy work environment'. [Human Resources Policy, 09/2012] • Not Met: Respect ILO labour standards on working hours or Commits to 48 hours regular work week: The Company has provided an additional source to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. The Company is expected to provide a publicly available policy statement committing it to respecting the ILO conventions on labour standards on working hours or alternatively, the Company publicly should states that workers shall not be required to work more than 48 hours in a regular work week or 60 hours including overtime and that all overtime work must be consensual and paid at a premium rate. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expect suppliers to commit to H&S of their workers: The Company's Corporate Business Principles indicates 'We expect all of our suppliers to comply with the Nestlé Responsible Sourcing Standard'. Regarding health and safety requirements, the Responsible Sourcing Standards includes requirements on workplace environment (risks, production and utilities equipment, personal protective equipment, hygiene, training, etc.), emergency and housing conditions. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com] • Met: Expect suppliers to commit to ILO labour standard or to 48 hours regular work week: Responsible Sourcing Standard indicates that it is mandatory that 'Regular working hours, excluding overtime, shall be defined by contract and shall not exceed 48 hours per week or the legal limit, whichever is more stringent. (...) All overtime shall be voluntary and shall not exceed 12 hours per week. Overtime shall be used responsibly, taking into account the extent, frequency and hours worked by individual workers and the workforce as a whole. Overtime shall always be compensated in accordance with local laws'. The Company's Corporate Business Principles indicates 'We expect all of our suppliers to comply with the Nestlé Responsible Sourcing Standard'. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com]
A.1.3.a.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – land, natural resources and indigenous	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: Respect land ownership and natural resources as set out in VGGT: The Company indicates: 'Nestlé is against all forms of land acquisitions that are illegal and/or have an adverse impact on local communities' livelihoods (land grabs). It is committed to develop its business in a way that complies with national laws and respects human rights, and particularly the customary rights to land and natural resources of Indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples, and communities that are impacted or potentially impacted by the company's business activities. [...] We will adopt the FAO's Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	peoples' rights (AG)		<p>Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, and other relevant and accepted instruments that codify the rights of communities in relation to their land and natural resources'. [Commitment on Land & Land Rights - Suppliers, 07/2014: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respecting indigenous peoples' rights or ILO Convention No.169 or UN Declaration: The Company indicates: 'It is committed to develop its business in a way that complies with national laws and respects human rights, and particularly the customary rights to land and natural resources of Indigenous Peoples, traditional peoples, and communities that are impacted or potentially impacted by the company's business activities'. [Commitment on Land & Land Rights - Suppliers, 07/2014: nestle.com] • Met: Expecting suppliers to make these commitments: See above. Both commitments are made in the 'Nestle Commitment on Land & Land Rights in Agricultural Supply Chains'. [Commitment on Land & Land Rights - Suppliers, 07/2014: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respecting the right to water: The Company states: 'We believe that access to water and sanitation is a basic human right. Together with other water users and partners, we are committed to managing water resources in a way that is ecologically sustainable, socially equitable and economically beneficial'. [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com] • Not Met: Company's policy commits to obtain FPIC [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com] • Met: Expecting suppliers to make these commitments <p>: On its 'Responsible Sourcing Standard', the Company indicates that the Suppliers shall: 'Demonstrate evidence of respect for community land rights and free, prior and informed consent of the local community regarding the Supplier's operations. [...] Agricultural and forestry developments and activities on local peoples' land are subject to the free, prior and informed consent [FPIC] of the affected local communities, including indigenous peoples, with or without governmental consent for expansion. [...] Identify, protect and avoid producing on [...] Sites and resources that are fundamental for satisfying the basic necessities of local communities or indigenous peoples (for livelihoods, health, nutrition, water, etc...), as identified through engagement with these communities or indigenous peoples. [...] Provide a hygienic working environment with adequate lighting, ambient temperature, ventilation, sanitation, potable drinking water to respect human right to water, sanitary facilities and food storage'. The Company's Corporate Business Principles indicates 'We expect all of our suppliers to comply with the Nestlé Responsible Sourcing Standard'. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com]</p>
A.1.3.b.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – vulnerable groups (AG)	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: Women's rights: The Company has provided various sources for this indicator. However, they were either a webpage section or a report. In order the meet CHRB requirement for this datapoint, the evidence has to be found in a formal policy statement (or a statement of commitment/being signatory to the WEPs). No evidence found that the Company has a publicly available policy statement committing it to respect women's rights. • Not Met: Children's rights: The Company has provided various sources for this indicator. However, they were either a webpage section, a report or a communication plan. In order the meet CHRB requirement for this datapoint, the evidence has to be found in a formal policy statement. No evidence found that the Company has a publicly available policy statement committing it to respect children's rights. • Not Met: Migrant worker's rights: The Company has provided an additional source for this indicator. However, it was a webpage section. In order the meet CHRB requirement for this datapoint, the evidence has to be found in a formal policy statement. No evidence found that the Company has a publicly available policy statement committing it to respect migrant workers' rights. • Not Met: Expects suppliers to respect at least one of these rights: The Company's Corporate Business Principles indicates 'We expect all of our suppliers to comply with the Nestlé Responsible Sourcing Standard'. This document requires 'respect the rights to women on farm and ensure that any work assigned to women is properly remunerated and recognized as for men'. However, as this requirement is made specifically to farmers, it is not clear it applies to all suppliers. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles: The previous assessment was based on the Company's engagement feedback which CHRB no longer considers a suitable source for policy statements. No further evidence found. • Not Met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not Met: Convention on migrant workers • Not Met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights: On its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provisions to 'Respect of Gender and Woman Empowerment Principle'. However, the specific requirement indicates the following: 'respect the rights to women on farm and ensure that any work assigned to women is properly remunerated and recognized as for men'. It's not clear if it would cover all women in supply chain or only those working at farms. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Corporate business principles, 07/2020: nestle.com]
A.1.4	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: The Company commits to remedy: The Company provides feedback for this indicator regarding the launch of action plans to tackle different salient issues and remedial action taken. However, no publicly available policy statement found committing it to remedy the adverse impacts on individuals and workers and communities that it has caused or contributed to. In order the meet CHRB requirement for this datapoint, the evidence has to be found in a formal policy statement. • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not Met: Work with suppliers to remedy impact: Previous assessment used evidence from the webpage section 'Our salient human rights issues', which CHRB no longer considers a suitable source for policy statements. No further evidence found.
A.1.5	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): In its response to Business & Human Rights Resource Center to allegations of violence against human rights defenders, the Company indicates: 'Human rights abuses, including violations of Indigenous Peoples' rights, are unacceptable and have no place in our operations and supply chains. We are working hard to address them. We recognize the important role that human rights defenders, play in the promotion and protection of human rights worldwide. We do not tolerate threats, intimidation or physical attacks against human rights defenders in relation to our operations. We expect our suppliers to follow the same approach'. However, in order the meet CHRB requirement for this indicator, the evidence has to be found in a formal policy statement. [Response to Business & Human Rights Resource Center, 24/09/2022: media.business-humanrights.org] • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Work with HRD to create safe and enabling environment

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	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: Board level responsibility for HRs: It indicates: 'The Board of Directors, Chairman, CEO and Executive Board supervise and manage our role in society and the CSV strategy'. Also: 'Our Board of Directors created a separate, dedicated Sustainability Committee to review Nestlé's sustainability agenda and how our long-term strategy relates to our ability to create shared value. In particular, the Sustainability Committee reviews our plans and actions with regard to (...) water management and responsible sourcing, while ensuring that Nestlé carries out human rights due diligence and manages diversity, inclusion and employee health and well-being appropriately'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe HR expertise of Board member: The Company indicates: 'In 2021, our Board created a separate, dedicated Sustainability Committee to advise on all aspects of our environmental and social sustainability. In particular, the Sustainability Committee oversees our response to climate change, our human rights due diligence program, and our strategies for diversity and inclusion'. However, no further description found of the human rights expertise of the board member or board committee tasked with that governance oversight. The Company has also provided additional source, however, the evidence referred to a member of the executive board. This indicator looks at Board level oversight. [2021 Annual Review, 2022: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO: The Company co-signed the WBCSD CEO Guide to Human rights, which is considered a proxy for this subindicator. [WBCSD CEO Guide to Human Rights, 18/06/2019: wbcscd.org]
A.2.2	Board responsibility	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: Board/Committee review HRs strategy: The Sustainability Committee 'reviews the Company's sustainability agenda. It reviews reports and gives advice on measures which ensure the long-term sustainability of the Company in its economic, social and environmental dimension and monitors the Company's performance against selected external sustainability indexes. It reviews the annual Creating Shared Value and Sustainability Report. It discusses periodically how material non-financial issues affect the Company's financial performance and how its long-term strategy relates to its ability to create shared value. (...) it ensures the Company carries out human rights due diligence and reports on its most severe human rights risks, and it reviews the Company's diversity and inclusion management and employee health and well-being. It meets at least four times a year and as frequently as necessary to fulfil its tasks'. [2021 Corporate Governance Report, 16/02/2022: nestle.com] • Not Met: Examples/trends re HR discussion in the last reporting period: The Company indicates: 'In 2021, our Board created a separate, dedicated Sustainability Committee to advise on all aspects of our environmental and social sustainability. In particular, the Sustainability Committee oversees our response to climate change, our human rights due diligence program, and our strategies for diversity and inclusion'. However, no example found of specific human rights issues or trends in types of human rights issues discussed at board level or a board committee during the Company's last reporting period. [2021 Annual Review, 2022: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1: See above. • Not Met: How affected stakeholders/HR experts informed discussions: The Company indicates: 'In 2021, our Board created a separate, dedicated Sustainability Committee to advise on all aspects of our environmental and social sustainability. In particular, the Sustainability Committee oversees our response to climate change, our human rights due diligence program, and our strategies for diversity and inclusion'. However, although the Company indicates it now has a Sustainability Committee that advises on different aspects, including human rights, it is not clear how the experiences of affected stakeholders or external human rights experts informed Board discussions. [2021 Annual Review, 2022: nestle.com]
A.2.3	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: Incentives for at least one board member: In its Corporate Governance Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'For the CEO, 100% of the target was linked to performance against the Nestlé Group objectives', which include: 'Additional quantitative and qualitative objectives, set by the Board of Directors in line with Nestlé's strategy are also used to determine the Nestlé Group performance. This set of additional objectives reflects Nestlé's Creating Shared Value framework and includes [...] further progress on quality, safety, sustainability and compliance'. The CEO is part of the Board of Directors. [Corporate Governance 2018, 2019: nestle.com] • Not Met: At least one key HR risk, beyond employee H&S: See above. However, there is no further information to identify if other aspects of human rights policy commitments are included or if the safety performance include the safety of local communities or workers of the supply chain. [Corporate Governance 2018, 2019: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria made public

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Review of other board performance criteria
A.2.4	Business model strategy and risks	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Board process to review business model and strategy: The Company indicates in its Human Rights Framework and Roadmap 'Now, to support the people behind our regeneration promise and strengthen the foundation for a just transition, we are launching our Human Rights Roadmap, which sets out how Nestlé intends to tackle its most salient human rights risks by putting people at the center of what we do. Respecting and promoting human rights is not new for us. We have already trained almost all of our employees on human rights and advocated for higher global and regional due diligence standards. Beyond our own operations, we have implemented innovative due diligence systems, like the Child Labor Monitoring and Remediation System in our cocoa supply chain that has set new standards for the industry. [...] We have put due diligence at the heart of our new approach. This begins with creating detailed action plans for every single one of our 10 salient human rights issues, supported by five enablers that will further enhance our due diligence and help us scale positive impact and track our progress. These include governance and incentives, policies and control systems, engagement and advocacy, strategic partnerships, and transparency and reporting'. However, although the Company has designed a Human Rights Framework and Roadmap, it is not clear the process it has in place to discuss and review its business model and strategy for inherent risks to human rights at board level or a board committee. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Describe frequency and triggers for reviewing <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Example of actions decided

