

**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark
2023 Company Scorecard**

Company name Exxon Mobil
Sector Extractives
Overall score 22.6 out of 100

Theme score	Out of	For theme
1.6	10	A. Governance and Policy Commitments
6.4	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
5.0	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
7.6	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
2.1	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	<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: General HRs commitment: The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: ‘ExxonMobil is steadfast in our commitment to respecting human rights as a fundamental principle in our operations’. However, this webpage is not considered suitable document for this indicator under CHRB’s revised methodology, as it is not clear it is the Company’s formal and official policy. The webpage Respecting Human Rights seems to explain the Company’s approach to human rights, which is considered one of its key socioeconomic elements, and it is not clear it is part of a policy statement approved at the highest levels of the business. In the same webpage, the Company makes reference to a Statement of Principles on Security and Human Rights, which could not be located. The 2022 Sustainability Report further explains its Sustainability Focus Areas, which include ‘Respecting Human Rights’. The webpage section Governance explains its governance focus areas and contains further information on its guidelines and policies. The webpage section Our Approach – Who We Are describes its approach to different aspects, including on ‘Investing in people’ and ‘Sustainability’. However, these webpages are not considered suitable sources for this session of the research, unless stated that the policy is posted as a website. The webpage section Code of Ethics contains different policies as well as an explanation on its Standards of Business Conduct, which states: ‘Our Standards of Business Conduct define the global ethical conduct of the Corporation and its majority-owned subsidiaries. These Standards, adopted and administered by the Board of Directors of the Corporation (Board), uphold the values of human rights, labor [...]’. However, no commitment to human rights found in the Standards of Business Conduct itself. Lastly, the webpage section Content Index indicates where to locate further information on its Respecting Human Rights approach. No publicly available policy statement committing it to respect human rights found. Commitments are expected to be placed in Company policy documents. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2022 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Universal Declaration of Human rights (UDHR): The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: ‘Our respect for the rights of our workforce and those within the communities where we operate is embedded throughout our corporate policies, practices and expectations and reflect the spirit and intent of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights’. However, ‘to reflect the spirit and intent’ is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. Moreover, only policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to UNGPs: The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: ‘Our policies and practices also incorporate elements of the 2011 U.N. Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) “Protect, Respect and Remedy” framework for the distinct but complementary roles of businesses’ and governments’ regarding human rights including commitments, due diligence and access to remedy’. As indicated above, it is not clear it is the Company’s official policy. Moreover, ‘to incorporate elements of’ is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. In addition, only formal policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. The Company has provided an additional comment to this indicator the core information was already in use. No further evidence found. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Managing socioeconomic impacts_web, 01/11/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Commitment to OECD MNE Guidelines
A.1.2.a	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: ILO Declaration on Fundamental	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 ILO core principles: The webpage section ExxonMobil Statement on Labor and the Workplace indicates: ‘ExxonMobil’s Standards of Business Conduct provide a worldwide framework for responsible operations and are consistent with the spirit and intent of the International Labour Organization 1998 Declaration Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The ILO Declaration

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	Principles and Rights at Work		<p>sets an obligation on Member States to promote and realize the following principles: Freedom of Association and effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; Elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor; Effective abolition of child labor; Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. ExxonMobil and its affiliates support these principles. The Company and its affiliates develop and implement suitable policies, procedures and practices in light of applicable laws and specific circumstances to accomplish the objectives of the ILO Declaration'. However, 'support' and 'to develop and implement suitable policies [...] in light of [...] to accomplish the objective' are not considered formal statements of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. The webpage section Respecting Human Rights adds: 'Our respect for the rights of our workforce and those within the communities where we operate is embedded throughout our corporate policies, practices and expectations and reflect the spirit and intent of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They also support the International Labour Organization 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (ILO Declaration)'. However, no publicly available policy statement committing it to respecting the human rights that the ILO has declared to be fundamental rights at work found. No further evidence found in the Standards of Business Conduct. Moreover, only policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. The Company has provided additional comments regarding its Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations, however, no Company commitment to ILO core principles found there (committing the Company itself). Moreover, it is not clear it is a formal policy statement as it indicates it is part of a report published in June 2020. [Statement on labor and the workplace (website), 03/06/2020: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles: See above. The webpage section Respecting human rights names each of the core ILO principles, however, this webpage is not considered suitable document for this indicator under CHRB's revised methodology, as it is not clear it is the Company's formal and official policy. The webpage Respecting Human Rights seems to explain the Company's approach to human rights, which is considered one of its key socioeconomic elements, and it is not clear it is part of a policy statement approved at the highest levels of the business. The Standards of Business Conduct document indicates: 'Individuals will not be subjected to harassment, intimidation, discrimination, or retaliation for exercising any of the rights protected by this policy and the various EEO statutes'. The webpage section ExxonMobil Statement on Labor and the Workplace adds: 'The ILO Declaration sets an obligation on Member States to promote and realize the following principles: Freedom of Association and effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, Elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor, Effective abolition of child labor, Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. ExxonMobil and its affiliates support these principles'. Regarding the right to Freedom of association and right to collective bargaining it notes: 'ExxonMobil recognizes and respects its employees' right to join associations and choose representative organizations for the purpose of engaging in collective bargaining in a manner consistent with applicable laws, rules and regulations as well as local customs as appropriate'. However, it is not clear whether it is committed to respect these rights in all contexts and locations (i.e. alternative mechanisms for those countries where there are legal restrictions to the exercise of these rights), as the Company indicates that it respects these rights should be 'in a manner consistent with applicable laws, rules and regulations as well as local customs as appropriate'. Moreover, it is not clear this webpage is a formal policy statement, as it indicates it is part of a report published in June 2020. Commitments are expected to be placed in Company policy documents. The Company has provided an additional comment to this indicator but core evidence was already in use. [Statement on labor and the workplace (website), 03/06/2020: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Standards of Business Conduct, 12/10/2017: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO core principles: The ExxonMobil Supplier Vendor and Contractor Expectations indicates: 'ExxonMobil expects its suppliers, vendors and contractors to: [...] conduct operations and business practices in a manner consistent with the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of the 1998 International Labour Organization (ILO) Declaration'. However, 'consistent with' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. The Company has provided an additional comment to this indicator but core evidence was already in use. [Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations, 20/12/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles for BPs/JVs: The ExxonMobil Supplier Vendor and Contractor Expectations indicates: 'ExxonMobil expects its suppliers, vendors and contractors to: [...] conduct operations and business practices in a manner consistent with the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of the 1998 International Labour Organization (ILO) Declaration, including the elimination of child labor, forced labor, workplace discrimination, and recognition of freedom association'. However, no reference to collective bargaining found. The webpage section Sustainable Procurement indicates: 'Our Statement on Labor and the Workplace articulates our support of the principles of the International Labor Organization (ILO) 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles on Rights at Work, namely the elimination of child labor, forced labor and workplace discrimination, the recognition of the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining and a safe and healthy workplace'. However, no commitment to respect those rights found as the webpage seems to be only naming them. Moreover, only policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations, 20/12/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.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 Standards of Business Conduct contains the Company's Health Policy, which includes: 'It is Exxon Mobil Corporation's policy to: identify and evaluate health risks related to its operations that potentially affect its employees, contractors or the public; implement programs and appropriate protective measures to control such risks, including appropriate monitoring of its potentially affected employees; [...]' . It also has the Safety Policy, which declares: 'It is Exxon Mobil Corporation's policy to conduct its business in a manner that protects the safety of employees, others involved in its operations, customers, and the public. The Corporation will strive to prevent all accidents, injuries, and occupational illnesses through the active participation of every employee. The Corporation is committed to continuous efforts to identify and eliminate or manage safety risks associated with its activities'. [Standards of Business Conduct, 12/10/2017: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Commitment to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to H&S of workers: The ExxonMobil Supplier Vendor and Contractor Expectations indicates it expects its 'suppliers, vendors and contractors to: [...] apply continuous efforts to improve safety, security, health and environmental performance and foster appropriate operating practices and training'. [Supplier, vendor and contractor expectations, 20/12/2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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	<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 webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'Our socioeconomic management practices support our integrated approach to respecting human rights and include elements such as [...] land use, resettlement and livelihood restoration'. The Company has provided additional an source referring to this subindicator, a webpage where it explain its land use and resettlement practices. 