

**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark
2023 Company Scorecard**

Company name Barrick Gold
Sector Extractives
Overall score 37.1 out of 100

Theme score	Out of	For theme
3.6	10	A. Governance and Policy Commitments
15.9	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
7.5	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
5.6	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
4.6	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 Policy Commitments (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 Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the human rights of all individuals impacted by our operations, including employees, contractors and external stakeholders'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Commitment to UNGPs: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We are committed to and always strive to act in accordance with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.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: Commitment to ILO core principles: The Company's Human Rights Policy covers each ILO Core are of rights at work: discrimination, forced labour, child labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining, as indicated below. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We do not tolerate the use of child labour, prison labour, or any form of forced labour, slavery or servitude. [...] We do not tolerate discrimination'. As for the right of freedom of association and collective bargaining, it indicates: 'We respect the freedom of expression and right to associate of our employees and contractors, including their right to establish and to join organizations of their own choosing to

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>bargain collectively and advance their occupational interests without our previous authorization or unreasonable interference'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO core principles: The Company's Human Rights Policy covers each ILO Core area of rights at work: discrimination, forced labour, child labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining. The Human Rights Policy 'is applicable to our entire workforce of Barrick, including [...] contractors [...], at every site that we operate'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles for BPs/JVs: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We do not tolerate the use of child labour, prison labour, or any form of forced labour, slavery or servitude. [...] We do not tolerate discrimination'. As for the right of freedom of association and collective bargaining, it indicates: 'We respect the freedom of expression and right to associate of our employees and contractors, including their right to establish and to join organizations of their own choosing to bargain collectively and advance their occupational interests without our previous authorization or unreasonable interference'. The Human Rights Policy 'is applicable to our entire workforce of Barrick, including [...] contractors [...], at every site that we operate'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.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 Occupational Health and Safety Policy indicates: 'Barrick is committed to: Full compliance with all relevant legislation and regulations. Effective management, with Board and Executive level oversight, of our Health and Safety performance. Transparent communication and engagement in relation to our Health and Safety performance with internal and external stakeholders. Striving for continual improvement of our occupational health and safety performance, with Board and Executive level oversight of this performance'. [Occupational Health and Safety Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Commitment to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We will enforce working hours to the best of our ability aligned with ILO standards, and provide fairly compensated overtime and pay for periodic holidays and time off'. However, 'to the best of our ability' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to H&S of workers: The Occupational Health and Safety Policy indicates: 'Barrick is committed to: Full compliance with all relevant legislation and regulations. Effective management, with Board and Executive level oversight, of our Health and Safety performance. Transparent communication and engagement in relation to our Health and Safety performance with internal and external stakeholders. Striving for continual improvement of our occupational health and safety performance, with Board and Executive level oversight of this performance'. This Policy is also applicable to contractors. [Occupational Health and Safety Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We will enforce working hours to the best of our ability aligned with ILO standards, and provide fairly compensated overtime and pay for periodic holidays and time off'. The Human Rights Policy 'is applicable to our entire workforce of Barrick, including [...] contractors [...], at every site that we operate'. However, 'to the best of our ability' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com]
A.1.3.a.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the sector – land, natural resources and indigenous peoples' rights (EX)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to respect land ownership/natural resources as in VGGT: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'we will aim to take several steps: [...] Respect the history, culture and traditional ways of indigenous peoples, their standing as distinct, self-determining peoples with collective rights, and their interests in land, waters and the environment'. However, no evidence found of a commitment to respect ownership/use of land and natural resources and respect legitimate tenure rights related to the ownership and use of land and natural resources as set out in the relevant part(s) of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land (VGGT). [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Commitment to respect land ownership/natural resources as in IFC Performance Standards

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commitment to respect indigenous rights or ILO No.169 or UN Declaration: The Social Performance Policy indicates: 'we commit to: [...] Respect the values, rights and interests of Indigenous Peoples in the areas where we work'. [Social Performance Policy, 2019: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments: The Social Performance Policy indicates: 'we commit to: [...] Respect the values, rights and interests of Indigenous Peoples in the areas where we work'. This Policy is also applicable to contractors. However, it is not clear the Company expects extractive business partners to commit to respect ownership/use of land and natural resources and respect legitimate tenure rights related to the ownership and use of land and natural resources as set out in the relevant part(s) of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, (VGGT) or the IFC Performance Standards. [Social Performance Policy, 2019: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to obtain FPIC or zero tolerance to land grabbing • Not Met: Commitment to respect the right to water: The Environmental Policy indicates: 'we commit to: [...] Minimise our use of water, control and manage our impacts on water quality, and engage with stakeholders including local communities to ensure sustainable management of water resources for the benefit of all local users'. However, although it indicates that it commits to manager its water usage and to engage with local communities, no statement found committing it to respecting the right to water. [Environmental Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments
A.1.3.b.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the sector – security (EX)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commitment to Voluntary Principles on Security and HRs: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We are committed to and always strive to act in accordance with the [...] Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Commits to International Humanitarian Law <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to commit to these rights: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We are committed to and always strive to act in accordance with the [...] Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights'. The Human Rights Policy 'is applicable to our entire workforce of Barrick, including [...] contractors [...], at every site that we operate'. However, it is not clear the Company expects extractive business partners commits to respect international humanitarian law. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.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: Commitment to remedy adverse HRs impacts: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'Wherever we operate, we seek to avoid causing or contributing to human rights violations and to facilitate access to remedy'. However, 'seek [...] to facilitate access' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make this commitments: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'Wherever we operate, we seek to avoid causing or contributing to human rights violations and to facilitate access to remedy'. The Human Rights Policy 'is applicable to our entire workforce of Barrick, including [...] contractors [...], at every site that we operate'. However, 'seek [...] to facilitate access' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to collaborate with judicial or non-judicial mechanisms • Not Met: Commitment to work with EX BPs on remedy
A.1.5	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	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: Zero tolerance of threats/attacks on HRDs: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We do not tolerate threats, intimidation, or attacks against human rights defenders'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Expects BPs to make this commitment: The Human Rights Policy 'is applicable to our entire workforce of Barrick, including [...] contractors [...], at every site that we operate'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to working with HRDs to create safe and enabling environment

A.2 Board Level Accountability (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: The purpose of the 'Environmental, Social, Governance & Nominating Committee (the "ESG & Nominating Committee" or the "Committee") of the Board of Directors (the "Board") is to assist the Board in: [...] overseeing the Company's environmental, safety and health, corporate social responsibility, and human rights programs, policies and performance'. Part of its responsibilities include: 'reviewing and assessing the effectiveness of the Company's programs, policies and standards relating to environment, safety and health, corporate social responsibility and human rights; satisfying itself that management of the Company monitors compliance and reviews current and emerging trends and issues in the environment, safety and health, corporate social responsibility and human rights fields and evaluates their impact on the Company'. [Environmental, Social, Governance & Nominating Committee Mandate, 02/2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Describes HRs expertise of Board member <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Board member/CEO signal importance of HRs in their communications
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: Process to review HRs strategy at board level: The Environmental, Social, Governance & Nominating Committee Mandate indicates: 'The Committee shall have a minimum of four meetings per year, to coincide with the Company's financial reporting cycle'. Moreover, the 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'The E&S Committee meets quarterly to review our sustainability performance, including compliance with our sustainability policies, and any emerging environmental and social issues or potential human rights concerns. The Board's Corporate Governance & Nominating Committee reviews the reports of the E&S Committee on a quarterly basis, as part of the Committee's mandate to oversee Barrick's sustainability programs, policies, and performance'. Regarding its governance, the 2021 Annual Report explains: 'Throughout the year, we have been tracking our progress against our Sustainability Scorecard'. The scorecard contains Human Rights related indicators. [Environmental, Social, Governance & Nominating Committee Mandate, 02/2022: s25.q4cdn.com] & [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Example of HRs issues/trends discussed in last reporting period <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Describes how affected stakeholders / HRs experts inform board discussions
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	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: At least one board member incentive linked to HRs commitments: The 2021 Annual Report indicates: 'Key management personnel include the members of the Board of Directors and the executive leadership team. Compensation for key management personnel (including Directors) was as follows: [...] Salaries and short-term employee benefits, [...] Post-employment benefits, [...] Share-based payments and other'. However, it is not clear incentive or performance management scheme linked to the company's human rights policy commitment or strategy. [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] & [Annual Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public • Not Met: Review of other board incentives for coherence with HRs policies
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 for HRs risks: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'The E&S Committee meets quarterly to review our sustainability performance, including compliance with our sustainability policies, and any emerging environmental and social issues or potential human rights concerns. The Board's Corporate Governance & Nominating Committee reviews the reports of the E&S Committee on a quarterly basis, as part of the Committee's mandate to oversee Barrick's sustainability programs, policies, and performance'. The 2021 Annual Report explains: Throughout the year, we have been tracking our progress against our