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: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a: See indicator A.1.2 • Met: Senior responsibility for HR implementation and decision making: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'The Executive Board is responsible for Nestlé's sustainability strategy management, through the ESG and Sustainability Council. The ESG and Sustainability Council provides governance, strategic leadership and execution guidance and makes recommendations to the Executive Board and decisions on behalf of the Executive Board within its delegated authority'. Moreover, according to the Human Rights Framework: 'The entire Executive Board is responsible for human rights, and the General Counsel oversees the implementation of the Human Rights Framework and Roadmap'. Also, 'a new ESG & Sustainability Council composed of eight Executive Board members was created in 2021. Its mandate includes the management of salient issues in the upstream supply chain'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com] & [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How it assigns Day-to-day responsibility: It indicates: 'To continuously embed due diligence and awareness into our operations, we launched a new, internal Human Rights Community in 2020. The Community comprises 25 members who meet bimonthly. As part of their work, they oversee all relevant functions that manage human rights within Nestlé'. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own ops: As it is mentioned above: 'To continuously embed due diligence and awareness into our operations, we launched a new, internal Human Rights Community in 2020. The Community comprises 25 members who meet bimonthly. As part of their work, they oversee all relevant functions that manage human rights within Nestlé'. It 'Leads the human rights agenda throughout the company, including advocacy; Coordinates the implementation of Nestlé's Human Rights Framework and Roadmap throughout the value chain; Monitors the implementation of the Framework and Roadmap and the efficiency of the program'. However, it is not clear whether they conduct the actual day-to-day work on human rights for their own operation since they meet bimonthly. It is not clear whether there are other resources/expertise allocated to managing human rights in its own operations. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Resources and expertise allocation in the supply chain: As it is mentioned above: 'To continuously embed due diligence and awareness into our operations, we launched a new, internal Human Rights Community in 2020. The Community comprises 25 members who meet bimonthly. As part of their work, they oversee all relevant functions that manage human rights within Nestlé'. It 'Leads the human rights agenda throughout the company, including advocacy; Coordinates the implementation of Nestlé's Human Rights Framework and Roadmap throughout the value chain; Monitors the implementation of the Framework and Roadmap and the efficiency of the program'. The 2020 MSA also indicates that 'This group [Human Rights Community] is a powerful enforcer of best practice across the supply chains for each of our priority raw materials'. However, it is not clear whether the Human Rights Community conducts the actual day-to-day work on human rights for supply chain since they meet bimonthly. The Responsible Sourcing Standard states: 'We source via trade channels through our Procurement organisation or directly from farmers via our Nestlé Farmer Connect Team'. However, no further description found on how day to day resources and expertise for the supply chain is allocated. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] & [2020 MSA, 2020: nestle.com.au]
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 Corporate Governance Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'For the other members of the Executive Board, at least 50% of the target is linked to business performance', which include: 'Additional quantitative and qualitative objectives, set by the Board of Directors in line with Nestlé's strategy are also used to determine the Nestlé Group performance. This set of additional objectives reflects Nestlé's Creating Shared Value framework and includes [...] further progress on quality, safety, sustainability and compliance.' [Corporate Governance 2018, 2019: nestle.com] • Not Met: At least one key HR risk, beyond employee H&S: See above. However, there is no further information to identify is other aspects of human rights policy commitments are included or if the safety performance includes the safety of local communities or workers of the supply chain. [Corporate Governance 2018, 2019: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria made public • Not Met: Review of other senior management performance
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 discloses its principal risks and uncertainties (which are included in the ERM), including the risk, description, potential impact and key mitigations. The principal risks include human rights: 'Failure to identify and/or prevent human rights violations in direct operations and extended supply chain (e.g., forced labor, child labor, working hours, fair wages, etc.)'. [2021 Annual Review, 2022: nestle.com] • Met: Provides an example: See above. Regarding its human rights risks, integrated in its Enterprise Risk Management, the Company indicates its potential impacts: 'Negative effect on Nestlé's reputation and/or brands; Penalties and/or fines; License to operate challenges; Litigation'. It also discloses its key mitigations: 'Human rights due diligence; Sustainable Sourcing programs (e.g., Nescafé Plan, Nestlé Cocoa Plan, etc.); Policies, processes and controls to respect and promote human rights; Grievance mechanisms and consequence management'. [2021 Annual Review, 2022: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment: One of the tasks of the Sustainability Committee is: 'ensure the Company carries out human rights due

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			diligence and reports on its most severe risks to human rights, including how the Company is addressing those risks'. However, it is not clear how it assesses the adequacy of the enterprise risk management system(s) in managing human rights during the company's last reporting year. The assessment was either overseen by the Board Audit Committee or conducted by an independent third party. The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources. [Sustainability Committee charter, 23/09/2021: nestle.com]
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to workers and external 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: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a: See indicator A.1.2.a • Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: In its Annual Review 2019, the Company indicates: 'Training is provided in our internal Management School, at in-person trainings in the Markets, as well as through our e-learning tools. For example in 2019, 44 959 employees performed our Code of Business Conduct training.' In addition, in its CSV 2019, it reports: 'Throughout 2019, we continued to roll out our human rights training program, developed with the DIHR. 23 708 additional employees received this training in 2019. We will continue to train as many employees as possible; however, we will not meet our objective of training all Nestlé employees on human rights by 2020. While the program was initially developed as an online training tool, two-thirds of our employees do not have access to computers, so an offline platform has also been developed'. [Annual Review 2019, 2020: nestle.com] & [Creating Shared Value and meeting our commitments Progress Report 2019, 03/2020: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder: The Company indicates its future plans in relation to its Human Rights approach: 'We will continue building human rights awareness and considerations into all aspects of our business. We will, for example, continue to improve how we communicate our policy commitments to affected stakeholders, suppliers and business partners, as part of our commitment to open engagement on human rights'. However, it is not clear this communication already takes place and how. The Company indicates, in its feedback to CHRB that its Human Rights Framework and Roadmap is publicly available. In the same instance, it also refers to an article by one of its executive directors on human rights. However, it is not clear how it actively communicates its policy commitments to affected stakeholders, including local communities. The Company has provided an additional source to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	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: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2 • Met: Requires suppliers to communicate policy requirements: On its website section, 'Responsible Sourcing', the Company indicates that its new 'Responsible Sourcing Standard document 'sets out basic non-negotiable standards as well as important and urgent sustainability practices that we ask our suppliers, their employees, agents and subcontractors to respect and to adhere to at all times when conducting business. The Standard is an integral part of all of our purchase orders and supply contracts'. In addition, the Company indicates in its Responsible Sourcing Standard document: 'It is the responsibility of sub tier suppliers to disseminate, educate and exercise due diligence in implementing requirements equivalent or similar to the Standard'. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Responsible Sourcing, N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: As indicated above: 'The Standard is an integral part of all of our purchase orders and supply contracts'. [Responsible Sourcing, N/A: nestle.com] • Not Met: Company requires suppliers to cascade down to their suppliers
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2.a: See indicator A.1.2.a • Met: How workers are trained on HR policy commitments: The Annual Review 2019 indicates: 'Training is provided in our internal Management School, at in-person trainings in the Markets, as well as through our e-learning tools. For example in 2019, 44 959 employees performed our Code of Business Conduct training.' In addition, in its CSV 2019, it reports: 'Throughout 2019, we continued to roll out our human rights training program, developed with the DIHR. 23 708 additional employees received this training in 2019. [...] While the program was

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>initially developed as an online training tool, two-thirds of our employees do not have access to computers, so an offline platform has also been developed'. Finally, it notes, in its 2021 Sustainability Report that: 'After launching mandatory human rights training for all employees, we identified in 2020 a handful of countries with gaps in terms of the number of employees trained. These were mainly low-risk countries with a substantial number of factory workers with no computer access and where in-person training was made difficult because of COVID-19 restrictions. By the end of 2021, we closed this gap in most countries. In addition, it is part of the mandatory training for all new employees, which will ensure that all future employees are trained. [...] 57 892 Employees trained on human rights in 2021'. [Annual Review 2019, 2020: nestle.com] & [Creating Shared Value and meeting our commitments Progress Report 2019, 03/2020: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company indicates: 'Nestlé buyers shall be trained in Responsible Sourcing and lead their category's strategy execution accordingly. This includes the incorporation of the end-to-end Responsible Sourcing Standard implementation mechanisms'. However, no evidence in relation to actual performance (description of how these actually take place) of these trainings. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a: See indicator A.1.2.a • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1: See above • Not Met: Trains suppliers to meet company's HR commitment: In order to drive ethical recruitment practices to address deception in recruitment and debt bondage in the palm oil responsible sourcing, it 'funded the development of training modules and a performance matrix to support our suppliers with the adoption of a human rights-based due diligence tool on ethical recruitment. The performance matrix has been designed to allow our palm oil suppliers to track and measure progress specifically related to improvements in their recruitment practices'. Although the Company describes specific training for suppliers, this seem to be in the context of tackling specific issues. No evidence found of general human rights training (policy commitments) conducted for suppliers. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Disclose % trained: In its feedback to CHRB, the Company provided the total number of employees trained in 2021 and the total number of employees the Company has. However, this indicator focuses on the percentage of suppliers trained, rather than the Company's workers.
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2 • Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments across global ops and supply chain: It indicates, in its 2021 Sustainability Report: 'Our global CARE Audit program is an internal social audit verification that aims to ensure that all our employees and sites operated by Nestlé comply with local legislation, our Corporate Business Principles and our Code of Business Conduct. External auditors assess compliance with our Corporate Business Principles against seven pillars: conditions of work and employment, business integrity, safety and health, environmental sustainability, security, local communities, and labor accommodation'. In its 2020 MSA it states: 'All Nestlé suppliers and contractors are required to comply with the Responsible Sourcing Standard and the Nestlé Business Principles. We monitor suppliers' compliance with our requirements through initiatives including third-party audits, independent assessments, and contractual and relationship reviews'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com] & [2020 MSA, 2020: nestle.com.au] • Met: Proportion of supply chain monitored: The Company reports 2 objectives, and then reports against progress on these objectives. These include: -By 2020: For Tier 1 suppliers, cover 80% of the total spend and volume sourced from audited and compliant suppliers*. -By 2020: For upstream, 80% of the spend and volume of our priority categories to be traceable and 70% to be Responsibly Sourced*. The Company discloses against these results in its MSA 2018: 61% of our total spend and volume sourced from audited and compliant suppliers. - 72% of our 14 priority categories of raw materials are traceable and 63% are responsibly sourced [How we implement responsible sourcing, N/A: nestle.com] & [Modern Slavery Report 2018, 12/2019: nestle.co.uk] • Not Met: Describe how workers are involved in monitoring <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes corrective action process: The Company indicates ‘ We are developing action plans for our 10 salient issues’. However, this datapoint looks for evidence for the corrective action process activated whenever non-compliances are found. • Not Met: Disclose findings and number of corrective action
B.1.7	Engaging and terminating business relationships	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: HR affects selection of suppliers: Regarding the document Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company indicates: ‘The Standard is an integral part of all of our purchase orders and supply contracts. Through our Sustainable Sourcing Tier 1 program, we verify compliance with the Standard by our direct suppliers through independent audits carried out by audit firms accredited by Nestlé. These audits follow the SMETA Best Practice Guidance [...]. If non-compliance issues or gaps are found, a time-bound action plan is developed and implemented by the supplier. The implementation of this plan will be later verified by the auditor. In case a supplier refuses to undergo an audit or to close gaps, we may terminate the business relationship’. However, it is not clear how human rights performance is taken into account in the identification and selection of potential suppliers (prior to start the relationship). [Suppliers (web), N/A: nestle.com] • Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships: It indicates: ‘We set out non-negotiable requirements including on human rights, that we require our suppliers to adhere to at all times. (...) Accredited firms conduct independent audits to verify compliance. If non-compliance issues or gaps are found, a plan is developed and implemented. (...) If our suppliers fail to take corrective action on any violations or meet agreed deadlines, we will take measures that include removing them from our supply chain and ending contracts’. [How do you ensure human rights are respected (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe positive incentives offered to respect human rights • Met: Working with suppliers to meet HR requirements: The Company indicates: ‘Our efforts to source sustainably have enabled us to make important progress in promoting human rights in agricultural supply chains. In 2021, we launched a detailed labor rights action plan for palm oil. We are working toward a palm oil supply chain where all workers, at all tiers of production, work and live in safe and healthy conditions, are provided contracts detailing their working conditions, are paid fairly, have the right to associate freely and collectively bargain and have access to grievance mechanisms. Our long-term Forest Positive strategy, announced in 2021, is helping us to find ways to integrate further protection for tenure-based rights for Indigenous People and Local Communities into our approach, while at the same time helping smallholder farmers to develop sustainable livelihoods’. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com]
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with 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: Discloses stakeholders that HRs may be affected: Based on its salient issues ‘we have identified six groups of people who are particularly at risk: our own employees, on-site contractors, suppliers and their employees, farmers and farm workers, local communities, consumers’. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders: The Company’s document Towards a Forest Positive Future indicates that in Côte d’Ivoire: ‘there have been meetings with 66 villages and more than 1,600 community members. Gaining perspectives from women, business owners, producers, young people and many others underline the project’s commitment to taking lessons from local people to co-create solutions. We learn more about how and where they work; if they are farming cocoa, rubber or both; are they working for themselves or for others; their average yields and productivity; and how they engage with middle-men and others in the supply chain to get their product to market’. Moreover, the Human Rights Framework states: ‘Since 2013, we have held dialogues with the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers’ Associations (IUF) on a biannual basis. This helps us develop areas of common interest, such as health and safety, working conditions, freedom of association and collective bargaining’. However, it is not clear these engagements (from the 2nd piece of evidence) took place in the last two years. The Company has provided two examples of engagement with different stakeholders, however, no example found of engagement with stakeholders whose human rights have been or may be affected by its activities (or their legitimate representatives or multi-stakeholder initiatives) in the last two years. The Human Rights Framework also notes: ‘The Framework incorporates stakeholder