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 (VGGT) to recognize the importance of communities' right to access to land and other natural resources. Commitments are expected to be placed in formal policy documents. Moreover, only commitments placed in formal policy statements are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Land use, resettlement and livelihood restoration_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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: The webpage section Indigenous Peoples notes: 'Our interactions with Indigenous peoples around the world are consistent with the goals of the following frameworks: International Labor Organization Convention 169 Concerning

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. [...] ExxonMobil is committed to conducting meaningful consultations with Indigenous peoples'. However, 'to have interactions consistent with the goals' is not considered a formal statement of commitment to the ILO 169 convention according to CHRB wording criteria. The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'Our socioeconomic management practices support our integrated approach to respecting human rights and include elements such as [...] Indigenous peoples'. However, no policy statement found committing it respecting indigenous peoples' rights or references the relevant part of the ILO Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples No.169 or of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Moreover, only policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Indigenous peoples_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to obtain FPIC or zero tolerance to land grabbing: The webpage section Indigenous Peoples notes: 'ExxonMobil is committed to conducting meaningful consultations with Indigenous peoples, incorporating traditional knowledge and land use information into our plans and promoting community engagement programs that respect traditions and cultures. Meaningful engagement is a key aspect of Free, Prior and Informed Consent, a specific right that pertains to Indigenous peoples and is recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples'. However, although the Company indicates that FPIC is a right recognised by the UN, no publicly available policy statement committing it to respecting ownership/use of land and natural resources which also includes a commitment to obtain the free prior and informed consent (FPIC) from indigenous peoples and local communities for transaction(s) involving land and natural resources found. Alternatively, the Company could commit to a zero tolerance for land grabbing. [Indigenous peoples_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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)	0.5	<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 webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'Since 2002, ExxonMobil has been a member of the Voluntary Principles Initiative (VPI), a multi-stakeholder effort supporting the implementation of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPSHR)'. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Uses only ICoCA members as security providers • 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 webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'These standard security services contract provisions require contractors to monitor, report and investigate credible allegations of human rights abuses. Contractors are required to immediately remove any of their personnel accused of violating human rights'. It is not clear the Company expects extractive business partners to commit to the VPSHR, evidence has to be found in a formal policy document. Moreover, it is not clear the Company expects extractive business partners to commit to respect international humanitarian law (IHL). [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.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 webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'ExxonMobil identifies, assesses and manages human rights risks and opportunities through practices that support due diligence and access to remedy. We have three focus areas: communities and people; security; and workforce and supply chain'. However, no evidence found of a direct commitment to remedy from the Company. In addition, this webpage seems to be part of what is considered key socioeconomic elements, which are eight, human rights included, and it is not clear it is part of a formal policy approved by the board. Only commitments placed in formal policy statements are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. The Company has provided additional comments on this subindicator regarding its Community

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			engagement and grievance management. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Community Grievance Mechanism_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The webpage section Board Leadership notes: 'The Board engages with both internal and external experts on issues of importance to the company. [...] The independent lead director's responsibilities include engaging with shareholders, as appropriate, including on environment, social and governance (ESG) topics. The Board's Environment, Safety and Public Policy Committee oversees operational risks associated with safety, security, health and environmental performance including actions taken to address [...] and community engagement'. The 2021 Sustainability Report adds: 'ExxonMobil has defined 14 Focus Areas to accelerate our sustainability progress. In developing these Focus Areas, we considered and analyzed our environmental and social impacts, business strategies and internal and external stakeholders'. It includes 'respecting human rights'. The webpage section Board Leadership notes: 'Stewardship of sustainability-related activities to the Chairman and Management Committee occurs quarterly'. The Chairman is a Board member. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Board leadership_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes HRs expertise of Board member • Not Met: Board member/CEO signal importance of HRs in their communications