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Sustainability Scorecard'. The scorecard contains Human Rights related indicators. However, 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. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes frequency and triggers for reviewing business model <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Example of actions resulting from reviews

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 A.1.2.a • Met: Senior responsibility for HRs implementation and decision making: The 2021 Annual Report indicates: 'We established the Environmental and Social Oversight Committee ("E&S Committee") to connect site-level ownership of our sustainability strategy with the leadership of the Group. It is chaired by the President and Chief Executive Officer and includes: (1) regional Chief Operating Officers; (2) mine site General Managers; (3) Health, Safety, Environment and Closure Leads; (4) the Group Sustainability Executive; (5) in-house legal counsel; and (6) an independent sustainability consultant in an advisory role. The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'The E&S Committee meets quarterly to review our sustainability performance, including compliance with our sustainability policies, and any emerging environmental and social issues or potential human rights concerns'. [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] & [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes day-to-day responsibility for implementing HRs commitments: See above. In addition, the 2021 Annual Report indicates: 'We implement this strategy by blending top-down accountability with bottom-up responsibility. This means we place the day-to-day ownership of sustainability, and the associated risks and opportunities, in the hands of individual sites. In the same way that each site must manage its geological, operational and technical capabilities to meet business objectives, it must also manage and identify programs, metrics, and targets that measure progress and deliver real value for the business and our stakeholders, including our host countries and local communities. The Group Sustainability Executive, supported by regional sustainability leads, provides oversight and direction over this site-level ownership, to ensure alignment with the strategic priorities of the overall business'. [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own operations • Not Met: Resources and expertise allocation with EX BPs
B.1.2	Incentives and performance 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: Senior manager incentives linked to HRs commitments: The 2021 Annual Report indicates: 'Our performance on the scorecard accounts for 25% of the long-term incentive awards for senior leaders in 2021 as part of the Barrick Partnership Plan'. The scorecard contains Human Rights indicators: Percentage of security personnel receiving training on human rights, Corporate human rights benchmark score, Independent human rights assessments with zero significant findings at high risk sites. It also contains indicators on safety: Total Recordable Injury Frequency Rate, Percentage of operational sites certified to ISO 45001. [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] & [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S: As indicated above, in addition to health and safety the Company has other human-rights related issues, including human rights impacts assessments results and training security personnel on human rights. [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public • Not Met: Review of other senior management incentives for coherence with HRs policies

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: HRs risks integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The Company describes some of its key risks, one of which is 'Social license to operate': 'At Barrick, we are committed to building, operating, and closing our mines in a safe and responsible manner. To do this, we seek to build trust-based partnerships with host governments and local communities to drive shared long-term value while working to minimize the social and environmental impacts of our activities. [...] Past environmental incidents in the extractive industry highlight the hazards (e.g., water management, tailings storage facilities, etc.) and the potential consequences to the environment, community health and safety. Our ability to maintain compliance with regulatory and community obligations in order to protect the environment and our host communities alike remains one of our top priorities'. [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Provides an example: According to the 2021 Annual Report, key risk modification activities include: 'Our commitment to responsible mining is supported by a robust governance framework, including an overarching Sustainable Development Policy and related policies in the areas of Biodiversity, Social Performance, Occupational Health and Safety, Environment and Human Rights; Implementation of a Sustainability Scorecard to track our sustainability performance using key performance indicators aligned to priority areas set out in our strategy; Mandatory training on our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics as well as supporting policies which set out the ethical behavior expected of everyone working at, or with, Barrick; [...] Established Community Development Committees at each of our operational mines to identify community needs and priorities and to allocate funds to those initiatives most meaningful to the local community; We open our social and environmental performance to third-party scrutiny, including through the ISO 14001 re-certification process, International Cyanide Management Code audits, and annual human rights impact assessments'. [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Risk assesment by Audit Committee or independent third party
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 A.1.2.a • Met: Communicates HRs policies to all workers in own operations: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Our employees undergo training on our human rights expectations as part of their induction and annual refresher training'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to stakeholders: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'We publicize our human rights commitments to local communities and other stakeholders'. However, no description found of how it takes place. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Example of how HRs policies are accessible for intended audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to 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"> • Met: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes steps to communicate HRs policies to EX BPs <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes how HRs policies are contractual/binding for suppliers: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'We require that all contractors abide by the Supplier Code of Ethics, which incorporates the 10 Principles of the UN Global Compact and key concepts of our Human Rights Policy. Furthermore, once we enter a contractual relationship with a supplier, our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and Human Rights Policy applies to them while they are on our mine sites or completing work for us, just as it does to our own people. Our contracts include provisions requiring suppliers to abide by key human rights norms and our policies, and we also provide focused training to suppliers who have risks of negative human rights impacts. Lower risk suppliers are less visible to the company and not as subject to our onboarding program unless their work takes them on site. Then they are required to comply with the requirements listed above'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Requires EX BPs to cascade contractual/binding HRs policies to their BPs: Although, as it is indicated above, the Supplier Code of Ethics document 'is intended to govern the conduct of Barrick's Suppliers and their relevant subcontractors', it is not clear extractive business partners are required to cascade

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			the contractual or other binding requirements down their own business partners. [Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 23/09/2016: s25.q4cdn.com]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	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 at least 1 on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2.a • Met: Describes how workers are trained on HRs policy commitments: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Our employees undergo training on our human rights expectations as part of their induction and annual refresher training'. The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'All employees and contractors (including their employees) who work at our mine sites receive human rights training. The training includes sections on how to identify modern slavery or child labor in our supply chains and communities. [...] We require all employees and contractors to complete human rights training that focuses on how to prevent and mitigate negative human rights impacts, and promote the respect for human rights in their area of operations. [...] Our new online human rights training has a module specific to Indigenous Peoples rights and how Barrick employees and contractors can respect these rights in their day-to-day responsibilities'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Trains relevant managers including security on HRs: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'enhanced specialist human rights training is provided for employees at operations with higher human rights risks or in higher risk roles, including security personnel. In total during 2021, we trained more than 2,269 public and private security personnel on the VPs'. The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'We continue to provide security personnel specific training on human rights, the VPSHR and Barrick's Use of Force Procedure'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] & [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2.a • Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Met: Trains BPs to meet HRs commitments: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'All employees and contractors (including their employees) who work at our mine sites receive human rights training. The training includes sections on how to identify modern slavery or child labor in our supply chains and communities. [...] We require all employees and contractors to complete human rights training that focuses on how to prevent and mitigate negative human rights impacts, and promote the respect for human rights in their area of operations'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Discloses % suppliers trained
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	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"> • Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2.a • Not Met: Monitors implementation of HRs policy commitments across global ops and EX BPs: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'We support implementation of the Policy [Human Rights Policy] through [...] compliance audits, adequate due diligence [...]'. Also, 'Alongside our human rights assessments, we conduct a range of internal and external audit and assurance activities which augment our human rights program. For example, we conduct a Conflict Free Gold assurance process and publish a Conflict Free Gold Report each year. The results are examined over a multi-year period to identify trends and changes. We also consider the findings in conjunction with information generated by other processes, such as our internal audits, grievances, hotline reports, our third-party annual social assurance process, our community and stakeholder engagement programs, our engagements with site and functional leads, and our investigations into incidents'. As for the monitoring of contractor performance: 'As part of our vision to build strong relationships, our approach to contractor relationship management is also focused on building long term partnerships throughout our supply chain. We don't undertake formal audits of our contractors, except for suppliers where we source engineered goods. In these cases, we set up an audit of the factories to directly verify their capabilities, the working conditions and review the adequacy of their corporate policies, including human rights. For other suppliers we instead conduct quarterly or biannual reviews and discuss any cost variances, key performance indicators and performance management issues and work together to resolve them'. However, it is not clear how it monitors implementation of its human rights policy commitment across its extractive business partners as evidence seems only to apply to source engineered goods. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Discloses % of EX BP's monitored • Not Met: Describes how workers are involved in monitoring