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>recommendations and inputs and has been developed to anticipate upcoming regulatory developments'. However, as it was mentioned before, no specific example of engagement in the last two years found. The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, the source of it was already in use. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] & [Towards a Forest Positive Future, 06/2021: nestle.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Analysis of stakeholder views on company's HR issues • Not Met: Describe how views influenced company's HR approach

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying human rights risks and impacts	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: Identifying risks in own operations: The webpage Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks indicates: 'Due diligence is at the core of our new approach. This begins with creating detailed action plans for every single one of our 10 salient human rights issues, supported by five enablers that will further enhance our due diligence and help us scale positive impact and track our progress. (...) Our salient issues (...) are informed by human rights impact assessments (HRIAs) carried out between 2009 and 2017 and the human rights risk assessment (HRRRA) methodology that we developed over the course of 2020 and 2021, as well as our strengthened audit, monitoring and Speak Up grievance processes'. The Human Rights Framework states: 'The HRRRA assesses the level of risks posed to rights holders across the countries where we operate (either directly or through our business relationships, in particular, the sourcing of raw materials). It is based on publicly available information from Unicef, the World Bank, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Development Programme and the US Department of Labor, among others, in addition to Verisk Maplecroft indicators'. [Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Met: Identifying risks through relevant business relationships: As indicated above, the process is also applied to the supply chain. [Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describe ongoing global risk identification in consultation with stakeholder/HR experts: See above. In addition, the 2020 MSA states: 'Nestlé began the journey to raise our human rights performance in 2008 when we started working with The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) to strengthen our approach. We have integrated human rights awareness into the core of our work practices, increased our understanding of the most relevant and serious risks to our business, and developed robust policies, practices and assessment procedures'. Also, to determine its salient human rights issues 'we worked with the Danish Institute of Human Rights in 2014 and 2015'. The Company still partners with the DIHR. The Human Rights Framework notes that in 2016: 'Working with the DIHR and in consultation with key stakeholders, we identified our salient issues – those human rights at risk of the most severe negative impacts on stakeholders through our activities and business relationships. [...] The Framework was developed over 2019 and 2020 by our Human Rights Community, following a review of the last decade of our human rights work. The Framework incorporates stakeholder recommendations and inputs and has been developed to anticipate upcoming regulatory developments. In addition, we included recommendations from various organizations, including business and human rights experts and benchmarks'. [2020 MSA, 2020: nestle.com.au] & [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Triggered by new circumstances: No description found of how these systems are triggered by new country operations, new business relationships, new human rights challenges or conflict affecting particular locations. Previous assessment was based on the webpage section Our salient human rights issues and the piece of evidence is no longer publicly available. • Not Met: Describes risks identified: As part of its Human Rights Framework & Roadmap, the Company came up with an updated list of salient issues: 'Our salient issues are the areas we have identified as those human rights at risk of the most severe negative impact on people through our activities or business relationships'. It then lists its salient human rights issues. However, it is not clear the risks identified specifically in relation to new country operations, new business relationships, new human rights challenges or conflict affecting particular locations. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.2	Assessing human rights risks and impacts	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: Describe process for assessment of HR risks and discloses salient HR issues: The webpage Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks indicates: 'Due diligence is at the core of our new approach. This begins with creating detailed action plans for every single one of our 10 salient human rights issues, supported by five enablers that will further enhance our due diligence and help us scale positive impact and track our progress. (...) Our salient issues (...) are informed by human rights impact assessments (HRIAs) carried out between 2009 and 2017 and the human rights risk assessment (HRRRA) methodology that we developed over the course of 2020 and 2021, as well as our strengthened audit, monitoring and Speak Up grievance processes'. The Human Rights Framework states: 'The HRRRA assesses the level of risks posed to rights holders across the countries where we operate (either directly or through our business relationships, in particular, the sourcing of raw materials). It is based on publicly available information from Unicef, the World Bank, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Development Programme and the US Department of Labor, among others, in addition to Verisk Maplecroft indicators'. Finally, in its CSV Report 2019, the Company indicates: 'These are the issues [salient human rights issues] that carry the risk of the most severe negative impact (defined by the scope, scale and remediability of the impact) on rights holders through our activities and business relationships, and that have the highest. We are currently reviewing these issues, determining how we can focus our activities for the biggest positive impact.' [Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Creating Shared Value and meeting our commitmentsProgress Report 2019, 03/2020: nestle.com] • Met: How process applies to supply chain: See above. It also applies to its supply chain. [Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Creating Shared Value and meeting our commitmentsProgress Report 2019, 03/2020: nestle.com] • Met: Public disclosure of the results of HR assessment: It discloses the 10 salient issues: 'Child labor and access to education, Forced labor and responsible recruitment, Living income and living wage, Gender equity, non-discrimination and non-harassment, Safety and health at work, Freedom of association and collective bargaining, Right to water and sanitation, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' land rights, Data protection and privacy, Right to food and access to nutritious, affordable and adequate diets'. [Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Meets all requirements under score 1: See above. • Not Met: How it involved affected stakeholders in the assessment
B.2.3	Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impact assessments	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: Action Plans to mitigate risks: It indicates: 'We are developing action plans for our 10 salient issues. These plans, which sit at the heart of our due diligence program, will enable us to act as a force for good. The action plans will articulate our strategy for assessing, addressing and reporting on each salient issue, defining what we need to do across our value chain, as well as what collective action can be taken. We aim to harness the strengths and capacities of each Nestlé department through clearly defined expectations. With collaboration built into each action plan, we hope to spark new engagement and inspire collective action with peers, civil society, NGOs and governments. This way, we can tackle the root causes of our salient issues and create positive impact at scale. We will publish all our salient issue action plans by the end of 2022 and report on progress against key performance indicators (KPI) by the end of 2025'. As the Company indicates the action plan is still to be published. No description of its global system to prevent, mitigate or remediate its salient human rights issues found. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Description of how global system applies to supply chain: as above. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HR issues: It discloses some of the work done within its cocoa supply chain 'In 2020, we launched two pilots to address agricultural poverty and support living incomes. The first aims to spread the insight and learnings from some of our most successful farmers, while the second, the Household Income Accelerator, uses cash incentives to encourage behavioural change'. Living income is one of the Company's salient human rights issues. [2020 MSA, 2020: nestle.com.au]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Involve stakeholders in decisions about actions
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: System for tracking or monitor if actions taken are effective: The Company reports on the progress of its 'Child Labor Monitoring and Remediation System (CLMRS)': 'The CLMRS covers the risks of child labor that we are linked to by our business relationships in the cocoa supply chain. [...] Quantitative and qualitative indicators (p.16-21) used to monitor the effectiveness of the CLMRS are provided in this report. They draw on the information and data collected by the Community Liaison Person from farmers, farm workers and local communities. Each child identified as having performed hazardous tasks is regularly visited in order to assess the impact of our interventions.' However, this system is focus on the CLMRS, and this indicator seeks for a general system to check the Company's actions taken in response to the different salient issues. [Cocoa Plan: Tackling Child Labor - 2019 Report, 2019: nestle.com] • Met: Lessons learnt from checking system effectiveness: The Company indicates in its 'Tackling Child Labor' document: 'Based on seven years' implementation of our CLMRS, we now have enough data on children to examine the effectiveness of different types of remediation. [...] The majority of remediation activities demonstrate a fairly similar rate of success for all children on average. One of our foremost objectives is to understand which types of remediation are most effective for which children. This can help us offer the most effective help and support to children identified in child labor. [...] Work on this has already begun. For example, in terms of gender, regression analysis shows that the provision of birth certificates, tutoring and targeted awareness-raising are more effective for girls than for boys. Income-generating activities and community service groups for adults are more effective in stopping boys from doing hazardous work. [Cocoa Plan: Tackling Child Labor - 2019 Report, 2019: nestle.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Involve stakeholders in evaluation of actions taken
B.2.5	Communicating on human rights impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders: The Company discloses a case of a complaint against six multinational coffee brands, including Nestlé, involving labor and human rights violations. It includes the issue at stake, who reported it and the progress that is being made of the case. However, the Company is expected to provide at least two examples of such communication. The Company has provided an additional source to CHRB regarding this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. [Conectas Human Rights (web), 01/2022: oecdwatch.org] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe challenges to effective comms and how it is working to address them

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (20% 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	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: It indicates: 'In 2021, we improved our grievance mechanism by integrating our former Integrity Reporting System (for employees) and our external platform (for all other stakeholders) into an independently operated system called 'Speak Up''. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages and workers aware: It indicates, in its 2021 Sustainability Report, that: 'we rolled out a comprehensive communication campaign aimed at reinforcing our culture of compliance and business ethics, and empowering employees to use the new system to Speak Up'. The mechanism is available in different languages. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com] & [SpeakUp Country list, N/A: speakupfeedback.eu] • Met: Describe how workers in the supply chain have access to grievance mechanism: The Responsible Sourcing Standards indicates its requirements to suppliers: 'Independent systems shall be implemented in order to enable anonymous grievances by the workforce, including reporting & management'. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expect Suppliers to convey expectation to their own suppliers: The Responsible Sourcing Standards indicates its requirements to suppliers: 'Independent systems shall be implemented in order to enable anonymous grievances by the workforce, including reporting & management'. However, it is not clear the Company expects its suppliers to convey the same expectation on access to grievance mechanisms to their own suppliers. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	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: Grievance mechanism for community: It indicates: 'In 2021, we improved our grievance mechanism by integrating our former Integrity Reporting System (for employees) and our external platform (for all other stakeholders) into an independently operated system called 'Speak Up''. It is available online or through a phone number. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes accessibility and local languages and stakeholder awareness: Although the mechanism is available in many different languages, it is not clear how all affected external stakeholders of the Company's own operations are made aware of it. The Company has made reference to the 2017 CSV Report, however, it is considered outdated according to the CHRB three-reporting-year timeframe policy. [SpeakUp Country list, N/A: speakupfeedback.eu] & [SpeakUp, N/A: speakupfeedback.eu] • Not Met: Communities access mechanism direct or through suppliers: It indicates: 'In 2021, we improved our grievance mechanism by integrating our former Integrity Reporting System (for employees) and our external platform (for all other stakeholders) into an independently operated system called 'Speak Up''. It is available online or through a phone number. However, it is not clear external individuals and communities within its supply chain have access to it. The Company has made reference to the 2017 CSV Report, however, it is considered outdated according to the CHRB three-reporting-year timeframe policy. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com] • Not Met: Expect supplier to convey expectation to their own suppliers
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: The Company has provided in its feedback to CHRB a report in German. However, according to the CHRB language policy, only documents in English are accepted. • Not Met: Examples (at least two) of how they do this <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Engages with potential or actual users on the improvement of the mechanism • Not Met: Provides user engagement example (at least two) on improvement
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are equitable, 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 and how complainants will be informed: It indicates: 'Our Compliance professionals will acknowledge receipt of your message. If your initial report does not include enough information / evidence, we will get in touch to ask you to provide more information / evidence. You will receive an individual case number after filing your report. This number will allow you to track the progress of your report after logging into the Speak Up system. Please follow up your report. (...) Each report is reviewed carefully. We will open a case if your report includes minimum actionable information and evidence. The investigation will be led by our Market Compliance Officer in the region/country where the incident is said to have taken place. (...) As a general practice, it takes around 90 days for an investigation to be concluded and it is possible that a longer period for complex matters may be needed. In any event, timelines established by applicable laws and regulations will be applied and respected. (...) After reviewing all the findings of our investigation, we will decide if a violation has occurred, and take action as appropriate. You will be informed accordingly'. [Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns (web), N/A: nestle.com] • Not Met: Describe support (technical, financial,etc) available for equal access by complainants <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe types of outcome to complainant through use of mechanism • Not Met: Escalation to senior/independent level: It indicates: 'Reports that contain non-compliance concern allegations on one of the 11 sensitive categories will be escalated to the Group Chief Compliance Officer and to the relevant Zone Head of Legal and Compliance. (...) Discrimination and Violence, (...) Human Rights