A.2.2	Board responsibility	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Process to review HRs strategy at board level: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates that 'ExxonMobil has defined 14 Focus Areas to accelerate our sustainability progress'. It includes 'respecting human rights'. The webpage section Board Leadership notes: 'Stewardship of sustainability-related activities to the Chairman and Management Committee occurs quarterly'. The Chairman refers to the Chairman of the Board. The 2023 Proxy Statement indicates: 'The full Board of Directors provides oversight of key risks to ExxonMobil's business. The Board throughout the year participates in reviews with management on the Company's business, including identified risk factors. [...] The Board, including the Environment, Safety and Public Policy Committee, periodically visits an ExxonMobil operations site. These visits enable the directors to observe and provide input on safety, operating practices, environmental performance, technology, products, industry and corporate standards, and community engagement'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Proxy Statement 2022, 07/04/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Example of HRs issues/trends discussed in last reporting period • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Describes how affected stakeholders / HRs experts inform board discussions: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates that 'The Board engages with both internal and external experts on issues of importance to the company. [...] The independent lead director's responsibilities include engaging with shareholders, as appropriate, including on environment, social and governance (ESG) topics. The Board's Environment, Safety and Public Policy Committee oversees operational risks associated with safety, security, health and environmental performance including actions taken to address climate-related risks, lobbying activities and expenditures, and community engagement. The Board, including the Environment, Safety and Public Policy Committee, visits an

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			ExxonMobil site regularly. These visits enable directors to observe and provide input on safety, operating practices, environmental performance, technology, products, industry and corporate standards and community engagement'. However, no description found of how the experiences of affected stakeholders or external human rights experts informed board discussions on human rights. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: At least one board member incentive linked to HRs commitments: The CEO compensation program include: 'maintained best-ever safety performance'. Regarding the 2021 highlighting performance, the 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Best-ever Lost Time Incident Rate of 0.02 per 200,000 work hours'. The CEO is a Board member. [Proxy Statement 2022, 07/04/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S: Although the CEO has an incentive based on safety performance, it is not clear whether it includes health and safety of local communities and workers of extractives business partners. <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 2021 Sustainability Report notes that 'The ExxonMobil Management Committee provides ongoing oversight of sustainability with the business lines and functions, including regular assessments of strategic risks, safeguards and mitigation plans. Each year, the business lines coordinate with ExxonMobil's Global Operations and Sustainability organization to present sustainability-related goals, plans and progress. [...] Stewardship of sustainability-related activities to the Chairman and Management Committee occurs quarterly. [...] The independent lead director's responsibilities include engaging with shareholders, as appropriate, including on environment, social and governance (ESG) topics'. The Chairman is both a Board and a Management Committee member. It also explains the Board engagement on sustainability topics. The 2023 Proxy Statement indicates: 'The Board oversees a broad spectrum of interrelated risks with assistance from its committees. This integrated risk management approach facilitates recognition and oversight of important risk interdependencies. [...] Environment, Safety and Public Policy Committee oversees operational risks such as those relating to employee and community safety, health, environmental performance, including actions taken to address climate-related risks, and security matters. The Committee also reviews and provides advice on objectives, policies, and programs related to lobbying activities and political and other contributions'. However, no description found of 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. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2023 Proxy Statement, 2023: d1io3yog0oux5.cloudfront.net] • Not Met: Describes frequency and triggers for reviewing business model: The report also indicates that 'Stewardship of sustainability related activities to the Chairman and Management Committee occurs quarterly'. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator regarding its risk assessment and materiality analysis. However, this subindicator looks for a description of the frequency of and triggers for reviewing its business model or strategy and potential impacts on human rights. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <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	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: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Met: Senior responsibility for HRs implementation and decision making: The Company indicates that 'ExxonMobil has defined 14 Focus Areas to accelerate our sustainability progress. In developing these Focus Areas, we considered and analyzed our environmental and social impacts, business strategies and internal and external stakeholders'. It includes 'respecting human rights'. It also states that 'The Global Operations and Sustainability Vice President collaborates with Corporate Strategic Planning and the business lines to develop sustainability-related goals and supports the integration of those goals into operating plans. [...] Within Global Operations and Sustainability, the Sustainability Director manages the focus areas'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes day-to-day responsibility for implementing HRs commitments: As indicated above, 'The Global Operations and Sustainability Vice President collaborates with Corporate Strategic Planning and the business lines to develop sustainability-related goals and supports the integration of those goals into operating plans. [...] Within Global Operations and Sustainability, the Sustainability Director manages the focus areas and subject matter experts are responsible for identifying opportunities'. It adds: [...] We have built an organizational and governance structure around our Focus Areas to ensure top-to-bottom and bottom-to-top alignment. Our objectives and strategies ensure a consistent approach across the company while empowering our business lines to take action and advance our sustainability priorities'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own operations: See above. Although the Company indicates it has 'subject matter experts are responsible for identifying opportunities', no description found of how it allocates resources and expertise for the day-to-day management of relevant human rights issues within its own operations. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Resources and expertise allocation with EX BPs: The webpage section Our global supply chain indicates: 'ExxonMobil is committed to promoting inclusive sourcing, respecting human rights and working to minimize impacts to the environment in our supply chain. We seek to work with suppliers that share our commitment. [...] To integrate sustainability into our practices, ExxonMobil leverages existing stewardship and purchasing processes and systems. Plans and initiatives are reviewed to identify opportunities related to inclusive sourcing and environmental performance as well as to identify potential human rights impacts within category families. Objectives are established annually'. The Company has provided an additional source. However, no description found of how it allocates resources and expertise for the day-to-day management of relevant human rights issues within its business partners. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Our Approach, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com]
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Senior manager incentives linked to HRs commitments: The 2022 Proxy statement details compensation of Executive Directors. Mr. Williams, senior vice president, provided strategic and executive oversight to: ' [...] beat prior year best-ever Downstream Total Recordable Incident Rate (TRIR) safety performance since 2006. [...] In acknowledgement of these achievements, the Committee approved total direct compensation of \$9.7 million'. [Proxy Statement 2022, 07/04/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S: Although the Mr. Williams has an incentive for safety performance, it is not clear whether it includes health and safety of local communities and workers of extractives business partners. The Company has provided an additional source, expanding on its Sustainable Governance and on the role of the Environment, Safety and Public Policy Committee. [Governance_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Our risk management approach_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public: The webpage section Executive Compensation indicates: ‘The executive compensation program is designed to incentivize long-term, sustainable decision-making. Key design features include performance shares with long vesting periods and compensation that is strongly tied to the company’s performance’. The 2023 Proxy Statement discloses its Long-Term Strategic Objectives, including: ‘Operations Performance Deliver industry-leading performance in safety [...]’. The Deliver industry-leading performance for the strategic object ‘Safety’ is: ‘Maintained industry-leading personnel safety performance; Sustained decreasing trend in Tier 1 process safety events’. However, the criteria linking the senior managers’ remuneration to the Company’s human rights performance was not found. The Company is expected to provide percentages of remuneration linked to incentives. [2023 Proxy Statement, 2023: d1io3yog0oux5.cloudfront.net] & [Executive compensation_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Review of other senior management incentives for coherence with HRs policies
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk 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: HRs risks integrated as part of enterprise risk system: Regarding its risk factors, the 2021 Form 10-K indicates: ‘ExxonMobil’s financial and operating results are subject to a variety of risks inherent in the global oil, gas, and petrochemical businesses, and the pursuit of lower-emission business opportunities. Many of these risk factors are not within the company’s control and could adversely affect our business, our financial and operating results, or our financial condition. These risk factors include: [...] Safety [...]. Our results depend on management’s ability to minimize the inherent risks of oil, gas, and petrochemical operations, to control effectively our business activities, and to minimize the potential for human error’. The Operations Integrity Management System Brochure indicates: ‘ExxonMobil’s OIMS [Operations Integrity Management System] Framework establishes common worldwide expectations to address the risks inherent to our business. ExxonMobil uses the term Operations Integrity (OI) to address all aspects of its business impacting personnel and process safety, security, health and environmental performance. [...] Application of the OIMS Framework is required across the entire ExxonMobil enterprise, with a specific emphasis on design, construction and operations. [...] Senior managers and business unit managers ensure there is a systematic, layered approach to effectively manage high consequence risks’. However, it is not clear how the ERM integrates human rights beyond safety-related aspects. [Form 10-K 2021, 2022: ir.exxonmobil.com] & [Operations Integrity Management System Brochure, 08/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Provides an example: The 2021 Form 10-K also adds: ‘We apply rigorous management systems and continuous focus on workplace safety