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a: See A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes corrective actions process • Not Met: Discloses findings and number of correction action processes
B.1.7	Engaging and terminating business relationships	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: HRs performance affects selection EX BPs: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'Human rights are an important part of the supplier onboarding process. All suppliers must commit to our Supplier Code of Ethics, [...] We also conduct basic due diligence in a pre-qualification process, including for human rights issues, on all direct suppliers before contracting with them'. The Supplier Code of Ethics endorses this criteria and adds: 'a "Supplier" is defined as a third party individual or entity Vendor that provides goods and/or services, and receives payment, for any aspect of the Company's operations including exploration, development, construction, operations and reclamation'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] & [Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 23/09/2016: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: HRs performance affects ongoing BPs relationships: Regarding Contractor Performance, the 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'We follow an approach of improvement rather than enforcement, particularly for our smaller, local and in-country suppliers. If compliance and human rights risks are identified during the vendor screening and onboarding process we engage with the supplier to develop an improvement plan to address the identified risks, improve compliance and remedy any impacts that may have occurred. Failure to meet or achieve progress on these plans can result in contract termination or the implementation of additional controls and remedies'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes positive HRs incentives for business relationships • Met: Works with EX BPs to meet HRs requirements: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'All employees and contractors (including their employees) who work at our mine sites receive human rights training. The training includes sections on how to identify modern slavery or child labor in our supply chains and communities. [...] We require all employees and contractors to complete human rights training that focuses on how to prevent and mitigate negative human rights impacts, and promote the respect for human rights in their area of operations'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.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: Describes how workers and communities identified and engaged in the last two years: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'We consider a stakeholder to be any person or organization potentially impacted by our activities, or who can affect the success of our business. We have identified 10 important stakeholder groups: (1) host governments; (2) local communities; (3) employees; (4) suppliers; (5) shareholders; (6) civil society organizations; (7) joint venture partners; (8) the media; (9) investors; as well as (10) the ESG raters and research community [...]'. Regarding its Human Rights assessments, the webpage section Human Rights adds: 'Our most important source of information is our stakeholders, particularly our local communities with whom we have built strong and lasting relationships grounded in a philosophy of transparency and continuous dialogue'. In the 2020 Human Rights Report reports on the Stakeholder engagement that takes place with each salient issue. Moreover, in the context of resettlements, it adds: 'We engage with the individuals affected by the resettlement through a structured Public Participation Process (PPP). [...] In the PPP, we identify the vulnerable peoples within the community to be displaced and find ways to engage with them'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] & [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] • Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Analysis of stakeholder views on company's HRs issues • Not Met: Describes how stakeholders views influenced company's HRs 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: Describes process of identifying risks in own operations: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'Our mines conduct human rights assessments on at least a two-year cycle. In the first year, every operational mine conducts a self-assessment to evaluate the actual, potential and perceived human rights risks and impacts of the operation. In the second year, an independent human rights assessment program is conducted at mines identified to have medium and high exposure to human rights risks. In 2021, we carried out independent human rights assessments at our Kibali, Loulo-Gouunkoto, and Pueblo Viejo mines'. See below further description. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] • Met: Describes process for identifying risks in EX BPs: See below description of the process, as indicated process focus 'on actual, potential, and perceived human rights impacts on the rightsholder by Barrick operations and all contractors, suppliers and business partners'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes global risk identification system incl. stakeholder consultation: The 2020 Human Rights Report states: 'The cornerstone of our due diligence is a stand-alone, independent human rights assessment program for Barrick-operated properties that is aligned with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Assessments are conducted by Avanzar, a respected independent third-party consultancy, and focus on actual, potential, and perceived human rights impacts on the rightsholder by Barrick operations and all contractors, suppliers, and business partners (including government entities such as public security). The assessments include a review of the policies and procedures at each site to determine whether they effectively prevent and mitigate the risks identified. Each site is assessed on a periodic cycle of two to three years, depending on identified risks to the rightsholder'. It adds: 'Our Human Rights Assessments also assess working conditions onsite and interview contractor employees to determine perceptions of their conditions at site'. The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'We identify, assess and evaluate our salient issues through a wide range of internal assessments and external engagement processes. Our most important source of information is our stakeholders, particularly our local communities with whom we have built strong and lasting relationships grounded in a philosophy of transparency and continuous dialogue. We also identify potential impacts to human rights through our site grievance mechanisms, hotline reports and internal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms including third-party human rights assessments, as well as internal and external audits. Finally, we participate in multi-stakeholder initiatives including the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights and industry associations such as the Mining Association of Canada (MAC), the WGC and the ICMM to broaden our understanding of where the risks for negative human rights impacts are most significant for mining companies'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] & [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Describes how risk identification system is triggered by new circumstances: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'We also conduct basic due diligence in a pre-qualification process, including for human rights issues, on all direct suppliers before contracting with them'. However, this subindicator looks for evidence that the Company launches a due diligence process including identification, assessment, action and tracking due to new circumstances generally, including new relations, markets, legislation, etc. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] • Not Met: Describes risks identified in relation to new circumstances
B.2.2	Assessing human rights risks and impacts	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: Describes assessment process and discloses salient HRs risks: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'We prioritize the potential impacts of our operations on the rights of our stakeholders to ensure we are addressing what matters most. We identify, assess and evaluate our salient issues through a wide range of internal assessments and external engagement processes. Our most important source of information is our stakeholders, particularly our local communities with whom we have built strong and lasting relationships grounded in a philosophy of transparency and continuous dialogue. We also identify potential impacts to human rights through our site grievance mechanisms, hotline reports and internal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms including third-party human

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>rights assessments, as well as internal and external audits. Finally, we participate in multi-stakeholder initiatives including the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights and industry associations such as the Mining Association of Canada (MAC), the WGC and the ICMM to broaden our understanding of where the risks for negative human rights impacts are most significant for mining companies'. Assessments are carried out by in each specific location of the Company's sites, therefore, it is specific for each geography. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes how process applies to EX BPs: As indicated in previous indicator, process focus 'on actual, potential, and perceived human rights impacts on the rightsholder by Barrick operations and all contractors, suppliers and business partners'. Also, as indicated below, part of the assessment includes consulting contractor's employees to determine their conditions at site. • Met: Public disclosure of results of HRs risk assessment: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'we have identified the following salient issues: Non-discrimination; Health & safety; Working conditions; Responsible resettlement; Security; Water use and management; Indigenous Peoples' rights'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Met: Describes how assessment involved affected stakeholders: See above. Although the Company indicates that in evaluating salient issues the most important source of information are local communities, no details found on how specifically are engaged. Nevertheless, the 2020 Human Rights Report adds: 'Our Human Rights Assessments also assess working conditions onsite and interview contractor employees to determine perceptions of their conditions at site'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com]
B.2.3	Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impact assessments	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: Describes system to prevent, mitigate and remediate HRs issues: The 2020 Human Rights Report 'sets out in detail how we manage these diverse risks and challenges'. For each one of its seven salient human rights risks the Company explains why it is a risk, its approach to managing this risk, and its performance and progress made till the moment. Its Action Plan is summarized in the section 'Managing the risk'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Describes how global system applies to EX BPs: The 2020 Human Rights Report 'sets out in detail how we manage these diverse risks and challenges'. For each one of its seven salient human rights risks the Company explains why it is a risk, its approach to managing this risk, and its performance and progress made till the moment. Its Action Plan is summarized in the section 'Managing the risk'. It includes its contractors. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HRs issue: In order to tackle issues related to respecting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Company has provides training: 'To achieve our goal of zero tolerance for any infringement on Indigenous Peoples' rights, we educate our employees about Indigenous Peoples' rights. Our new online human rights training has a module specific to Indigenous Peoples rights and how Barrick employees and contractors can respect these rights in their day-to-day responsibilities'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Meets all requirements under score 1: See above. • Met: Describes how stakeholders involved in decisions about actions taken: For each salient issue, the Company also reports on the Stakeholder engagement that takes place. For example, in the case of resettlements: 'We engage with the individuals affected by the resettlement through a structured Public Participation Process (PPP). The PPP encourages the inclusion of any and all opinions and grievances into the compensation process. We work closely with local and regional authorities, as well as the communities to be displaced. In the PPP, we identify the vulnerable peoples within the community to be displaced and find ways to engage with them. The results of the PPP are used for the development and implementation of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), which must be agreed to prior to any resettlement occurring'. As for non-discrimination in the work place: 'We engage with our employees and contractors to define the risks and opportunities to mitigate and prevent the risk of discrimination and harassment'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com]
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to	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: Describes system for evaluation effectiveness of actions: Regarding its Human Rights Assessments, the 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'Each site is