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			(Child labor, forced labor and modern slavery), (...) Sexual Harassment'. However, it is not clear if escalation to more senior levels or independent third party adjudicators or mediators also entails challenging the process or outcome and that it can be done at complainant discretion. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, the content of it was already in use. [Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns (web), N/A: nestle.com]
C.5	Prohibition of retaliation for raising complaints or concerns	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: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: It indicates its Non-retaliation commitment: 'Nestlé prohibits retaliation of any type against an employee, individual or entity and will take action accordingly. In addition, Nestlé also protects the rights of the implicated persons'. [Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns (web), N/A: nestle.com] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: Also: 'Speak Up replaces the internal IRS reporting system and the external Tell Us system and is independently operated by a third party to ensure anonymity when requested'. [Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Company indicate it will not retaliate against workers/stakeholders • Not Met: Expects suppliers to prohibit retaliation against workers/stakeholders: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company indicates: 'Supplier shall follow a non-retaliation Standard towards grievance or any employee's union activity, which includes protection for whistle blowers.' Additionally, the webpage section Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns notes: 'we also have a non-retaliation policy which means that retaliation for reporting possible non-compliances in good faith will not be tolerated and will be subject to sanction'. However, it is not clear that the non-retaliation standard covers also suppliers' external stakeholders, as it is not clear whether they can file reports (see indicator C.2). [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] & [Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns (web), N/A: nestle.com]
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	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: Complainants not asked to waive rights • Not Met: Company does not require confidentiality provisions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Will work with state based non judicial mechanisms: It indicates: 'As well as our own internal and external grievance mechanisms, we collaborate with others such as business partners, NGOs and authorities to improve access to remedies in our upstream supply chain, including developing third-party non-judicial mechanisms such as worker helplines'. The Company reports a case of an allegation through a OECD's National Contact Point. [2020 MSA, 2020: nestle.com.au] • Met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable): The Company provides an example of an investigation carried out after an allegation of labor and human rights violations in Brazil filed through the Brazilian National Contact Point. [Conectas Human Rights (web), 01/2022: oecdwatch.org]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts	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: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company indicates: 'The hazelnut supply chain contains serious challenges around conditions, especially over labour conditions for migrant workers and the existence of child labour'. It discloses its remedial actions taken in Turkey in 2020 in the hazelnuts supply chain: 'Training 4454 farmers, workers, traders and labour brokers on workers' rights and child labour; 716 children benefiting from our activities to address child labour in hazelnut orchards; Agreeing formal contracts before harvest with 366 workers, farmers and labour brokers; 165 workers benefiting from improved accommodation; 589 workers benefiting from improved water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) conditions; 58,587 personal protective equipment kits, including first aid and sanitary kits, hats, gloves, masks, t-shirts and belt bags, were distributed to farmers and workers'. [2020 MSA, 2020: nestle.com.au] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Changes to systems, processes and practices to stop similar impact: In its website section 'Sustainable cocoa' and in its document 'Tackling Child Labour-Report 2019', the Company discloses its Child Labour Monitoring and Remediation System. The Company indicates in its website: 'Since 2012, a key element in our work has been our Child Labor Monitoring and Remediation System (CLMRS), which enables us to identify children at risk, raise awareness and provide remediation'. The report confirms that CLMRS is working well. Overall, we have

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>almost doubled our outreach in the last two years to include 78 580 children across 1751 communities, with 1640 Community Liaison People monitoring the children. The report shows that since CLMRS was launched in 2012, benefits have included: 593 925 people attending awareness-raising sessions; 87 925 children within and outside our supply chain receiving prevention or remediation support; 78 580 children being monitored, with 18 283 found to be in child labor; 49 schools being built or refurbished, benefiting 20 000 children; 1225 children benefiting from tutoring; 19 152 school kits containing essential equipment being provided to children; 5756 birth certificates being issued; 62 children enrolling in vocational training'. However, it is not clear the changes to systems, processes and practices to prevent similar adverse impacts in the future carried out by the Company. Current evidence seems to refer to an example of a broader action taken in order to tackle a more systemic problem, involving awareness raising, identification of the issue, prevention and remediation and follow up. [Sustainable cocoa (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Cocoa Plan: Tackling Child Labor - 2019 Report, 2019: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe approach to monitoring implementation of agreed remedy • Not Met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts
C.8	Communication on the effectiveness of grievance mechanism(s) and incorporating lessons learned	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: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcome achieved: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates that there were, in 2021, 49 messages received on Human rights (child labour, forced labour and modern slavery risks), and of those, 1 was substantiated. The webpage Report your concerns indicates: 'All substantiated cases are subject to corresponding actions and decisions as appropriate. In total, 133 employees left the company in 2021. We will continue to promote a strong ethical and Speak Up culture in line with our principles and values'. The Company provides, in its feedback to CHRB, information about communication and training of the grievance mechanism. It also indicates, in its 2021 Sustainability Report, that 'with the launch of Speak Up, we have also introduced a new Case Management System. This is an add-on feature whereby all the cases reported on Speak Up are recorded and managed by markets, enabling the analysis of relevant anonymized KPIs and statistics on an ongoing basis. With the Case Management System, we will have more complete and accurate information and improved capabilities to analyse data trends. This will provide us with more meaningful information and support the development of improvement plans'. However, it is not clear the outcomes achieved for its own workers, for external individuals or communities that may be adversely impacted by the company. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com] & [Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns (web), N/A: nestle.com] • Not Met: How lessons from mechanism improve management system <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism and changes made as result: The webpage section Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns indicates that 'In order to reinforce our Speak Up culture, we launched in April 2021 our single global internal and external reporting channel for non-compliance concerns and questions - Speak Up. Speak Up replaces the internal IRS reporting system and the external Tell Us system and is independently operated by a third party to ensure anonymity when requested. This new system will provide us with more transparency and better data'. However, no description of the process to review the effectiveness of the grievance mechanism found. It also notes, in its 2018 Creating Shared Value and meeting our commitments that: 'In 2018, we implemented a root cause analysis system to help us learn from serious compliance breaches and prevent their reoccurrence'. Additionally, it provides an example of this root cause analysis. However, although the Company indicates the implementation of a changes in the system, it is not this change happened as a result of a review of the effectiveness of the mechanism. Moreover, the Company is expected to describe the process to review the effectiveness of the grievance mechanism. [Speak Up - Report your compliance concerns (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Creating Shared Value and meeting our commitments 2018, 2019: nestle.com] • Not Met: Describes procedures to address delays of outcomes agreed with stakeholders