and avoiding spills or other adverse environmental events. For example, we work to minimize spills through a combined program of effective operations integrity management, ongoing upgrades, key equipment replacements, and comprehensive inspection and surveillance. Similarly, we are implementing cost-effective new technologies and adopting new operating practices to reduce air emissions, not only in response to government requirements but also to address community priorities. We employ a comprehensive enterprise risk management system to identify and manage risk across our businesses. We also maintain a disciplined framework of internal controls and apply a controls management system for monitoring compliance with this framework. Substantial liabilities and other adverse impacts could result if we do not timely identify and mitigate applicable risks, or if our management systems and controls do not function as intended’. The 2020 PNG LNG ESG Annual Report expands on how the Company implements its OIMS at EMPNG [ExxonMobil PNG Limited – a subsidiary in Papua New Guinea]. The 2022 PNG LNG ESG Annual Report explains how it manages and mitigates environmental and social impacts in Papua New Guinea: ‘To manage and mitigate PNG LNG-related environmental, social, community health, safety and security impacts, and to meet PNG LNG’s obligations under Papua New Guinean legislative and regulatory requirements, EMPNG operates in accordance with the Production ESMP. The Production ESMP was developed following extensive consultation with stakeholders. It contains environmental and social management and mitigation measures, as well as monitoring requirements that were determined as part of the PNG LNG Environmental Impact Statement, along with lessons learned from the Project’s construction phase. It also incorporates OIMS requirements, the International Finance Corporation Performance Standards, and other international standards such as the Equator Principles. The Production ESMP consists of three

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Environmental Management Plans (EMPs), [...] which cover all PNG LNG facilities. An additional seven Social Management Plans (SMPs) are based on key social themes. National content commitments are contained within each of the SMPs. EMPNG is accountable for implementing actions defined in the ESMP. Production ESMP requirements apply during normal operating conditions and in reasonably foreseeable abnormal operating conditions or emergency situations'. However, it is not clear how the ERM integrates human rights beyond safety-related aspects. [Form 10-K 2021, 2022: ir.exxonmobil.com] & [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com]</p> <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	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: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to all workers in own operations: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Employees are introduced to the Standards of Business Conduct, which include ExxonMobil's foundation policies, upon commencement of employment. During employment, employees are reminded of the Standards of Business Conduct annually. Business practices training is required for employees every four years. This includes training on select foundation policies such as Ethics, as well as complaint procedures and open-door communication. Our wholly owned and majority-owned subsidiaries generally adopt policies similar to our foundation policies and provide similar training'. However, although the Standards of Business Conduct contains its health; harassment; and safety policies, it does not contain the Company's general Human Rights commitments. The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'Human rights awareness training is available to all employees to build an understanding of human rights issues and an awareness of potential human rights risks. Human rights is also included as a core element of our two-day Socioeconomic Management training course offered in an instructor-led training environment'. However, although training is 'available', it is not clear that all workers receive it or that it's mandatory. Also, it is not clear the scope (employees that receive it) of Socioeconomic Management training. The Code of Ethics adds: 'Employees receive training on our ethics policy every four years through business practices reviews, including a detailed review of our Standards of Business Conduct, implementation guidelines and procedures, and the Corporation's antitrust, anti-corruption, and international operations policies'. However, as indicated previously, neither the Ethics Policy nor the Standards of Business Conduct contain the Company's human rights commitments. It continuous: 'Employees in relevant job functions receive computer-based and in-person training on antitrust, anti-corruption, anti-boycott, trade sanctions and export controls'. However, no description found on how it proactively communicates its human rights policy commitment to all its workers, including in local languages where necessary. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to stakeholders: The Company has provided an additional comment to this indicator but no material evidence was found. • 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	<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: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes steps to communicate HRs policies to EX BPs: The webpage section Our Global Supply chain indicates: 'We annually reiterate our expectations of suppliers, including on human rights, through a Year End Supplier Letter. This letter highlights that suppliers are expected to conduct business in compliance with standards similar to the Standards of Business Conduct and that compliance with all applicable laws is a fundamental expectation'. However, it is not clear how the Company communicates its human rights commitments and requirements to its business partners as the Standards of Business Conduct does not seem to contain the Company's human rights expectations. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how HRs policies are contractual/binding for suppliers: The webpage section Our Global Supply Chain indicates: 'The standard terms and conditions used by the Procurement function oblige suppliers to: Adhere to all applicable laws and regulations, including those related to employment, safety, security, health and the environment. Impose similar terms and conditions on their