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	human rights risks and impacts		<p>assessed on a periodic cycle of two to three years, depending on identified risks to the rightsholder. The focus is continuous improvement, rather than one-time, standalone assessments. This approach allows for tracking the actions taken in response to impacts identified and assessing their effectiveness'. However, no details were found on how it actually tracks actions taken. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Example of lessons learned from evaluation effectiveness of actions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Involves stakeholders in evaluation effectiveness of actions
B.2.5	Communicating on human rights 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: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders: The Company indicates that We also identify potential impacts to human rights through our site grievance mechanisms, hotline reports and internal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms including third-party human rights assessments'. It discloses various cases demonstrating how it communicates with affected stakeholders regarding specific human rights impacts raised by them or on their behalf: 'At the Porgera joint venture, concerns have been raised regarding the discharge of tailings in the Porgera river and lack of access to safe drinking water for local communities, as well as alleged human rights abuses by public and private security and insufficient remedy under the previous remedy framework. At North Mara, allegations of use of excessive force and human rights violations by public and private security forces. At Pascua-Lama, allegations of environmental harm. At Veladero, allegations that repeated cyanide spills have negatively impacted community water and glaciers'. Each case is explained in depth and outcomes are disclosed. It adds, that in the case of Porgera that: 'Beyond our own investigation and co-operating with the police, we also worked with stakeholders to develop the Porgera Remedy Framework'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes 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 mechanism(s) for workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all workers: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Barrick employees, contractors, third parties and community members can report potential violations of our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and related policies, including our AntiBribery and our Anti-Corruption Policy and AntiFraud Policy confidentially and anonymously through several channels, including our global hotline which is operated by an independent provider. We encourage and expect all our stakeholders to raise any concerns through one of these channels.' [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and workers made aware: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates: 'The hotline is available 24 hours a day in multiple languages. Hotline contact information is promoted through staff training and communications as well as our groupwide internal communications portal, and onsite posters. We have an optional feedback survey for all individuals submitting reports to the hotline which was implemented in 2021.' The webpage section Hotline is available in three languages. However, it is no clear it is available in all appropriate languages. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] & [Hotline_web, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Met: Describes how workers in EX BPs access grievance mechanism: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'Our hotline is an independent confidential reporting service that is available to all employees, contractor and supplier employees, community members and business partners 24 hours a day'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs
C.2	Grievance mechanism(s) for 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 accessible to all external individuals and communities: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Barrick employees, contractors, third parties and community members can report potential violations of our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and related policies, including our AntiBribery and our Anti-Corruption Policy and AntiFraud Policy confidentially and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>anonymously through several channels, including our global hotline which is operated by an independent provider.' The Code of Business Conduct contains the Company's approach to Human Rights. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and affected stakeholders made aware: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates: 'The hotline is available 24 hours a day in multiple languages.' The webpage section Hotline is available in three languages. However, it is not clear the mechanism is available in local languages and how affected external stakeholders at its own operations are made aware of it. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Describes how external individuals/communities access grievance mechanism: In its Supplier Code of Ethics, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers under contract with Barrick are encouraged to engage the community to help foster social and economic development and to contribute to the sustainability of the communities in which they operate.' However, no evidence found of a grievance mechanism available for business partners' external stakeholder, including communities. Also, although the Company's mechanisms are open to external stakeholders, it is not clear if this includes extractive business partners' external stakeholders. [Supplier Code of Ethics Standard, 23/09/2016: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the 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: Describes how users engaged on design and performance: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'In 2021, we added an optional feedback survey for all individuals submitting reports to the hotline'. However, although the Company engages with users, it is not clear the purpose of the engagement, whether it includes engagement on the design and performance. No further description found. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on design and performance <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how users engaged on improvement of mechanism • Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on improvement
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(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: Describes procedure and timescales for managing complaints or concerns: Regarding the follow-up on reports, the webpage section Ethics Point, indicates: 'All Compliance Hotline correspondences are held in the same strict confidence as the initial report, continuing under the umbrella of anonymity'. However, no further description of the procedures for managing the complaints or concerns, including timescales for addressing the complaints or concerns and for informing the complainant found. [EthicsPoint FAQ_web, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Not Met: Describes technical, financial, advisory support to enable equal access <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe types of outcome to complainant through use of mechanism • Not Met: Describes escalation to senior levels / independent adjudicators: It is not clear how complaints or concerns for workers and all external individuals and communities may be escalated to more senior levels or independent third party adjudicators or mediators to challenge the process or outcome at the complainant's discretion.
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 against workers/stakeholders: The Code of Business Conduct indicates: 'We take hotline reports seriously and do not tolerate retaliation against any person submitting a timely, good-faith report'. [Code of Business Conduct, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Describes practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Code of Business Conduct indicates: 'The Hotline can be accessed anonymously to report concerns'. [Code of Business Conduct, N/A: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Specifies no legal action, firing or violence • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation against workers/stakeholders: Although the Company's grievance channel is open to contractor and supplier employees, it is not clear expects its business partners to prohibit retaliation against workers and other stakeholders (including those that represent them) for

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			raising human rights related concerns. The prohibition should also cover individual stakeholders and communities at extractive business partner level.
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 legal rights • Not Met: Does not require confidentiality provisions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Cooperates with state based non judicial mechanisms: The Company indicates: 'If the grievance mechanism, hotline, and our human rights investigation procedure do not sufficiently provide adequate redress for adverse impacts, we implement programs to remedy impacts on the rightsholders when necessary. These programs are developed in accordance with the UNGPs and do not obstruct access to other remedies available to rightsholders such as state-based remedies or other internationally recognized mechanisms'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable): The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'When Barrick and Randgold merged at the start of 2019, one of our priorities was to deal with a range of legacy issues which required additional attention, research and energy. Since then, the new management team and operational staff have worked tirelessly to ensure these legacy issues are satisfactorily resolved through review with fresh eyes and a new management approach. Most issues have now been resolved. However, some have continued to negatively impact our reputation and social license to operate'. The Company then discloses some of the 'issues raised by the ESG ratings community'. However, no example found of an issue resolved through a state-based non-judicial grievance mechanism. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse 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: Describes approach taken to remedy adverse HRs impacts: The Human Rights Report indicates: 'In 2019, at our Kibali mine, the DRC workers from one of our site housekeeping and waste management contractors reported to Barrick staff that they had not been paid for a number of months and went on strike. The supplier was called for a meeting to discuss the situation with the Kibali supply and human resources team. A corrective action plan was put together between the mine and the supplier and regular review meetings were held to monitor progress and ensure outstanding wages were paid. When it became clear that despite assistance from Kibali that the supplier was still not paying his workforce, we ended the relationship. To remedy the situation Kibali directly paid the workers the money owed to them by the supplier'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes changes to systems, processes and practices to prevent future impacts: It also indicates: 'Since our last stand-alone human rights report in 2018, Barrick security and human rights related incidents linked to our relationships with private and public security have occurred at our North Mara mine. These incidents occurred under the previous Acacia management, prior to Barrick acquiring the minority share of Acacia and taking operational control of Acacia's assets in Tanzania. In September 2019 when we assumed operational control of North Mara, major changes were implemented both in terms of the standards used, and monitoring. Further to this in line with our local partnership philosophy a new local private security company was hired; we increased the amount of training provided, and we have worked to improve the relationship between the mine and the community. Other actions include reviewing the relationship with the local police to establish clear boundaries. Police now only enter the mine site when requested by senior management to engage on criminal matters. There have been no new security-related human rights incidents raised to group level in the two years since Barrick acquired the remaining minority interest in Acacia'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Describes approach to monitoring/implementing agreed remedy • Not Met: Describes approach to learning from incidents if no adverse impacts identified
C.8	Communication on the effectiveness of grievance mechanism(s) and	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 number of grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcomes achieved: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates 'During 2022, we received 422 grievances across the group. This was a 6% decrease compared to 2021. While this is encouraging, we do not consider year-on-year change in grievances received as a meaningful metric. [...] Of the grievances received in 2022, 64% were resolved