D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (25% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	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: Discloses timebound target for suppliers to pay living wage or include in code or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company indicates: 'In any event, cash wages plus in-kind benefits (up to 30%) shall aim to meet basic needs for employees and their entitled official dependents and to provide some discretionary income. Where living wages have been objectively calculated, progress should be made to close any gaps between current wages and living wages. Wages shall under no circumstances fall below the legal minimum'. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers: The Company indicates that 'The income accelerator program rewards farmers not just for the quantity and quality of their cocoa beans, but also for adopting practices that benefit the environment and their community. Through a mix of cash incentives and training programs, we are enabling and incentivizing farmers and their families to close the gap to living income and tackle child labor risks'. [Living income and living wage (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of number affected by payment below living wage: The Company indicates: 'Since 2013, Nestlé has been implementing a Living Wage Initiative to ensure that all our direct employees, including temporary ones, earn a living wage. We work with our partner Business for Social Responsibility (BSR) to help us define the living wage threshold in each country where we operate. We use this information to identify and address cases where legal minimum wages do not fulfill basic needs. These figures are updated on a regular basis to ensure that our employees continue to be paid above the living wage'. However, no assessment of the number of people potentially affected by (scope of) payment below living wages in its supply chain found. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices) • Not Met: Practices adopted to pay suppliers in line with agreed timeframes • Not Met: Review own operations to mitigate negative impact <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Examples of how it assessed, addressed and change purchasing practices
D.1.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	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: Identifies direct and indirect suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields): It indicates, in its 2020 MSA: 'Key to responsible sourcing is traceability. We make it our business to know not only where our ingredients come from, but how they are produced and the impact they have on the environment and the community they originate from. Tracing the ingredients we buy back to their place of origin allows us to assess human rights and modern slavery risks. To support transparency, we also publish information on our suppliers for each of our priority categories'. Moreover, its webpage Supply chain disclosure states: 'We have decided to disclose the list of suppliers alongside a variety of data of our priority raw materials that are part of our Responsible Sourcing program. This is the first disclosure of its kind in the industry and aims at increasing transparency in the agri-food sector. This covers 95 percent of our company's annual sourcing of raw materials'. It discloses cereals tier 1 and tier 2, cocoa, coconut, coffee tier 1, dairy ingredients, hazelnuts, meat tier 1, meat upstream, milk (fresh), palm oil, pulp and paper tier 1, pulp and paper mills, seafood supply origins, soya, spices tier 1 and processing sites, sugar tier 1 and sugar mills, vegetables tier 1 and processing sites. [2020 MSA, 2020: nestle.com.au] & [Supply chain disclosure (web), N/A: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Discloses names and locations of significant parts of SP and why: Its webpage Supply chain disclosure states: ‘We have decided to disclose the list of suppliers alongside a variety of data of our priority raw materials that are part of our Responsible Sourcing program. This is the first disclosure of its kind in the industry and aims at increasing transparency in the agri-food sector. This covers 95 percent of our company’s annual sourcing of raw materials’. It discloses cereals tier 1 and tier 2, cocoa, coconut, coffee tier 1, dairy ingredients, hazelnuts, meat tier 1, meat upstream, milk (fresh), palm oil, pulp and paper tier 1, pulp and paper mills, seafood supply origins, soya, spices tier 1 and processing sites, sugar tier 1 and sugar mills, vegetables tier 1 and processing sites. The lists disclose the name and location of suppliers (sometimes with a complete address, other times only the city). [Supply chain disclosure (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Supply chain disclosure - vegetables, 04/2020: nestle.com] • Not Met: Discloses which direct or indirect suppliers is involved in higher-risk activities: The Company indicates on its website that ‘We have identified 14 raw materials that present higher environmental and/or social risks’. The webpage section Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks indicates its 10 salient human rights issues. However, no further information found on which direct or indirect suppliers it considers to be involved in higher-risk activities, geographies, and products. [Sustainably Sourced Raw Material (web), N/A: nestle.com] & [Our approach to identifying and addressing human rights risks (web), N/A: nestle.com]
D.1.4.b	Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	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: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provisions related to Child Labour: ‘In accordance with international labour standards, no person shall be employed under the age of 15 or under the age for completion of compulsory education, whichever is higher, except in the strict frame of the Family Farm Work described in 4.2.1: If the Supplier employs young workers, defined as between the ages of 15 and 18, it shall demonstrate that the employment of young people contributes to their personal education and does not expose them to undue physical risks that can harm physical, mental or emotional development; Young workers are not allowed to work night shifts or engage in work with hazardous conditions.’ [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Met: How working with suppliers on child labour: The Company indicates: ‘We were the first company in the industry to introduce a Child Labor Monitoring and Remediation System (CLMRS), which has now become a leading tool that helps tackle child labor risk by working directly with communities on the ground. Our CLMRS prioritizes access to education – including building and renovating schools and securing birth certificates for registration – and tackling rural poverty through income diversification programs and support’. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Assessment of number affected by child labour in supply chain: The Company indicates, in its webpage section Child labor and access to education, that ‘159783’ is the ‘total number of children in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana who have received support through our Child Labor Monitoring and Remediation System (CLMRS)’. Additionally, in its 2020 Cocoa Plan Progress Report, it discloses the ‘Number and % of children identified in child labor’ in Côte d’Ivoire, ‘15,933 / 18%; and Ghana, ‘1,789 / 30%’. It also discloses other figures related to child labor and child labor prevention. [2020 Cocoa Plan Progress Report, 2021: nestlecocoaplan.com] & [Child labor (web), N/A: nestle.com] • Met: Analysis of trends in progress made: Our 2017 report showed that the Nestlé CLMRS had helped 51% of children to stop doing hazardous work (an estimated 3,571 of the 7,002 children identified). This was based on a representative sample of children who were interviewed once as part of an internal evaluation. [...] This year’s data demonstrated that on the same basis 55% of children, i.e. 7,981 of 14,511 identified in child labor, were no longer doing hazardous work at their most recent follow-up visit’. [Cocoa Plan: Tackling Child Labor - 2019 Report, 2019: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.5.b	Prohibition of forced labour: Recruitment fees and costs (in the supply chain)	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: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provisions related to recruitment: 'Not charge fees or costs nor request deposits for job placement services, from jobseekers, his/her employers, agents, nor subagents. The Supplier's financial arrangements with agents and subagents shall not allow fees from job-seekers as part of the agents' or subagents' revenue for services provided. Should it become evident that recruitment fees have been paid, the supplier shall have to establish a plan to reimburse the worker of any fees, costs or deposits paid.; Disclose charges or deductions for room and board to jobseekers, where permitted or required by law and shall verify to be consistent with market rates.; [...] Have a Standard in place that requires recruitment agencies to uphold workers rights.' [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Not Met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees: It indicates, in its Human Rights Framework: 'Ethical recruitment practices to address deception in recruitment and debt bondage are a core focus of our palm oil responsible sourcing work. We funded the development of training modules and a performance matrix to support our suppliers with the adoption of a human rights-based due diligence tool on ethical recruitment. The performance matrix has been designed to allow our palm oil suppliers to track and measure progress specifically related to improvements in their recruitment practices'. Additionally, 'we have supported the development of a human rights-based due diligence tool on ethical recruitment for palm oil supply chains that can be used by suppliers looking to responsibly recruit workers'. Also: 'In our seafood supply chain in Thailand, we work with Issara Institute to analyse recruitment practices and channels to implement responsible recruitment pathways. Partnering on the ground with recruitment agencies, grassroots organizations and government, Issara works to ensure worker voice and remediation of grievances, from recruitment through employment'. More information on its ethical recruitment projects in palm oil can be found in the webpage section Forced labor and responsible recruitment. However, it is not clear whether the work conducted includes ensuring full reimbursement to workers where relevant. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] & [Forced labor and responsible recruitment (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by payment of recruitment fees • Not Met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.d	Prohibition of forced labour: Wage practices (in the supply chain)	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: Suppliers to pay workers in full and on time in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provisions related to freedom from forced labour. The supplier shall 'Pay related costs in full and workers shall not be recharged nor see their salary deducted in any form to pay back the associated costs. In case working permits are a legal requirement for workers in their workplace, supplier shall pay related costs in full and workers shall not be recharged nor see their salary deducted in any form to pay back the associated costs'. However, no evidence found within its contractual arrangements with suppliers or supplier code of conduct, that the company requires the suppliers to pay workers both in full and on time [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Not Met: How working with supply chain to pay workers regularly and on time: Regarding its work done to protect migrant workers from exploitation in Turkey, the Company indicates: 'Nestlé has been a project partner on the Fair Labor Association's (FLA) Harvesting the Future project since 2019. The project seeks to help producers improve working conditions for seasonal workers who migrate across different food industries in Turkey and the surrounding countries on a six to eight-month cycle. The project's efforts include [...] adherence to living wages, [...]. Central to the project is training company and supplier officials within our supplier organizations and guiding them in initiating child labor prevention programs'. However, it is not clear how the Company works with suppliers to pay workers in full and on time. The Company has provided an additional source to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by failure to pay directly • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.5.f	Prohibition of forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	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: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provisions related to Freedom of Movements: 'Not require workers to lodge "deposits" as a condition of employment (e.g. workers' passports or ID, work permits, bank books, ATM cards, or other personal documents), and workers are free to leave their employer after reasonable notice. Where presentation of these documents is required by law they shall be returned promptly, and in all cases immediately upon demand and cannot be confiscated from workers, even with individual worker or worker union consent.' [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Not Met: How working with suppliers on free movement: Regarding workers in the palm oil industry, the Company indicates: 'Nestlé sources palm oil from over 80 suppliers in over 20 countries. Its production is labor-intensive, conducted over vast swathes of land, often in remote locations. Workers are vulnerable to [...] restricted movement, [...]. For ten years we have been working to progress labor rights in palm oil, collaborating with suppliers, governments and non-governmental organizations. In 2020 we piloted a new framework for labor rights in palm oil, developed with our partner Verité, ahead of rolling it out, first with other suppliers and then across our entire palm oil supply chain. It is part of our [...] that runs through to 2025'. However, no details found on the actual work conducted with suppliers to eliminate retention of worker's documents or other actions to physically restrict movement. The Company has provided an additional source to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. [Forced labor and responsible recruitment (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by retaining docs or restricting movement • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	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: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company include provisions related to FA & CB: 'Uphold workers' right to freedom of association and collective bargaining, and specify grievance mechanisms and how workers can use them. [...] Supplier shall follow a non-retaliation Standard towards grievance or any employee's union activity, which includes protection for whistle blowers.' [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Not Met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB: The Company indicates: 'Since 2013, we have held dialogues with the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF) on a biannual basis. This helps us develop areas of common interest, such as health and safety, working conditions, freedom of association and collective bargaining'. However, these dialogues seem to take place in the context of its own operations. No description found of how it works to support the practices in relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining in its supply chain. The Company has provided additional sources to CHRB regarding this subindicator, however, one of them was already in use and no material evidence was found in the other, as it also seemed to refer to the Company's own operations. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] & [Freedom of association and collective bargaining (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by restrictions to FoA and CB in the SP • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in the supply chain)	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: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: Its Responsible Sourcing Standard include a complete section related to Health and safety, which includes requirements related to Emergency management, Workplace Environment and Housing Conditions. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Not Met: Injury Rate or Lost days or Near miss disclosures for last reporting period: The Company has provided additional sources to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. [Workplace safety, health and wellness, N/A: nestle-cwa.com] • Not Met: Fatalities rate for lasting reporting period: The Company has provided additional sources to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Occupation disease rate for last reporting period: The Company has provided additional sources to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How working with suppliers on H&S: It indicates: 'we have initiated interventions in various supply chains to help ensure workers have access to protective personal equipment, hygiene services or emergency equipment'. Also, 'In Thailand, we partnered with Verité on a project to explore how to improve safety on Thai fishing vessels. The project focused on promoting safe working and living conditions at sea. This was based on a demonstration vessel funded by Nestlé and our supplier Thai Union to showcase how worker welfare and business imperatives can align through mechanization. Impacts of the mechanization included less overcrowding on the vessel (due to needing smaller crews) and improved worker safety as crew members were no longer extensively involved in deploying and retrieving nets'. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by H&S issues in the SP • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.8.b	Land rights: Land acquisition (in the supply chain)	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: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provisions related to Land Rights: 'Demonstrate evidence of respect for community land rights and free, prior and informed consent of the local community regarding the Supplier's operations; Demonstrate legal right to use the land.' However, no further evidence found, including how requirements to identify vulnerable rights holders and to negotiate with legitimate tenure rights holders to provide adequate compensation or requested alternatives to financial compensation in its supplier code of conduct. [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Not Met: How working with suppliers on land issues: It indicates, in its Human Rights Framework: 'In British Columbia, Canada, Nestlé is participating in a program to address risks to forest degradation and infringements of the rights of indigenous peoples. We are supporting the Tsay Keh Dene Nation to gain protection for key areas of land against harvesting for pulp and paper. The Tsay Keh Dene will be leading high conservation value assessments across their territory to identify and protect its most unique and critical areas'. Additionally, the website section Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' land rights notes: 'An assessment of two of our largest sugar suppliers in Nigeria revealed we needed to secure the rights of neighboring communities and enhance dialogue between them and our suppliers. We then collaborated with the non-profit Proforest group to agree on the best way forward to enhance the sustainability of sugar production and preserve the interests of local people in the future'. However, it is not clear how it works with suppliers to improve their practices in relation to land use/ acquisition. No further details found. The Company has provided an additional source to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, the content of it was already in use. This subindicator looks for a description of how the Company specifically works with suppliers to improve their practice in relation to land acquisition (identification of rights holders and negotiation). [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] & [Indigenous people's & community land rights (web), N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Includes resettlement requirements that the supplier provides financial compensation • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by land rights issues in its SP • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.9.b	Water and sanitation (in the supply chain)	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: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provision related to Water and Sanitation: 'Provide a hygienic working environment with adequate lighting, ambient temperature, ventilation, sanitation, potable drinking water to respect human right to water, sanitary facilities and food storage. [...] Enable access to potable water, electricity, clean shower and toilet facilities respecting the right of privacy, sanitary food preparation and storage facilities.[...]. Identify, protect and avoid producing on High Conservation Values [HCV] lands in and around their territory. [such as] Sites and resources that are fundamental for satisfying the basic necessities of local communities or indigenous peoples (for livelihoods, health, nutrition, water, etc...), as identified through engagement with these communities or indigenous peoples. ' [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues: It indicates: ' We are working on projects in several areas, particularly those where water is lacking. We are helping farmers implement better water management practices to save water in their day-to-day work, using technology, knowledge sharing and other educational means. (...) In Pakistan and South Africa, where drought and water-stress are of concern, Nestlé is working with dairy farmers to implement the use of water sensors and develop water saving techniques for animal feed production. In Brazil, we are supporting farmers to install water meters and improve manure management techniques. And in Vietnam, we have trained thousands of farmers on best irrigation practices'. [Sustainable water management in our operations (web), N/A: nestle.com] Score 2 • Not Met: Assessment on the number affected by lack of access to water and sanitation: The Human Rights Framework indicates that 'In 2016, we developed our Nestlé Guidelines on Respecting the Human Rights to Water and Sanitation. These rules have since been implemented in all our markets and key agricultural supply chains. We have worked with local stakeholders and organizations to increase access to WASH. To date, these projects have benefited more than 1.4 million people in the areas surrounding our facilities'. Moreover, in the webpage section Right to water and sanitation, the Company notes: 'In Benha, Egypt, home to one of our bottling facilities, a nearby village of 27 000 people was lacking much-needed access to clean water'. However, although the Company discloses numbers for people benefited from different projects, no assessment of the global number affected by (scope of) lack of access to water and sanitation in its supply chain found. [Human Rights Framework, 12/2021: nestle.com] & [Right to water and sanitation (web), N/A: nestle.com] • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.10.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Women's rights in codes or contracts: In its Responsible Sourcing Standard, the Company includes provisions related to Women's Rights: 'recognize the unique position and needs of women, and that women are often impacted by working conditions differently than men, and that interventions will therefore need to be designed and operated accordingly; respect the rights to women on farm and ensure that any work assigned to women is properly remunerated and recognized as for men; identify opportunity for inclusion of women in farm work to promote worker diversity and equal opportunity in the community.' [Responsible Sourcing Standard, Jul 2018: nestle.com] • Met: How working with suppliers on women's rights: In its CSV Report 2018, the Company indicates: 'In Turkey, we support women workers in the hazelnut supply chain. With the Fair Labor Association, we completed a project to help 400 women through awareness raising on labor rights and financial literacy and developing leadership skills. Our Strong Women, Strong Farming program helped empower women hazelnut garden owners.' No new relevant evidence found in latest revision. [Creating Shared Value and meeting our commitments 2018, 2019: nestle.com] Score 2 • Not Met: Assessment on the number affected by discrimination or unsafe working conditions: The Company has provided additional sources to this indicator, however, no material evidence was found. • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress

