

**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark
2023 Company Scorecard**

Company name China Energy Investment Group (CHN Energy)
Sector Extractives
Overall score 0.0 out of 100

Theme score	Out of	For theme
0.0	10	A. Governance and Policy Commitments
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.0	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.0	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
0.0	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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: General HRs commitment • Not Met: Universal Declaration of Human rights (UDHR) • Not Met: International Bill of Human Rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to UNGPs • Not Met: Commitment to OECD MNE Guidelines
A.1.2.a	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to ILO core principles • Not Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO core principles • Not Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles for BPs/JVs
A.1.2.b	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: Health and safety and working hours	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to respect H&S of workers: The webpage section Corporate Culture indicates: 'By promoting clean, integrated, refined, intelligent and internationalized development, it aims to achieve best performance in safety, quality, benefits, technological innovation, human resources, brand management,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			and Party building'. However, no policy statement of commitment to respect the health and safety of workers was found. [Corporate Culture_web, N/A: ceic.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to H&S of workers • Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week
A.1.3.a.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the sector – land, natural resources and indigenous peoples' rights (EX)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to respect land ownership/natural resources as in VGGT • Not Met: Commitment to respect land ownership/natural resources as in IFC Performance Standards • Not Met: Commitment to respect indigenous rights or ILO No.169 or UN Declaration • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments Score 2 <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 • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to Voluntary Principles on Security and HRs • Not Met: Uses only ICoCA members as security providers • Not Met: Commits to International Humanitarian Law Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to commit to these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to remedy adverse HRs impacts • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make this commitments Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Zero tolerance of threats/attacks on HRDs • Not Met: Expects BPs to make this commitment Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Board level responsibility for HRs • Not Met: Describes HRs expertise of Board member Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Board member/CEO signal importance of HRs in their communications
A.2.2	Board responsibility	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Process to review HRs strategy at board level • Not Met: Example of HRs issues/trends discussed in last reporting period Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: At least one board member incentive linked to HRs commitments • Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S Score 2 <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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.4	Business model strategy and risks	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Board process to review business model and strategy for HRs risks • Not Met: Describes frequency and triggers for reviewing business model Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Senior responsibility for HRs implementation and decision making Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes day-to-day responsibility for implementing HRs commitments • 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Senior manager incentives linked to HRs commitments • Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S Score 2 <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
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HRs risks integrated as part of enterprise risk system • Not Met: Provides an example Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to all workers in own operations Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to stakeholders • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes steps to communicate HRs policies to EX BPs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how HRs policies are contractual/binding for suppliers • Not Met: Requires EX BPs to cascade contractual/binding HRs policies to their BPs
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes how workers are trained on HRs policy commitments • Not Met: Trains relevant managers including security on HRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Trains BPs to meet HRs commitments • Not Met: Discloses % suppliers trained
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Monitors implementation of HRs policy commitments across global ops and EX BPs • Not Met: Discloses % of EX BP's monitored Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how workers are involved in monitoring

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 2 on 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HRs performance affects selection EX BPs • Not Met: HRs performance affects ongoing BPs relationships Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes positive HRs incentives for business relationships • Not Met: Works with EX BPs to meet HRs requirements
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how workers and communities identified and engaged in the last two years • Not Met: Discloses stakeholders whose HRs may be affected • Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes process of identifying risks in own operations • Not Met: Describes process for identifying risks in EX BPs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes global risk identification system incl. stakeholder consultation • Not Met: Describes how risk identification system is triggered by new circumstances • Not Met: Describes risks identified in relation to new circumstances
B.2.2	Assessing human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes assessment process and discloses salient HRs risks • Not Met: Describes how process applies to EX BPs • Not Met: Public disclosure of results of HRs risk assessment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Describes how assessment involved affected stakeholders
B.2.3	Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impact assessments	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes system to prevent, mitigate and remediate HRs issues • Not Met: Describes how global system applies to EX BPs • Not Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HRs issue Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Describes how stakeholders involved in decisions about actions taken
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes system for evaluation effectiveness of actions • Not Met: Example of lessons learned from evaluation effectiveness of actions Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders Score 2 <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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all workers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and workers made aware • Not Met: Describes how workers in EX BPs access grievance mechanism • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs
C.2	Grievance mechanism(s) for external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all external individuals and communities Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and affected stakeholders made aware • Not Met: Describes how external individuals/communities access grievance mechanism • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how users engaged on design and performance • Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on design and performance Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes procedure and timescales for managing complaints or concerns • Not Met: Describes technical, financial, advisory support to enable equal access Score 2 <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
C.5	Prohibition of retaliation for raising complaints or concerns	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation against workers/stakeholders • Not Met: Describes practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 <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
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Complainants not asked to waive legal rights • Not Met: Does not require confidentiality provisions Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Cooperates with state based non judicial mechanisms • Not Met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes approach taken to remedy adverse HRs impacts • Not Met: Describes how remedy would be provided if no adverse impact identified Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes changes to systems, processes and practices to prevent future impacts • 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses number of grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcomes achieved

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	and incorporating lessons learned		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Example of how lessons from mechanism improved HRs management system Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Pays living wage or sets time-bound target • Not Met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Member of EITI • Not Met: Reports of taxes and revenues beyond legal minimums Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country • Not Met: Steps taken 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Measures to prohibit violence/retaliation against workers for joining trade union: The webpage section Organization indicates it has Workers' Union Department. However, it is not clear the measures the Company puts in place to prohibit any form of intimidation, harassment, retaliation or violence against workers seeking to exercise the right to form and join a trade union of their choice (or equivalent worker bodies where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is restricted under law). [Organization_web, N/A: ceic.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses % of total direct operations covered by CB agreements • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts • Not Met: Discloses injury rate or lost days for last reporting period • Not Met: Discloses fatalities for last reporting period • Not Met: Discloses occupational disease rate for last reporting period Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Set targets for H&S performance • Not Met: Met targets or explains why not or actions to improve H&S management systems
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples' rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Process to identify/recognise indigenous rights holders • Not Met: Describes how indigenous communities are engage during assessment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to FPIC • Not Met: Recent example of obtaining FPIC or not pursuing indigenous people's land/resources

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.6	Land rights: Land acquisition (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Describes approach to identifying land tenure rights holders and negotiating compensation Score 2 • Not Met: Describes approach to compensation including valuation • Not Met: Describes steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Describes security implementation (incl. VPs or ICOC) and provides an example • Not Met: Ensures Business Partners/JVs follow security approach Score 2 • Not Met: Security and HRs assessment includes input from local communities • Not Met: Two examples of working with local communities to improve security
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Describes preventative/corrective action plans for water and sanitation risks Score 2 • Not Met: Sets targets on water stewardship that consider water use by local communities • Not Met: Reports progress in meeting targets and trends demonstrating progress
D.3.9	Women's rights (in own extractive operations, which include JVs)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Describes processes to stop harassment and violence against women • Not Met: Working conditions take into account gender issues • Not Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of employment Score 2 • 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		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 0.00 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D has been applied to produce a score of 0.00 out of 20 points for theme E.

Disclaimer

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