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	incorporating lessons learned		<p>within our 30 day target. [...] Of the grievances received during 2022, the majority (42%) related to the resettlement and land compensation process at Kibali, and in line with the majority of grievances received in 2021. A further 20% of grievances related to our contractors, primarily in Tanzania, Dominican Republic and Peru. It indicates its grievances per type: Contractor: 52; Resettlement and reallocation: 104. It also discloses its grievances received by site. The Company also reports that 32 households have agreed and accepted compensation. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Example of how lessons from mechanism improved HRs management system <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes process to evaluate mechanism and changes made as a result • 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.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Pays living wage or sets time-bound target: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'We believe that paying fair wages and benefits [...] is critical to the creation of a motivated and dedicated workforce'. In addition, 'we follow a country-based approach to determining salary bands, compensation, and benefits, and we take care to ensure our workers make more than the national minimum wage in the countries or regions in which we operate'. However, it is not clear the Company has a time bound target for paying all workers a living wage or that it pays all workers a living wage. A living wage should include basic needs plus some discretionary for employees and his/her family and/or depends. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how living wage determined • Not Met: Achieved paying living wage • Not Met: Reviews definition living wage with unions
D.3.2	Transparency and accountability (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Member of EITI: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'We were the first Canadian mining company to be a signatory to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: The 2021 Tax Contribution Report indicates: 'Barrick has gold and copper mining operations and advanced projects in 12 countries. All of these countries, other than the United States, Canada, Saudi Arabia and Chile, are members of the EITI. In accordance with EITI standards, all information about our payments to governments are disclosed to the EITI, reconciled with the state revenue information on a regular basis and then published in the EITI reports'. In the Report, it discloses taxes and revenues of all the countries where it operates except from Chile. [2021 Tax Contribution Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Steps taken to promote transparency in non EITI countries • Not Met: Provides example of contracts for terms of exploitation for countries without disclosure requirements
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Measures to prohibit violence/retaliation against workers for joining trade union: The Human Rights Report indicates: 'We recognize and respect the right of our workers to join a union and to participate in collective bargaining without interference or fear of retaliation. We have collective bargaining/enterprise agreements (covering wages, benefits, and other employment terms) with unions.' However, no information was found on measures or steps the Company takes to tackle this issue. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Discloses % of total direct operations covered by CB agreements: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'We also seek to engage with trade unions in an honest and constructive way. Approximately 40% percent of our employees are union members or have collective bargaining agreements in place'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts: Regarding its health and safety management approach, the Company indicates: 'Each site has its own site-specific safety management plan, procedures and system in place. Key elements of the site-specific safety management systems include: Site-level risk assessments to identify and inform people of any potential operational risks and the most appropriate controls. We also require individual risk assessments to be undertaken prior to any worker or team conducting a potentially hazardous or nonroutine work activity. [...] Monitoring is consistently conducted through regular internal and external audits, inspections and assurance reviews of our safety procedures. We use daily on the ground Leadership Safety Interactions to actively engage our people in the review, to identify potential weaknesses in our controls and to develop alternative and additional controls. All of our operational sites are certified to the ISO 45001 standard'. [Health & Safety_web, N/A: barrick.com] • Met: Discloses injury rate or lost days for last reporting period: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates that the total recordable injury frequency rate in 2022 was 1.30. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Discloses fatalities for last reporting period: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates that the work-related fatal injuries in 2022 was 5. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Discloses occupational disease rate for last reporting period <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates its 'Our ultimate ambition is zero harm. That means we eliminate fatalities and life-altering injuries from our operations, and to reduce the number of potential hazards on site to the lowest possible level'. 'Our ultimate goal is to become a Zero Harm workplace. To meet this goal, we launched the Journey to Zero Harm initiative in 2020. Zero Harm is achieved when all personnel across all regions and levels of the company consistently achieve zero recordable injuries. The concept is focused on proactive management of safety across the company and involves: Visibly present leadership and engagement with our workforce through Safety Leadership Interactions; Aligning and improving our standards; Ensuring accountability to our safety commitments; and Authority to stop unsafe work'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Met: Met targets or explains why not or actions to improve H&S management systems: The 2022 Sustainability Report indicates: "Unfortunately we have had an equally poor start to 2023, with three fatalities occurring in January 2023. This has jolted us into a state of honest self-reflection in terms of our performance and safety program, and a determination to take action. This culminated in a week-long workshop in London in January 2023, where representatives from our regional safety team, group sustainability team and members from the production team met to review our safety culture and practice, and to develop a roadmap to not just reverse but stop the concerning trend of workplace fatalities. Five progressive milestones have been identified in our new safety roadmap to achieving our safety vision. These are: Honest Reflection; Connection; Engagement; Ownership and One Team, One Mission. [...] The approach is underpinned by an internal communications strategy aimed at reinforcing the importance of safe work.' [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com]
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples' rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Process to identify/recognise indigenous rights holders: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'We require all sites with exposure to Indigenous Peoples to develop and implement an Indigenous Peoples Plan outlining specific actions to engage, address impacts and provide opportunities to Indigenous Peoples'. However, no description of its process to identify and recognise affected indigenous peoples found. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Describes how indigenous communities are engaged during assessment: Although there are various examples of engagement with indigenous peoples, in its webpage section Human Rights, it is not clear how it engages directly with indigenous communities specifically in carrying out the assessment. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to FPIC: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'Our approach to managing potential impacts is guided by the ICM position statement to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of Indigenous Peoples'. It is not clear the Company is committed to free prior and informed consent (FPIC), as 'guided by' is not considered a state of commitment. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Recent example of obtaining FPIC or not pursuing indigenous people's land/resources: The webpage section Human Rights discloses various examples of indigenous partnerships. However, no example found where it has obtained free prior and informed consent (FPIC) or where it decided not to pursue the land or resources impacting on indigenous peoples. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com]
D.3.6	Land rights: Land acquisition (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes approach to identifying lang tenure rights holders and negotiating compensation: Regarding resettlements, the website indicates that: 'Our approach is to avoid, minimize or mitigate the need for resettlement. This policy is guided by the IFC Performance Standards, and compels us to: Work to make sure that the affected parties are fully engaged in, and help to shape, the resettlement process; and Improve or at least restore the relocated persons' standard of living. The key features for any resettlement process we undertake are: The establishment of a resettlement policy framework; This is followed by a Public Participation Process (PPP). The PPP encourages the inclusion of any and all opinions and grievances in the compensation process; and The results of the PPP are used for the development and implementation of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) which covers aspects such as economic displacement and livelihood restoration. The RAP must be agreed to prior to any resettlement occurring'. The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'In the PPP, we identify the vulnerable peoples within the community to be displaced and find ways to engage with them'. However, although the Company indicates that it identifies vulnerable people during the PPP, no further description is found of how tenure rights holders were identified, as it seems that in the PPP are the affected people who reach the Company. [Social amp Economic Development_web, N/A: barrick.com] & [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes approach to compensation including valuation: The Company indicates on its website that this policy [Social Performance Policy] is guided by the IFC Performance Standards, and compels us to: Work to make sure that the affected parties are fully engaged in, and help to shape, the resettlement process; and Improve or at least restore the relocated persons' standard of living. The key features for any resettlement process we undertake are: The establishment of a resettlement policy framework; This is followed by a Public Participation Process (PPP). The PPP encourages the inclusion of any and all opinions and grievances in the compensation process; and The results of the PPP are used for the development and implementation of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) which covers aspects such as economic displacement and livelihood restoration. The RAP must be agreed to prior to any resettlement occurring'. However, although the Company indicates that affected stakeholders are engaged in the process, it is not clear how it provides financial compensation or other compensation alternatives, including its valuation methods. [Social amp Economic Development_web, N/A: barrick.com] • Met: Describes steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals: The Company indicates that: 'As set out in our Social Performance Policy, our approach is to avoid, minimize or mitigate the need for resettlement. This policy is guided by the IFC Performance Standards, and compels us to: Work to make sure that the affected parties are fully engaged in, and help to shape, the resettlement process; and Improve or at least restore the relocated persons' standard of living. The key features for any resettlement process we undertake are: The establishment of a resettlement policy framework; This is followed by a Public Participation Process (PPP). The PPP encourages the inclusion of any and all opinions and grievances in the compensation process; and The results of the PPP are used for the development and implementation of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) which covers aspects such as economic displacement and livelihood restoration. The RAP must be agreed to prior to any resettlement occurring'. [Social amp Economic Development_web, N/A: barrick.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes security implementation (incl. VPs or ICOC) and provides an example: The Human Rights Report states: 'The standard [VPs] also requires that each mine engage with neighboring communities, civil society, host country, private security, and public security to consult on the nature of these risks and how best to address these issues. In 2020, our Voluntary Principles Standard and related procedures were revised to ensure alignment with the latest international guidelines, principles related to security and human rights and findings from past Voluntary Principle compliance assessments. [...] During 2019 and 2020, 8,300 security personnel received in depth training on the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights'. It also indicates: 'Barrick security and human rights related incidents linked to our relationships with private and public security have occurred at our North Mara mine. [...] In September 2019 when we assumed operational control of North Mara, major changes were implemented both in terms of the standards used, and monitoring. Further to this in line with our local partnership philosophy a new local private security company was hired; we increased the amount of training provided, and we have worked to improve the relationship between the mine and the community. Other actions include reviewing the relationship with the local police to establish clear boundaries. Police now only enter the mine site when requested by senior management to engage on criminal matters. There have been no new security-related human rights incidents raised to group level in the two years since Barrick acquired the remaining minority interest in Acacia'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Ensures Business Partners/JVs follow security approach: The 2022 Sustainability Report states "Our commitment to respect human rights is codified in our Human Rights Policy and informed by the expectations of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs), the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPs), and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. It is further augmented and embedded across the business through our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, Anti-Bribery and Corruption Policy, and our Social Performance Policy. We also expect the same standards from our suppliers, and our Supplier Code of Ethics similarly incorporates human rights provisions.' However, it does not ensure that Business Partners or JVs follow this approach. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Security and HRs assessment includes input from local communities: See above. Although the Company indicates that in North mara it worked to improve the relationship between the mine and the community, no evidence found of security and human rights assessments including inputs from local communities. [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Two examples of working with local communities to improve security: The Company shows some steps it has taken "[...] to drive improved and trust-based relationships with the communities at North Mara: Established a CDC; Engaging with the local community to explain our plans for the mine and our commitment to the community; Working to understand and detail the voluntary promises made by the previous owners (Acacia) and fulfill them; Working with local NGOs to help communicate, socialise and entrench the grievance mechanism with the local community; Focusing on development initiatives which continue to provide opportunities and means of income for the local community and particularly youth groups; Providing community education programs on gender-based violence and FGM; and Providing training and business incubator programs for local entrepreneurs to help create and support local businesses.' However, it discloses only one example (two required). [Sustainability Report 2022, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes preventative/corrective action plans for water and sanitation risks: The Company indicates: 'We aim to deliver enough water for the effective operation of our mines, while at the same time protecting the quality and quantity of water available to host communities and other users in our watersheds by: Managing the design, construction and operation of our tailings management facilities according to local laws and international standards, Striving for International Cyanide Code Certification for all our mine sites, Applying good practices in environmental management by implementing and maintaining robust Environmental Management Systems (EMSs) certified to ISO14001:2015 at each mining and refining site. Encouraging our partners, contractors, and suppliers to implement effective Environmental Management Systems and integrate environmental best practices within their operations, Striving for environmental protection and continual improvement of our environmental performance, Conducting periodic reviews of our performance against this policy to ensure it addresses the needs of our host countries, operations, and communities in which we operate, and to ensure we fulfil our policy commitments, and Communicating this policy to our employees, partners, contractors, sub-contractors, local communities, and other stakeholders affected by our operations, and make it available to the public'. However, it is not clear how it implements corrective action plans for identified specific risks to the right to water and sanitation. This indicator looks for specific actions for particular risks. Current evidence seems to the operation of water management system. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Sets targets on water stewardship that consider water use by local communities: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates the target for 2021: 80% of water used across the Group to be reused or recycled. However, this subindicator looks for specific targets, which also takes into consideration water use by local communities and other users in the vicinity of its operations. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Reports progress in meeting targets and trends demonstrating progress: The 2020 Human Rights Report indicates: 'We have reached a target of 79% efficiency rate in 2020 and hope to surpass 80% in 2021'. However, no analysis of trends demonstrating progress against specific targets, which take into account water use by local users. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com]
D.3.9	Women's rights (in own extractive operations, which include JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes processes to stop harassment and violence against women: The 2020 Human Rights Report states: 'Regardless of location, our expectations for the treatment of women and others and our application of international anti-discrimination standards remains the same and is applied equally across all sites'. Regarding its risk identification, it indicates: 'Each mine identifies the areas where the greatest risk of discrimination may lie. These risks may include: [...] Workplaces that are hostile to women and their growth as a direct or contractor employee. [...] We engage with our employees and contractors to define the risks and opportunities to mitigate and prevent the risk of discrimination and harassment. Whenever possible, we partner with government and civil society to implement mitigation and prevention strategies adapted for the country and societal context. For example, in the Democratic Republic of Congo, we held discussions with the Ministry of Women on how we can help support efforts against gender-based violence. In the Dominican Republic, we worked with international organizations and the government to implement award winning programs to promote gender equality. [...] To create awareness of these international norms, we provide anti-harassment and human rights training to all our employees and contractors onsite'. [2020 Human Rights Report, 2021: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Working conditions take into account gender issues