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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Working hours, child labour, health & safety • Headline: Nestle suppliers accused of mistreating Syrian refugee workers at Turkey's hazelnut farms • Story: On April 29th, 2019, The New York Times published an article about Syrian refugees looking to make money picking hazelnuts in Turkey. Syrian refugees allegedly perform arduous tasks for long hours and receive only half the pay promised by middlemen. They reportedly work from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., seven days a week. <p>The Black Sea coast of northern Turkey is the world's largest concentration of hazelnut farms that supply companies like Nestlé and Ferrero. Approximately 70% of all hazelnuts come from the numerous small farms gripping the hillsides of Turkey's Black Sea region. It is a crop known for hazards and hardships, as well as child labour, problems that may be exacerbated by the growing number of Syrian refugee workers, said the NY Times.</p> <p>Among the 3.5 million Syrian refugees in Turkey, few have work permits. They lack legal protections and Turkey's labour code doesn't apply to small farms. Therefore, oversight falls to the confectionary companies, said the NY Times, as much of the harvest winds up in confections, like Nutella spread made by Ferrero, candy bars made by Nestlé and Godiva chocolates made by a Turkish company, Yildiz. [The New York Times, 29/04/2019, "Syrian Refugees Toil on Turkey's Hazelnut Farms With Little to Show for It": nytimes.com]</p>
E(1).1	The company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response: The company responded to the allegation by pointing to the response by the Fair Labour Association (FLA), a partnering organisation. [Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 20/05/2019, "Nestle responds to allegations of refugee labour abuse on Turkish hazelnut farms": business-humanrights.org] [Supply chain disclosure - hazelnuts, 02/2019] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The response by Nestlé does not address any detail of the allegation. The FLA response outlines progress that has been made with regard to working conditions for hazelnut farmers in Turkey, however, the project they are citing was completed more than 6 months prior to the release of the NYT article. The FLA response does not go into any detail regarding the allegations made in the article. [Fair Labor Association, 02/05/2019, "FLA COMMENT ON THE APRIL 29 ARTICLE BY THE NEW YORK TIMES": fairlabor.org]
E(1).2	The company has investigated and taken appropriate action	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: Engaged with stakeholders: The company has not engaged directly with the affected stakeholders in regards to the allegation or investigated the claims. The report "harvesting the Future" published by the FLA in 2021 includes mention of 11 engagement sessions with stakeholders. However, it is not clear from the report if that included rightsholders affected by the alleged rights violations. The report only speaks directly of meetings with suppliers, peer-to-peer learning, and engagement with government officials. <p>The Company provided feedback for this indicator, however, it was found not material for the assessment, as the feedback did not include any new relevant information. [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future, Phase I Project Report": fairlabor.org] [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future": fairlabor.org] [Fair Labor Association, 30/06/2020, "Harvesting The Future": fairlabor.org] [Hazelnuts, N/A: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified cause: The FLA "harvesting The Future" Report states that "Several suppliers became aware, for the first time, of the prevalence and root causes of child labor and other labor rights violations in their supply chains." However, this does not clearly refer to the violations of working hours or health and safety. <p>The Company provided feedback for this indicator, however, it was found not material for the assessment, as the feedback did not include any new relevant information. [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future, Phase I Project Report": fairlabor.org] [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future": fairlabor.org]</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>fairlabor.org [Fair Labor Association, 30/06/2020, "Harvesting The Future": fairlabor.org]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identified and implemented improvements: As a result of the company's 2018 engagement project, it states that it has adjusted its audit approach following the completion of the 2018 project because it found that audits "told us little about the effect of interventions, to measuring the impact of our actions and activities around training, renovations and summer schools for children." However, this was measured prior to the allegation, and is not directly relevant to the allegation. <p>In response to the "Harvesting The Future" project, the company states in its 2021 sustainability report "The program in 2021 focused on child protection and child labor risk remediation, elimination of hazardous work for workers under the age of 18, improved access to basic services and greater adherence to responsible recruitment practices, grievance mechanisms and living wages. So far, 85 company and supplier representatives have received training in these areas. A total of 12 suppliers have launched child labor risk monitoring and remediation programs, and we increased awareness and registration of labor intermediaries." [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future, Phase I Project Report": fairlabor.org] [Hazelnuts, N/A: nestle.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: It is unclear whether affected stakeholders were able to provide input. [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future": fairlabor.org] [Fair Labor Association, 30/06/2020, "Harvesting The Future": fairlabor.org]
E(1).3	The company has engaged with affected stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies)	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: Provided remedy: The company states that in 2018, its suppliers in Turkey received and addressed 561 workers' grievances were addressed. However, this was measured prior to the allegation, and is not directly relevant to the allegation. There is no evidence that the company provided remedies for the affected stakeholder identified in the allegation. <p>The FLA "Harvesting The Future" report mentions that 12 suppliers launched child labour remediation programs. However, there is no information available as to whether any remedy has already been provided. [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future, Phase I Project Report": fairlabor.org] [Hazelnuts, N/A: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders: The company states that in 2018, its suppliers in Turkey received and addressed 561 workers' grievances were addressed. However, this was measured prior to the allegation, and is not directly relevant to the allegation. There is no evidence that the company provided remedies for the affected stakeholder identified in the allegation. <p>The FLA "Harvesting The Future" report mentions that 12 suppliers launched child labour remediation programs. However, there is no information available as to whether any remedy has already been provided. [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future, Phase I Project Report": fairlabor.org]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy delivered: The company states that in 2018, its suppliers in Turkey received and addressed 561 workers' grievances were addressed. However, this was measured prior to the allegation, and is not directly relevant to the allegation. There is no evidence that the company provided remedies for the affected stakeholder identified in the allegation. <p>The FLA "Harvesting The Future" report mentions that 12 suppliers launched child labour remediation programs. However, there is no information available as to whether any remedy has already been provided. [Fair Labor Association, 2021, "Harvesting The Future, Phase I Project Report": fairlabor.org]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Independent remedy process used
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Child labour • Headline: Child slaves from Ivory Coast appeal dismissal of the child labour charges against Nestle • Story: Nestlé (along with ADM and Cargill) is a defendant in a lawsuit alleging it sourced cocoa from suppliers in Cote d'Ivoire despite being aware of child labour