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>subcontractors. Permit audits and allow access to office and work locations, documentation and personnel’. However, it seems to focus on applicable laws and regulations rather than on its human rights commitments. The Company is expected to describe how its human rights policy commitments are reflected within contractual or other binding arrangements with its business partners. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Requires EX BPs to cascade contractual/binding HRs policies to their BPs: The webpage section Our Global Supply Chain indicates: ‘The standard terms and conditions used by the Procurement function oblige suppliers to: Adhere to all applicable laws and regulations, including those related to employment, safety, security, health and the environment. Impose similar terms and conditions on their subcontractors. Permit audits and allow access to office and work locations, documentation and personnel. [...] Purchases arranged by our global procurement organization include contract language that requires adherence to all applicable laws and regulations. Furthermore, requests for quotations issued by our procurement staff typically include clauses relating to the prohibition of forced or child labor and the payment of wages in accordance with local laws. Participants in such tenders are required to adhere to those requirements’. However, the Company seems to the focusing of applicable and local law. In order to meet the requirement of this subindicator, the Company is expected to demonstrate it requires business partners to cascade the contractual or other binding [human rights] requirements down their supply chain. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes how workers are trained on HRs policy commitments: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: ‘Employees are introduced to the Standards of Business Conduct, which include ExxonMobil’s foundation policies, upon commencement of employment. During employment, employees are reminded of the Standards of Business Conduct annually’. However, although the Standards of Business Conduct contains its health; harassment; and safety policies, it does not contain the Company’s general Human Rights policy. It adds: ‘Over the past several years, we have provided the following training to reinforce our respect for human rights: Since 2016, we have supported the development and delivery of training on the goals of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights for more than 40,000 security service providers and members of government security forces. Since 2016, more than 700 procurement employees have received training tailored to procurement professionals to help improve their understanding of human rights in the supply chain. Over the past several years, computer-based human rights awareness training has been available to company employees, including professionals in the Procurement function, to improve their understanding of human rights issues and awareness of potential human rights risks’. The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: ‘Human rights awareness training is available to all employees to build an understanding of human rights issues and an awareness of potential human rights risks. Human rights is also included as a core element of our two-day Socioeconomic Management training course offered in an instructor-led training environment’. The 2021 Sustainability Report has similar information. However, although Human Rights training is available, it is not clear the Company proactively conducts or if training is received at workers’ discretion. Also, it is not clear the scope in terms of employees trained of the Socioeconomic Management training course. The Code of Ethics adds: ‘Employees receive training on our ethics policy every four years through business practices reviews, including a detailed review of our Standards of Business Conduct, implementation guidelines and procedures, and the Corporation’s antitrust, anti-corruption, and international operations policies. These general training sessions, in addition to more comprehensive training given to relevant functions on a more frequent basis, are a condition of employment at ExxonMobil’. However, as indicated previously, neither the Ethics Policy nor the Standards of Business Conduct contain the Company’s human rights commitments. It continuous: ‘Employees in relevant job functions receive computer-based and in-person training on antitrust, anti-corruption, anti-boycott, trade sanctions and export controls’. However, no description found of how its workers are trained on its human rights policy commitment. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Trains relevant managers including security on HRs: See above. The 2021 Sustainability Report notes: ‘Our standard security services contracts include provisions, where appropriate, requiring training for security personnel on

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>expectation'. It adds: 'Since 2016, we have supported the development and delivery of training on the goals of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights for more than 40,000 security service providers and members of government security forces'. The webpage section Respecting Human Rights notes: 'We help train security providers on the goals of the VPSHR and provide targeted training for ExxonMobil personnel in global affiliates where host government security forces are engaged. The training focuses on our expectations for host government security deployment, including identification of the risks of security-related human rights impacts in communities'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <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: The webpage section Our global supply chain indicates that 'We purchase goods and services from local suppliers and build their capabilities through training programs. This approach creates competitive advantage for ExxonMobil through access to qualified and reliable local suppliers. It also helps in building long-term, local economic capacity, strengthening our relationships as a valued community member and supporting the objectives of the related U.N. SDGs'. However, no further description of this training found, it is not clear the training contains Human Rights contents. The webpage section Respecting Human Rights notes: 'We help train security providers on the goals of the VPSHR and provide targeted training for ExxonMobil personnel in global affiliates where host government security forces are engaged. The training focuses on our expectations for host government security deployment, including identification of the risks of security-related human rights impacts in communities'. However, the Company is expected to provide a description of training it provides to suppliers to help them meet its human rights policy commitment beyond security providers. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Discloses % suppliers trained