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of employment: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: ‘Doing our part to right the gender imbalance in the historically male-dominated mining industry by prioritizing initiatives that support gender diversity, including the recruitment and development of women at all levels in our workforce, from internship to management. [...] we also continued to work with local governments to remove barriers to employment for women and we partnered with local communities to change cultural norms and raise awareness about the importance and value of employment and economic empowerment for local women’. However, it is not clear how it measures and takes steps to address any gender pay gap throughout all levels of employment. [Human Rights_web, N/A: barrick.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating closing gender pay gap

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

- Area: Right to security of persons

- Headline: NGO still accusing Acacia Mining, owned by Barrick Gold, of violation of Human Rights in its Tanzanian Mara gold mine

- Story: In 2018, in a statement released during Barrick Gold's annual general meeting (majority owner of Acacia), Mining Watch Canada claimed that Acacia was still violating human rights at its Mara gold mine in Tanzania. The Company has been accused of violence and sexual violence against villagers and, between 2016 and 2017, at least four men drowned after a barrier wall was removed. It was also claimed that a large vehicle destroyed a home and ran over a child.

On June 18th, 2019, news outlets in several countries simultaneously released the results of investigations by a consortium of journalists, Forbidden Stories, into human rights and environmental abuses at Barrick Gold's North Mara gold mine in Tanzania, confirming six years of investigations, reported on yearly by MiningWatch Canada, into assaults on men, women and children by the mine's private security and by police contracted by the mine. There have been injury cases including loss of limbs, loss of eyesight, broken bones, and internal injuries. Additionally, the consortium highlighted attacks on journalists who have tried to report on human rights abuses at the mine. At least a dozen local and foreign reporters were censored or threatened, and this is why Forbidden Stories has decided to investigate Acacia Mining's activity in the mine. The consortium also exposed how the gold from this mine is refined in India and Switzerland before being sold to, among others, international electronic companies.

In June 2019, at the annual shareholders meeting, human rights campaigners called for independent and transparent assessment of grievance claims and an end to the memorandum of understanding with police.

On February 7th, 2020, a group of seven Tanzanian victims launched a legal claim at the British High Court against subsidiaries of Barrick Gold, alleging serious abuses by security forces, including local police, employed at Barrick's North Mara gold mine. The claim was issued against Barrick Tz Limited, formerly known as Acacia Mining, of which Barrick was the majority shareholder.

The group of claimants reside in communities around the mine. The group includes the father of a nine-year-old girl run over and killed by a mine vehicle, driven without due care, on 19 July 2018. The young girl's stepmother and other women who had gathered around the body, and whose claims were also issued, say they were injured when security personnel and/or police fired on them without warning. The claimants further include a 16-year-old youth who says he was shot in the back and then beaten by the police employed by the mine, and a man who says he was seriously assaulted by the police on the mine site.

On 14 August 2020, three more Tanzanian victims have joined a legal claim in British courts against Barrick Gold subsidiaries for serious human rights violations at the company's North Mara gold mine in northern Tanzania.