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>and human trafficking concerns. Plaintiffs, alleged former child slaves from Mali, claimed that they were held captive, beaten and forced to work long hours with no pay. They slept on the floor in locked rooms and were given only food scraps, those caught trying to escape were severely beaten or forced to drink urine, according to the complaint. The case has split appeals courts but continues to make its way through the system. In June 2018, a three-judge Ninth Circuit panel agreed the claim could be pursued.</p> <p>The lawsuit was launched in 2005 by two human rights organizations, Global Exchange and the International Labour Rights Fund. In September 2010, the court dismissed the case finding that it could not be brought under the Alien Tort Claims Act. The plaintiffs appealed the dismissal and in December 2013 a federal appeals court overturned that ruling, allowing the plaintiffs to refile the lawsuit. In September 2014, the federal appeals court replaced its December 2013 opinion with an expanded one reversing and vacating the lower court's dismissal of the case. The new opinion sets out expanded reasoning for allowing the plaintiffs to amend their complaint to show the connection their claims have to the US (addressing the US Supreme Court's holding in Kiobel v. Shell). The court found that the plaintiffs had standing to bring an Alien Tort case because of the universal prohibition against slavery</p> <p>On January 12, 2016, the US Supreme Court refused to dismiss the charges against the companies. On March 10 2017 a Los Angeles federal judge dismissed the claim. The plaintiffs appeal has been upheld</p> <p>An independent investigation by the Fair Labor Association released in June 2012, mapped Nestles cocoa supply chain from its headquarters to the farms in Ivory Coast and identified numerous violations of its labour code, especially with regard to child labour. Archer-Daniels-Midland was dismissed from the lawsuit in 2016, according to court records. On 23 October 2018, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeal allowed the lawsuit against Nestle and Cargill under the Alien Tort Statute to proceed.</p> <p>In January 2020, the US Supreme Court signalled interest in hearing the case when they asked the Trump administration for advice on whether they should take the case. Nestlé and Cargill have requested that the Supreme Court end the suit against them.</p> <p>In addition, in April 2019, a proposed class action filed in California federal court claims that child slaves on West African farms harvest cocoa for Nestle, even though it labels its products as "sustainably sourced".</p> <p>The original case was dismissed by the US Supreme Court on 17 June 2021. The court found the connection of the conduct to the US was not strong enough as it was committed in Ivory Coast and the case could not prove that major decisions regarding the conduct were made on US soil. Therefore, the ATS was deemed inadmissible. However, the dismissal is not based on the merits of the case and gives no ruling on their validity. The lawyer for the plaintiffs intends to refile the lawsuit with more detailed allegations on conduct that took place in the US. Therefore, the search for remedies continues.</p> <p>In the mean time, however, on February 12, 2021, eight children who claim they were used as slave labour on cocoa plantations in Ivory Coast launched separate legal action against chocolate companies. They accuse the corporations of aiding and abetting the illegal enslavement of "thousands" of children on cocoa farms in their supply chains.</p> <p>Nestlé, Cargill, Barry Callebaut, Mars, Olam International, The Hershey Company and Mondelez International have been named as defendants in a lawsuit filed in Washington DC by the human rights firm International Rights Advocates (IRA), on behalf of eight former child slaves who say they were forced to work without pay on cocoa plantations in the west African country. The plaintiffs, all of whom are originally from Mali and are now young adults, are seeking damages for forced labour and further compensation for unjust enrichment, negligent supervision and intentional infliction of emotional distress.</p> <p>It is the first time that a class action of this kind has been filed against the cocoa industry in a US Court. Citing research by the US state department, the</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>International Labour Organisation and Unicef, among others, the Court documents allege that the plaintiffs' experience of child slavery is mirrored by that of thousands of other minors. The lawsuit also accuses the companies of actively misleading the public in their 2001 promise to "phase out" child labour. The original deadline for achieving the commitment, made as part of the voluntary Harkin-Engel Protocol, was 2005. The World Cocoa Foundation, an industry body to which all the defendants belong, now aims to achieve the target by 2025. In the claim, all eight plaintiffs describe being recruited in Mali through trickery and deception, before being trafficked across the border to cocoa farms in Ivory Coast. There, they were forced to work – often for several years or more – with no pay, no travel documents and no clear idea of where they were or how to get back to their families.</p> <p>The Court papers allege that the plaintiffs, all of whom were under 16 years old at the time of their recruitment, worked on farms in major cocoa-producing areas of the country. The defendants' apparent influence in these markets is described as "dominant" by the plaintiffs' counsel. The lawsuit claims one plaintiff was only 11 years old when a local man in his home town of Kouroussandougou, Mali, promised him work in Ivory Coast for XOF 25,000 (approximately USD 46) a month. The legal documents allege that the boy worked for two years without ever being paid, often applying pesticides and herbicides without protective clothing.</p> <p>The documents claim another child named as a plaintiff in the suit had visible cuts on his hands and arms from machete accidents. Speaking of his experience of forced labour between 2009 and 2011, he recalls being constantly bitten by insects. As with most of the plaintiffs, he claims in the lawsuit that he was promised payment after the harvest, but it never came. Court papers filed in October 2021 allege that the plaintiffs were trafficked from Mali while they were still children. While the defendants argue that there is not enough evidence to link them to the conduct, the plaintiffs cite the "should have known" negligence standard of the TVPRA.</p> <p>[Reuters, 13/01/16, "U.S. Supreme Court gives boost to child slave labor case against Nestle": reuters.com] [The Guardian, 01/02/2016, "Nestlé admits slavery in Thailand while fighting child labour lawsuit in Ivory Coast": theguardian.com] [The Independent, 01/11/2021, "Nestle, Mars and Hersey accused of 'using child labour to get cheap cocoa' in new court papers": independent.co.uk] [Reuters, 17/06/2021, "U.S. Supreme Court rules for Nestle, Cargill over slavery lawsuit": reuters.com]</p>
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Public response: With regards to the lawsuit filed in 2005, the spokesperson claimed that "the issue cannot be properly addressed through lawsuits such as the one just filed in California". After the dismissal a spokesperson said that "Nestle never engaged in the egregious child labor alleged in this suit, and we remain unwavering in our dedication to combating child labor in the cocoa industry," <p>With regards to the lawsuit filed in 2019 a company spokesperson told Law360 that the company had "prevailed in similar suits and [...] is confident this one will also be decided in its favor" they added that "Forced child labor is unacceptable and has no place in our supply chain. We have explicit policies against it and are working with other stakeholders to combat this global social problem," the spokesperson said. "Regrettably, in bringing such lawsuits, the plaintiffs' class action lawyers are targeting the very organizations trying to fight forced labor."</p> <p>With regards to the lawsuit filed in 2021 a company spokesperson claimed that "Child labour is unacceptable, that is why we are working so hard to help prevent it. We remain unwavering in our dedication to combatting child labour in the cocoa industry and to our ongoing work with partners in government, NGOs and industry to help tackle this complex, global issue". [Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 12/01/2016, "Nestlé says in its website that no company sourcing cocoa from Ivory Coast can guarantee they have completely removed the risk of children working on small farms in their supply chains": business-humanrights.org] [Business and human rights resource centre, 24/04/2019, "USA: Class action lawsuit filed against Nestle for child slavery on cocoa harvest in West African farms": business-humanrights.org] [The Independent, 01/11/2021: independent.co.uk]</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: None of the responses go into detail. They do not address aspects of the individual cases, plaintiffs, or content of the claims.
E(2).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Engaged with stakeholders: The company provided a feedback for this datapoint, referring to its new Income Accelerator Programme. However, in this feedback, no information could be found on Nestle's engagement with child victims of forced labour in Côte d'Ivoire. As a result, the feedback has been found not material for the assessment. [Nestlé, 27/01/2022, "Nestlé announces innovative plan to tackle child labor risks, increase farmer income and achieve full traceability in cocoa": nestle.com] [Income Accelerator Program, N/A: nestle.com] • Met: Identified cause: In its Income Accelerator Program, the company states: "Insufficient income is a leading factor in the prevalence of child labor risks. [...] Cocoa-farming communities face immense challenges, including widespread rural poverty, increasing climate risks and a lack of access to financial services and basic infrastructure like water, health care and education. These complex factors contribute to the risk of child labor on family farms. Together with partners, including governments, and building on a promising pilot program, Nestlé's new initiative sharpens focus on these root causes of child labor." The company has thus identified what it believes to be the cause of the events concerned. [Nestlé, 27/01/2022, "Nestlé announces innovative plan to tackle child labor risks, increase farmer income and achieve full traceability in cocoa": nestle.com] [Income Accelerator Program, N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identified and implemented improvements: In 2013, Nestlé partnered with the Fair Labour Association (FLA) to investigate and report about the incidence of child labour in the supply chain, particularly in Ivory Coast, and to find solutions in order to tackle the problem. The Company's measures include building new schools, training farmers and providing 12 million higher-yielding disease-resistant cocoa plants by 2020. [Cocoa Plan: Tackling Child Labor - 2019 Report, 2019: nestle.com] • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: The company provided feedback for this indicator, referring to its new Income Accelerator Programme. However, in this feedback, no information could be found on Nestle's engagement with child victims of forced labour in Côte d'Ivoire. As a result, the feedback has been found not material for the assessment. [Nestlé, 27/01/2022, "Nestlé announces innovative plan to tackle child labor risks, increase farmer income and achieve full traceability in cocoa": nestle.com] [Income Accelerator Program, N/A: nestle.com]
E(2).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy: The company provided feedback for this indicator. However, Nestlé's feedback does not provide any evidence of a remedy provided to the child victims of forced labour identified in the allegation. Therefore, the feedback provided was found not relevant for the assessment. [2020 Cocoa Plan Progress Report, 2021: nestlecocoaplan.com] • Not Met: Evidence for lack of impact or link: The US Supreme Court dismissed the lawsuit, however, the dismissal was based solely on procedural grounds. The dismissal was not based on the merit of the case and is therefore no evidence of a lack of impact or link. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used: The US Supreme Court, while it presents an independent process according to this indicator, dismissed the lawsuit solely on procedural grounds. The dismissal was not based on the merit of the case and is therefore no evidence of a lack of impact or link.
E(3).0	Serious allegation No 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Forced labour; working hours • Headline: Animale, Work Global Brazil and others linked to slave labor in Brazil Nestle Nespresso, Starbucks, and Syngenta's Nucoffee reported to have sourced coffee from Brazilian farms using forced labor and child labor • Story: 3 May 2019, In April 2019 the Brazilian Government updated its 'Dirty List' of employers - those deemed guilty by an internal government body to have engaged in acts of modern slavery - to include 48 additional employers. The article notes "Another new member of the 'dirty list' is the producer of Fazenda Cedro II, in Triângulo Mineiro, Helvécio Sebastião Batista, who sells Café Fazenda Cedro,"

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>which had been certified with Nespresso and Starbucks quality seals and used to provide coffee for both brands. The article observes that labor inspectors found six workers on the farm, after inspection in July 2018, with exhaustive hours that went, in some cases, from 6 am to 11 pm, in addition to hygiene conditions considered degrading in the lodgings. The article adds that at Cedro II and other properties managed by Batista, labor inspectors have found 19 more workers in slavery-like conditions, in addition to the six that caused his property's inclusion on the Dirty List. Those properties lacked proper toilets and had no kitchen facilities. The workers also reported working exhaustive hours, in some cases until 11pm, often without their mandatory weekly day off. In a statement Nespresso, owned by Nestle, said, "In the light of the last report of the Ministry of Labor, we immediately suspended business with the producer in question and we will investigate the case. Farms providing coffee to the company are rigorously evaluated and inspected every year to meet the program's criteria. We will not accept otherwise and there will be no exception." In Brazil slavery is defined as forced labor, but also includes debt bondage, degrading work conditions, long hours that pose a health risk or work that violates human dignity.</p> <p>[Reporter Brasil, 03/05/2019, "Slave labor found at second Starbucks-certified Brazilian coffee farm": reporterbrasil.org.br] [Monga Bay, 03/05/2019, "Slave labor found at second Starbucks-certified Brazilian coffee farm": news.mongabay.com] [Reporter Brasil, 04/04/2019, "Nespresso e Starbucks compraram café de fazenda flagrada com trabalho escravo": reporterbrasil.org.br]</p>
E(3).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response: In a response the company states "In the light of the last report of the Ministry of Labor, we immediately suspended business with the producer in question and we will investigate the case. Farms providing coffee to the company are rigorously evaluated and inspected every year to meet the program's criteria. We will not accept otherwise and there will be no exception." [Monga Bay, 03/05/2019: news.mongabay.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The company's response doesn't provide sufficient detail, such as the alleged working conditions.
E(3).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Engaged with stakeholders: In its response the company says "In the light of the last report of the Ministry of Labor, we immediately suspended business with the producer in question and we will investigate the case. Farms providing coffee to the company are rigorously evaluated and inspected every year to meet the program's criteria. We will not accept otherwise and there will be no exception." While the company has suspended its business with the producer and said it will conduct an investigation, it is not clear whether they have engaged with the affected stakeholders involved. <p>[Monga Bay, 03/05/2019: news.mongabay.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified cause: Although the company stated it would be investigating the case, it does not present the results of this investigation. In particular it does not present findings of underlying causes of the events. • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: While the company claims to have suspended the business relationship with the producer, there is no information available on whether the company reviewed its management system in the light of the incident. [Monga Bay, 03/05/2019: news.mongabay.com] • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: While the company has suspended its business with the producer and said it will conduct an investigation, it is not clear whether it has engaged with the affected stakeholders to improve its management systems. [Monga Bay, 03/05/2019: news.mongabay.com]
E(3).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used
E(4).0	Serious allegation No 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Forced labour