The initial claim was issued in the British High Court in February 2020 on behalf of seven human rights victims against Barrick Tz Limited, formerly known as Acacia Mining, of which Barrick was the majority shareholder, and its Tanzanian subsidiary. The new claimants allege that security forces guarding Barrick's gold mine shot and killed members of their families.

On 15 December 2021, Inequality.org released an article entitled: ""Will Barrick Gold CEO go beyond rhetoric to deliver justice for victims of police killings at Tanzanian mine?"". The article claimed that Barrick Gold's last human rights report doesn't mention a UK court case on behalf of victims of killings and injuries inflicted by security forces at its North Mara mine.

According to Inequality.org, ten survivors of alleged human rights violations, and families of those killed, are suing Barrick subsidiaries in the British courts. The case doesn't appear in Barrick's human rights reporting. The article claimed: "" Barrick doesn't let the facts about ongoing claims stand in the way of good public relations.""

A 2016 Tanzanian parliamentary inquiry into the relentless violence at the mine had received reports of 65 killed and 270 injured. MiningWatch Canada and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>corporate watchdog RAID documented 22 killings and 69 injuries at or near the mine from 2014 to 2016 alone.</p> <p>The article further alleged that ""Barrick Gold hasn't published the human rights assessment it says has been carried out at the mine. The mine still uses the police to provide security and local communities continue to report persistent violence, including killings and serious beatings."" According to local communities, the company's ""deeply flawed grievance mechanism"" where those harmed can bring complaints has been shut down without an effective replacement.</p> <p>On March 14, 2022, RAID (Rights and Accountability in Development), a UK corporate watchdog, alleged in its released report ""Police violence at the North Mara gold mine"" that since 2019 when Barrick took operational control of the North Mara mine, at least four people have been killed and seven others seriously injured by local police.</p> <p>The report claimed the company has ties to police and allegedly pays and equips officers assigned to provide security for the mine. Meanwhile, the company still faces allegations of unlawful killings and assaults at the mine between 2014 and 2019. The victims include a nine-year-old girl killed by a mine vehicle driven by police, and four women who were fired upon while gathering around her body.</p> <p>RAID further accused Barrick Gold of one incident in January 2022, when allegedly a police guarding the mine fired teargas near children on their way to school.</p> <p>The corporate watchdog raised concerns about the behaviour of the police ""assigned to the mine"", urging Barrick and its subsidiaries to consider ending the company's reliance on the police for its security needs. RAID executive director Anneke Van Woudenberg added: ""Barrick's board and investors should ensure an end to the mine's relationship with the police and set up a truly credible and independent investigation into the abuses".</p> <p>[RAID, 17/04/2018, "Acacia Mining Fails to Address Rights Abuses in Tanzania ": raid-uk.org] [Mining Watch Canada, 10/02/2020, "Tanzanian Victims Commence Legal Action against Barrick Gold in UK": yubanet.com] [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 16/07/2018, "Barrick response to Facing Finance's Dirty Profits 6 report - July 2018": business-humanrights.org] [RAID, 14/03/2022, "New killings and assaults at Barrick Gold's Tanzania mine shatter company's radical improvement claims": raid-uk.org]</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 states that 'Acacia provided a detailed response to these allegations in July 2018, indicating that these are historical and that it is not aware of any new allegations of abuse. It also outlined the extensive action the company took in 2011 upon learning of these incidents, described that the remedy provided was developed in consultation with claimants and international experts, and invited any dissatisfied individual who received remedy to have that remedy reviewed.' <p>On 22 February 2022, Barrick provided a response to a letter RAID sent to the company to highlight further human rights concerns at the mine.</p> <p>In addition, on 14 March, Barrick published a statement in response to RAID's publication. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 16/07/2018: business-humanrights.org] [RAID, N/A, "Correspondence between RAID and Barrick February - March 2022": raid-uk.org]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: While the response issues in 2018 by Acacia did go into detail, the Company's responses to the renewed allegations in 2022 did not address all aspects of the allegations in detail. In both its responses, Barrick said, 'it would not be appropriate to discuss any allegations raised by RAID outside of the English High Court proceedings'. The company merely explained its human rights policies and its relationship with the police but did not address in detail the violations alleged against it. Moreover, in relation to Raid's new allegations, merely stating that : 'it would not be appropriate to discuss any allegations raised by RAID outside of the English High Court proceedings', though RAID is not a party and the allegations do not concern incidents subject to those proceedings.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).2	The company has investigated and 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: Engaged with stakeholders: There is no evidence suggesting that the company engaged with the affected stakeholders. • Not Met: Identified cause: The company declared that Barrick 'is not responsible for the conduct of the Tanzania Police Force', which is a state body that 'operates solely under its own chain of command in accordance with its own regulations'. Therefore, the company not only presents no investigative findings on the causes of the event, but also denies any connection with the police who committed the violations. [RAID, 14/03/2022: raid-uk.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: Barrick said that that the relationship with the Tanzanian police was reviewed 'to establish clear boundaries' since bringing the North Mara mine back under its control. It says third party human rights assessments conducted at the mine since 2019, the most recent in early 2022, found 'considerable improvement...[on] security matters at the mine since Barrick took over operational control.' However, no public comments of that nature can be found by an auditor or assessor. In addition, RAID requested Barrick to identify where such public comments may be found. Barrick did not do so. There is thus no public evidence that the Company made changes to its management and security systems following the events and their human rights impacts. [RAID, 14/03/2022: raid-uk.org] • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: See above.
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: Acacia Mining established a grievance mechanism which accepted claims from those seeking remedy for human rights abuses by police assigned to the mine. However, this mechanism rejected 82% of the 163 "security-related" human rights grievances it concluded and did not provide a fair or independent process. The mechanism was later closed by Barrick. Overall, no evidence was found that any of those harmed in the incidents it documented had received remedies from Barrick or the mine, though in at least some of the cases, the incident had been brought to the mine's attention. [RAID, 14/03/2022: raid-uk.org] • 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: Even though the company claims to have established a grievance mechanism (see above) there is no evidence that any remedy was delivered to the affected stakeholders. • Not Met: Independent remedy process used
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Right to safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment • Headline: Local communities protest against environmental impact of Pueblo Viejo gold mine in Dominican Republic • Story: On November 6th 2017, community members of Las Piñitas, Dominican Republic, began occupying space outside the Pueblo Viejo gold mine owned by Barrick Gold Corporation (60%) and Goldcorp (40%) in order to protest against the companies' causing the environmental damage to the Margajita River which is the community's water source. Community members claimed that more than 600 families impacted by the project. Since the start of commercial production in 2012, community members of Las Piñitas, Las Lagunas, El Naranjo, and La Cerca have expressed their concern regarding environmental impacts, which they believe has directly impacted their health and livelihoods. <p>The site was historically a small mining site, state-run from 1975 until 1999, by company Rosario Dominicana. The company's operations exposed enough sulphide ore to initiate acid mine drainage which left a community water source, the Margajita River, in an acidic state. However, the communities assert that the impacts of mining have significantly worsened since Barrick Gold Corporation began operating in the area.</p> <p>Individuals within the community, along with experts in the field, maintain that the alleged increased contamination within the area could be caused by the extensive use of cyanide at the Pueblo Viejo mine and the lack of suitable measures to dispose of the residue acid mine drainage.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Members of nearby communities have lesions on their bodies. Most people indicated that these lesions appeared after having direct contact with the water in the area, leading them to believe it is due to mine contamination. Members of surrounding communities underwent blood testing; all five tested positive for cyanide traces above accepted safe levels. Great concern has also been raised in regards to a drastic decline in agriculture production. The communities allege that they have lost over 80 percent of cacao, a source of income on which many families depend.</p> <p>On 4 May 2021, civil society groups urged Barrick Gold Corp to halt USD 1.3 billion expansion of its Pueblo Viejo gold mine in the Dominican Republic, citing risks posed by increased mine waste and threats to local communities' rights.</p> <p>Around 87 environmental and aid groups signed a letter opposing the expansion and construction of a facility for storing mine waste, known as a tailings dam. Police and military on April 27 restricted more than 200 people from taking part in the community meeting held for the expansion work.</p> <p>[Axis of Logic, 05/12/2017, "Fighting for Their Water and Their Lives, Communities Take Direct Action Against Barrick Gold in the Dominican Republic": axisoflogic.com] [El Caribe, 06/11/2017, "Campesinos se encadenan en zona minera de Cotui": elcaribe.com.do] [Mining Watch, 04/10/2021, "International NGOs Stand with Dominicans Opposed to Pueblo Viejo Mine Expansion": miningwatch.ca] [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 18/05/2021, "Barrick Gold's response on social and environmental impacts of mine expansion in the Dominican Republic": business-humanrights.org]</p>
E(2).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: Barrick Gold addressed a letter to Earthworks, Global Justice Clinic and MiningWatch Canada in response to their concerns over social and environmental impacts of Barrick's Pueblo Viejo joint venture operation in the Dominican Republic. <p>Regarding the allegation of environmental health, agriculture, and cattle contamination, Barrick stated that the concerns of civil society groups and local communities are a result of contamination caused by Rosario Dominicana's previous operations. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 18/05/2021: business-humanrights.org]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Detailed response: Barrick Gold provided a detailed response to the allegations of social and environmental negative impacts of Pueblo Viejo's mine and to the concerns over the inherently risky nature of tailings dams, the opaque and non-transparent nature of the expansion process, and Barrick's track record of environmental harm in its letter addressed to Earthworks, Global Justice Clinic and MiningWatch Canada dated 18 May 2021. <p>[Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 18/05/2021: business-humanrights.org]</p>
E(2).2	The company has investigated and taken appropriate action	0	<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: The company worked together with the Dominican government to find solutions to the residents' consistent opposition to the tailings dam's expansion by offering jobs to the young community, promising relocation programs for people living in proximity to the mine and future dam. However, no evidence was found of the Company has engaged with the affected stakeholders to understand the root causes for the alleged rights violations. While the Company did engage with the government it is not clear whether the government was mandated by the stakeholders to represent their interests in this case. [Mining Watch, 04/10/2021: miningwatch.ca] • Not Met: Identified cause: The company repeatedly denied being linked to the allegation. Thus, it does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned, merely stating that " prior to our arrival, the water flowing from the Pueblo Viejo mine to the Margajita River was highly acidic and was unable to sustain aquatic life". [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 18/05/2021: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: There is no evidence that the company made changes to its management systems following the events and their human rights impacts. • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(2).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: There is no evidence suggesting the company provided remedy to the affected stakeholders. • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link: The company denies being linked to the allegation, claiming "environmental health, agriculture, and cattle contamination allegations have been extensively reviewed by us and the government authorities and it has been found that these were not attributable to Pueblo Viejo". However, the company did not provide sufficient evidence to justify why the impacts of mining have significantly worsened since the Barrick began operating in the area. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 18/05/2021: business-humanrights.org] <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(3).0	Serious allegation No 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment • Headline: Landowners oppose to the reopening of Barrick Gold's Porgera mine • Story: On April 28th, 2020, Papua New Guinea has threatened to take control of a gold mine operated by Barrick Gold Corp after Barrick's local unit suspended operations following news the mine's lease would not be renewed. Barrick Gold had applied for a twenty-year lease renewal with its joint venture partner, China's Zijin Mining, of the Porgera gold mine which Papua New Guinea rejected on April 24th, 2020. <p>Barrick and Zijin each own 47.5 per cent of the mine, with the remaining 5 per cent held by landowner group, Mineral Resources Enga.</p> <p>Barrick Gold had run into opposition from Papua New Guinea landowners and residents. Critics say the Porgera mine has polluted the water supply and created other environmental and social problems, with minimal economic returns for locals. "In the best interests of the state, especially in lieu of the environmental damages, claims and resettlements issues, the Special Mining Lease will not be renewed." Prime Minister James Marape said.</p> <p>The government has said it plans to give a portion of Barrick and Zijin's stakes to the national and provincial governments and to landowners. "Once the transition phase has been completed, then the state will enter into owning and operating the mine after transition arrangements." Marape said.</p> <p>Barrick has warned that it will pursue all legal avenues to challenge the governments decision and to recover any damages.</p> <p>On 20 October 2020, landowners from the Special Mining Lease (SML) area of Porgera Mine demanded Barrick Niugini Limited (BNL) to pay USD 13.28 Billion in damages if the company wants to return operating. Chairman Jonathan Paraia said BNL cannot return to Porgera until the company resolves its outstanding liabilities owed to the landowners for past damages.</p> <p>The Justice Foundation for Porgera headed up by the PNG Resource Owners Chairman Jonathan Paraia said the landowners have resolved that BNL conditions to return must include settlement to those issues or provide 60% share as "Equity of Liability" to the landowners. He said BNL has lost the "social licence" from the landowners and in order to reclaim the license was to have appropriate dialogue with landowners concerned.</p> <p>On 16 October 2020, Papua New Guinea (PNG) Prime Minister James Marape said that Barrick Niugini joint venture is set to remain as operator of the Porgera gold mine following talks in Port Moresby. Barrick Niugini, which is jointly owned by Barrick Gold and Zijin Mining, owns a 95% stake in the Porgera Joint Venture that owns the Porgera gold mine.</p> <p>On 9 April 2021, the landowners of the Porgera Special Mining Lease Area called on the Prime Minister Hon James Marape to stop his plan to give Porgera Mine back to Barrick Gold. Barrick Gold has announced that it is about to finalize an agreement with the Papua New Guinea (PNG) Government to reopen the Porgera</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>gold mine. The company cited a statement from Papua New Guinea Prime Minister James Marape, in which he said an agreement to reopen the mine was "imminent".</p> <p>The landowners said: "We note that the announcement by the Prime Minister comes after a lengthy negotiation between the State and Barrick at the exclusion of the landowners". They also added: "We have also been aware of the allegations of certain former prime ministers and government ministers who have had contracts in the mine, through their companies registered offshore, especially in Australia, since the operation of the mine in 1989. We ask the Prime Minister to liaise with the Australian government to cause a joint investigation into the conduct of these former and current politicians who have corrupted this nation by such practices."</p> <p>[Reuters, 28/04/2020. "Papua New Guinea warns Barrick over gold mine control": reuters.com] [Mining Technology, 16/10/2020, "Barrick to remain Papua New Guinea's Porgera gold mine operator": mining-technology.com] [Mines and Communities, 09/04/2021, "Barrick forces hand of Papua New Guinea Government in reopening Porgera": minesandcommunities.org]</p>
E(3).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response: In response to the allegation, the company stated: "PJV has been in temporary care and maintenance since April 2020 as we negotiate the terms for the reopening of the Porgera mine with the PNG government. That does not mean we have stopped our monitoring work – rather, we have taken the opportunity to undertake further studies and to fully comprehend PJV's environmental impacts". [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Detailed response: The company addressed all the aspects of the allegation at its Sustainability Report 2021, as saying "at the Porgera joint venture, concerns have been raised regarding the discharge of tailings in the Porgera river and lack of access to safe drinking water for local communities, as well as alleged human rights abuses by public and private security and insufficient remedy under the previous remedy framework." [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com]
E(3).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"> • Met: Engaged with stakeholders: The company stated: "Further to this, PJV's environmental permit requires extensive river monitoring and strict compliance with discharge and monitoring requirements. To do this, we work closely with an independent body, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) which is Australia's national science agency, to monitor impacts on the river. With CSIRO we also undertake extensive monitoring downstream of the mine. The monitoring program involves engagement and participation with the communities as well as local, provincial, and national governments. The results of the monitoring are made public in PJV's Annual Environmental Report, which is independently reviewed by the CSIRO". [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] • Not Met: Identified cause: The company stated: "PJV is currently undertaking a comprehensive study of river system health to fully understand how the physical, chemical and biological conditions of the system have responded during care and maintenance. This study is scheduled for completion by the fourth quarter of 2022". However, the company did not presented investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: There is no evidence that the company made changes to its management systems following the events and their human rights impacts. • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken
E(3).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 'the Porgera Remedy Framework, a comprehensive program to compensate victims of sexual violence' This framework was launched in 2012 and concluded in 2015. There is no evidence suggesting that the Company provided remedy for the victims of the allegation of environmental damage. [2021 Sustainability Report, 2022: s25.q4cdn.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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not Met: Remedy delivered• Not Met: Independent remedy process used

Disclaimer

The terms and conditions as stated in WBA's disclaimer are applicable to this publication. Please consult our disclaimer via worldbenchmarkingalliance.org