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Danone and Dairy Partners Americas Brasil criticized for complicity in forced labor in Brazil • Story: A Brazilian official inspection accused Danone and DPA (a joint venture between New-Zealand company Fonterra and Nestle) of being complicit with a businessman who kept 28 people in debt bondage, because their affiliated distributors sold him their products in bulk without monitoring working conditions at his operation. The door-to-door salesmen had been trafficked from poor regions of the state of Ceará, and made to sell soon-to-be-expired yoghurt at a discount in the city of Salto, in the state of Sao Paulo. "Many workers arrived already in debt due to the cost of travel," said Luis Alexandre Faria, the labor inspector that coordinated operations on the ground. "They sometimes worked over 15 hours in extreme heat, cold or rain." While Danone and DPA were not directly involved, inspectors want to hold them accountable for not monitoring their distribution chain. Danone Brasil, maker of products like Activia and Evian water, denied having any relationship with the businessman, and said it will fight the claim that they were complicit. "The company emphasizes that it has worked in partnership with the Labor Secretariat to spread the company's best practices and to be an active agent against all forms of slave labor among the more than 10,000 businesses that are part of the complex supply chain that distributes its products," the company said in an email. DPA, a joint venture between New-Zealand company Fonterra and Nestle that sells refrigerated products, also said it did nothing wrong. [Reuters, 06/02/2019, "Danone and Nestle-owned company could join Brazil's slavery 'dirty list': officials": reuters.com]
E(4).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response: DPA, a joint venture between New-Zealand company Fonterra and Nestle that sells refrigerated products, said that did nothing wrong related to the case. [Reuters, 06/02/2019: reuters.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The statement by DPA contained information about the immediate actions taken by the company upon learning of the violations and that it was in the final stages of hiring an external auditor to verify the conditions under which their microdistributors operate. It did, however, deny wrongdoing in the case. It failed to explain the exact business relationship that connected it to the businessman conducting the slavery.. [Reuters, 06/02/2019: reuters.com]
E(4).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Engaged with stakeholders: The DPA stated that it was in the final stages of hiring an external auditor for their microdistributors, however, there is no information on whether this auditor or the company itself conducted an investigation into the underlying causes of this case. There is also no information on whether the company, the joint venture, or the external auditor engaged with the affected stakeholders. [Reuters, 06/02/2019: reuters.com] • Not Met: Identified cause: The DPA stated that it was in the final stages of hiring an external auditor for their microdistributors, however, there is no information on whether this auditor or the company itself conducted an investigation into the underlying causes of this case. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: The DPA answered in a email to the journal that it has come to adopt, in its distribution chain, measures to ensure that its commercial partners can contribute to the fight against work in conditions analogous to slavery. However, no further details were provided about the review of management system and practical measures adopted. [Reuters, 06/02/2019: reuters.com] • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken
E(4).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(5).0	Serious allegation No 5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Child labour; forced labour • Headline: Solidar Suisse report accuses Nestle of sourcing palm oil produced from forced labour in Malaysia • Story: In August 2019, A report released by Suisse Solidar, an NGO based in Switzerland, has documented the use of forced and child labour in two palm oil plantations denoted as Mojokuto & Suluk (not real names) in the Malaysian state of Sabah. The report notes that many of the workers on each of the plantations are undocumented migrants, subject to conditions of forced labour through debt bondage and retention of their identification documents by their employers. Additionally they report receiving threats of violence and possible deportation by police. The report also notes that child workers have been confirmed as being used in the fields of Mojokuto of the plantations. The report links the company Nestle to the plantations, stating, "Through our investigation, we can demonstrate that the Mojokuto plantation delivers its harvest to two palm oil mills, both of which are on Nestlé's 2018 list of palm oil mills. All other mills in the vicinity of Mojokuto are also listed. Mojokuto palm oil ends up in Nestlé's supply chain with almost certainty. The owner of the Suluk plantation also supplies palm oil to Nestlé." In a statement to SwissInfo, Nestle said "Human rights abuses and child labor have no place in our supply chain. We were informed of the allegations by Solidar Switzerland. We are in contact with them and wish to establish the facts in this matter. If the allegations are true, we will take decisive action." Furthermore, in a separate petition submitted to the Commissioner of U.S. Custom and Border Security two months earlier, the company was also linked to the use of forced labour by palm oil mills in Malaysia's state of Sabah. [Suisse Solidar, 08/2019, "Palm Oil Report - Exploited and Illegalised: The Lives of Palm Oil Migrant Workers in Sabah": solidar.ch] [Grant & Eisenhofer, 24/06/2019, "Petition to exclude all palm oil, palm kernel oil, and palm oil fractions produced in Malaysia by FGV Holdings Berhad from importation into the United States because they are produced "wholly or in part" with forced and child labor ": gelaw.com] [Swiss Info, 17/09/2019, "Nestlé criticised over migrant palm oil workers in Malaysia": swissinfo.ch] [Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 20/09/2019, "Malaysia: Report finds child labour, forced labour & migrant worker abuses at Nestlé palm oil suppliers; Includes comment from Nestlé": business-humanrights.org
E(5).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response: The company has provided a public response to the allegations, stating "Human rights abuses and child labor have no place in our supply chain. We were informed of the allegations by Solidar Switzerland. We are in contact with them and wish to establish the facts in this matter. If the allegations are true, we will take decisive action." [Swiss Info, 17/09/2019: swissinfo.ch] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The company refers to impact assessments it has conducted in 2017, however, those were completed before the publication of the report. The company does not provide a detailed response regarding the alleged violations or its connection to the two sites. <p>Information given in the company's 2021 Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil make no specific reference to the allegation at issue. [Swiss Info, 17/09/2019: swissinfo.ch] [Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil (web), 04/2021: nestle.com]</p>
E(5).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders: Although the company states in its response that it is in contact with Suisse Solidar and wishes to establish the facts in this matter. There is no further evidence that the company has attempted to investigate the causes leading to the impact or has engaged with the affected stakeholders involved. <p>The company has commissioned Verité in 2018 to conduct a Management Systems Assessment of how it manages labor rights challenges in our palm oil supply chain globally. While this took place before the allegation was published, the study was conducted over 18 months in 2018 and 2019 and continued in its second Phase in 2020 covering Indonesia and Malaysia. According to Verite this included interviews of mill and estate workers. However, the report remains unclear on the point of</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>where the workers that were interviewed were based. It cannot be concluded that it was Malaysian workers based on the information provided. Neither can it be assumed that the company engaged with the affected stakeholders raising the issue in the original allegation.</p> <p>The company provided feedback for this indicator, referring to Nestlé's 2021 Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil. However, the company did not provide any new relevant information that would allow a reassessment of the company's engagement with stakeholders. As a result, the feedback has been found not relevant for the assessment. [Swiss Info, 17/09/2019: swissinfo.ch] [Verite, April 2021, "Review of the Nestlé Palm Oil Upstream Supply Chain Management Program in Malaysia and Indonesia": verite.org] [Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil (web), 04/2021: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified cause: Although the company states in its response that it is in contact with Suisse Solidar and wishes to establish the facts in this matter. There is no further evidence that the company has attempted to investigate the causes leading to the impact or has engaged with the affected stakeholders involved. <p>While the report issued by Verite includes specific findings, it is not made clear whether they refer to the supplier in Indonesia or Malaysia. This is making it impossible to conclude the root causes of the issues.</p> <p>Feedback provided by the company on this datapoint has been found immaterial for the assessment of this indicator. [Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil (web), 04/2021: nestle.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identified and implemented improvements: The company has updated its "Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil" in April 2021 based on the findings of the Verite report and other investigations. The company states in particular "As part of the upgraded action plan, Nestlé has developed a framework that will help the company prioritize supplier engagement and systematically take action based on suppliers' risk profile and their capacity to address labor rights issues. Under the framework, the company will work with external partners to develop corrective action plans for suppliers and put monitoring systems in place to track against a set of key performance indicators" <p>[Nestlé strengthens its plan to help protect labor rights in the palm oil sector, 28/04/2021: nestle.com] & [Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil (web), 04/2021: nestle.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: See above.
E(5).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy: The company claims it is implementing a pilot project that includes remediation plans. However, there is no evidence that remedy has been provided at the moment this research is conducted. Feedback provided by the company on this datapoint has been found immaterial for the assessment of this indicator. [Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil (web), 04/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders: The company claims it is implementing a pilot project that includes remediation plans. However, there is no evidence that remedy has been provided at the moment this research is conducted. [Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil (web), 04/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Remedy delivered: The company claims it is implementing a pilot project that includes remediation plans. However, there is no evidence that remedy has been provided at the moment this research is conducted. [Labor Rights Action Plan for Palm Oil (web), 04/2021: nestle.com] • Not Met: Independent remedy process used
E(6).0	Serious allegation No 6	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Child labour • Headline: An undercover probe has discovered child labour at farms linked to Nespresso owned by Nestle in Guatemala • Story: On November 26, 2020, Nespresso (owned by Nestle) has launched an investigation into its coffee supply chain, following allegations of child labour at farms in Guatemala linked to the brand. Channel 4's Dispatches exposed coffee

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>farms in the Central American country paying children less than GBP 5 to work eight-hour days. Children were filmed working up to six days a week picking beans and lifting heavy loads at the plantations linked to Nespresso.</p> <p>Dispatches claims it was given access to farms supplying Nespresso among other companies in remote regions of Guatemala, and found children working at all of them.</p> <p>Nespresso has previously claimed its beans come from ethical sources and does not publicly list its supplier farms. [Metro, 26/02/2020, "Nespresso exposed for using child labour at coffee farms": metro.co.uk] [The Grocer, 26/02/2020, "Nespresso investigates coffee supply following child labour accusations": thegrocer.co.uk] [Daily Mail, 25/02/2020, "George Clooney's Nespresso coffee beans 'are picked by child labourers": dailymail.co.uk] [Nespresso, N/A, "Preventing and eradicating child labor from Nespresso's supply chain": nestle-nespresso.com]</p>
E(6).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Public response: In response to the allegation, the Company stated: "We were incredibly concerned about the allegations made by the Dispatches documentary, aired Monday 2 March 2020. Protecting children from exploitation and ensuring they are able to learn is of paramount importance to us, and that's why we have zero tolerance for child labor. It is unacceptable. That's also why, whenever there are claims that our high standards are not met, we act immediately". [Response to allegations of child labor in Guatemala, N/A: nestle.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Detailed response: The Company stated: "All of the farms in the cooperatives in this region of Guatemala are Rainforest Alliance and Fairtrade International certified. We rely on these organizations to certify compliance with all laws relating to child labor. On top of this, Nespresso's 400 agronomists worldwide made 170,000 farm visits, many of which are unannounced. Nespresso will continue to engage with our partners to improve and strengthen the certification process. We know that economic factors are a major driver in child labor. That is why Nespresso pays a premium to farmers for their AAA coffee. Paying a premium price for coffee improves the economic and social aspects of farming families and reduces a significant factor in the use of child labor. In fact, Nespresso pay the highest prices for coffee in the region of Fraijanes". [Response to allegations of child labor in Guatemala, N/A: nestle.com]
E(6).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders: Nespresso stated: "We strongly believe that working in collaboration and under advisement from key local stakeholders is paramount to ensure that appropriate actions are taken on the ground to bring a positive change moving forward. That is why we are developing a network of local organizations, the Community Child Labor Committee (CCLC), in order to support and work with us on prevention as well as remediation activities when a child labor case is uncovered". However, the company fails to clarify whether the "local stakeholders" will include stakeholders directly affected by the alleged conduct. It is also unclear whether the local organizations mentioned by the company are legitimate representatives of the affected stakeholders. <p>The company provided additional feedback for this indicator. However, the company did not provide any new information in addition to that on which the assessment was assigned. Therefore, there is no new evidence available to revise this assessment. [Nespresso, N/A, "ADDRESSING CHILD LABOR ALLEGATIONS IN GUATEMALA": nestle-nespresso.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Identified cause: Nespresso stated: "Given that the allegations related to a period of school vacation, the investigators were particularly careful to distinguish between cases where children were helping their parents legitimately, mitigating the safety risks of leaving children unattended at home, and cases of child labour which contravene local and international standards, for which Nespresso has a clear zero-tolerance approach". It lists additional causes for child labour as linked to specific economic, social and cultural issues affecting entire communities. [Nespresso, N/A, "Preventing and eradicating child labor from Nespresso's supply chain": nestle-nespresso.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Identified and implemented improvements: Nespresso has created a six-step action plan designed to enforce a “zero tolerance” policy against child labor in its supply chains. The plan includes: doubling the number of Nespresso agronomists in Guatemala while hiring dedicated social workers before the harvest season; conducting more unannounced farm visits; improved documentation regarding the treatment of coffee pickers; expanding a pilot project to include “child-friendly” spaces on coffee farms; increased education and outreach; and a hotline for reporting labor issues. [Daily Coffee News, 07/04/2020, "Nespresso Releases Plan to Combat Child Labor Found in its Supply Chain": dailycoffeenews.com] Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: Nespresso stated: "With the Fair Labor Association, we have identified and are engaging with specialized civil society organizations and other local agencies to form this committee. Incorporating worker and farmer voices on this topic will not only identify the issues to address before they become major problems but also encourage ideas and views to find collaborative and sustainable solutions to systemic issues such as child labor" [Nespresso, N/A, "ADDRESSING CHILD LABOR ALLEGATIONS IN GUATEMALA": nestle-nespresso.com]
E(6).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Provided remedy: Nespresso stated: "we initiated a remediation plan with the farmers, a 90-day process, whereby the farmers in question could make progress to become compliant again with our AAA Sustainable Quality™ Program standards, along with ILO conventions, as well as local and international laws. Following the positive completion of the remediation process, the three farms were reinstated in our AAA Program". It is unclear, however, whether this remediation plan includes providing remedy to the affected stakeholders. <p>The company provided additional feedback for this indicator. However, the feedback provided by the company is too general and does not allow for a review of the assessment. In any case, the company speaks of a remedy process that was discussed and approved but does not mention in any way whether the remedy was actually provided. In light of this, the feedback provided by the company does not allow the assessment to be changed. [Nespresso, N/A, "ADDRESSING CHILD LABOR ALLEGATIONS IN GUATEMALA": nestle-nespresso.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders: It is unclear whether the "remediation plan" completed by the farmers included providing remedy to the affected stakeholders. Not Met: Remedy delivered: It is unclear whether the "remediation plan" completed by the farmers included providing remedy to the affected stakeholders. Not Met: Independent remedy process used

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 2020 Key Findings report and the 2019 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 CHRB is part of the World Benchmarking Alliance ('WBA'). 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 WBA,

unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither WBA 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 WBA 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 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 Dutch law and shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of Amsterdam.

As WBA, 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.

COPYRIGHT

Our publications and benchmarks are the product of the World Benchmarking Alliance. Our work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit creativecommons.org