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: The webpage section Management systems, standards and controls indicates: 'we launched a top-to-bottom review of our operations and then implemented a system that today guides every operating decision we make on a daily basis. That system is called OIMS (Operations Integrity Management System). It consists of 11 separate elements that measure and mitigate safety, security, health and environmental risk to people, the environment and the communities in which we operate. [...] OIMS provides a systematic, structured, and disciplined approach to measure progress and track accountability for safety, security, health and environmental performance across business lines, facilities and projects. [...] Our OIMS establishes expectations that apply across all our operations to address risks inherent to our business, including environmental risks. The OIMS framework contains 11 elements related to leadership, operations and maintenance, community relations, emergency response, incident investigation and information and documentation, among others. It also provides protocols and guidance for mitigating risk. ExxonMobil monitors the performance of joint ventures and company assets operated by others against OIMS expectations and encourages them to consider improvements, as appropriate. Each element of OIMS contains overarching objectives and expectations. The OIMS framework also includes the characteristics of and processes for implementation'. It discloses each of the 11 elements. The 2021 UK Slavery and human trafficking statement adds: 'The Operations Integrity Management System under which the Company operates its business plays a role in managing ongoing risks in the area of human rights'. The Company has provided further information on its OIMS, in special on 'Assessing and driving effectiveness'. However, no further description of how the OIMS works found. [Management systems, standards and controls_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2021 UK Slavery and human trafficking statement, 07/09/2022: exxonmobil.co.uk] • Not Met: Discloses % of EX BP's monitored • Not Met: Describes how workers are involved in monitoring <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes corrective actions process: See above. The webpage section Management systems, standards and controls indicates: ‘ExxonMobil monitors the performance of joint ventures and company assets operated by others against OIMS expectations and encourages them to consider improvements, as appropriate’. The Operations Integrity Management System Brochure adds that in the case of incidents: ‘Development of interim and long-term corrective actions to prevent similar incidents from occurring, with a focus on the root cause of the incident and on the identification of high-impact risk reduction recommendations. [...] Agreed-upon corrective actions are prioritized, implemented and stewarded to closure. Backlogs are managed to ensure corrective action selection, prioritization and implementation processes are effective. A process is in place that ensures these actions remain effective’. [Management systems, standards and controls_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Operations Integrity Management System Brochure, 08/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Discloses findings and number of correction action processes
B.1.7	Engaging and terminating business relationships	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HRs performance affects selection EX BPs: The webpage section Our global supply chain indicates that 'Not only do we review a potential supplier’s operational, technical and financial performance, but we also perform compliance due diligence. We screen potential suppliers across compliance areas such as [...] human trafficking using third-party information. [...] Our due diligence process for identifying and assessing human rights risks focuses on three factors: supplier, commodity and location. Additional due diligence is applied when procuring goods and services that utilize a significant amount of low-skilled, physical labor in a country ranked in the lower tiers(i.e., 2 Watch, 3 or Special Case) of the Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report published by the U.S. Department of State. If a potential higher risk is identified, then the potential suppliers complete a questionnaire prior to contract award to assess whether they have the policies or practices in place to address such risks and we review and assess the responses prior to continuing with the contracting process. [...] In addition, standard requests for quotations highlight ExxonMobil’s expectation that the supplier shall: Comply with all applicable laws prohibiting the utilization of forced or compulsory labor. Provide its employees with working conditions, including payment of wages and benefits, which comply with all applicable laws. Hire only employees who meet the legal employment age requirements in the country of employment’. It explains the standard terms and conditions suppliers are obliged to comply with. However, although the Company has an onboarding policy that takes human trafficking into account, and it indicates that potential higher risk is identified have to complete a questionnaire, it is not clear how human rights performance [beyond human trafficking] is taken into account in the identification of potential business relationships. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: HRs performance affects ongoing BPs relationships: The webpage section Our global supply chain indicates that 'ExxonMobil audits a select number of suppliers each year for contract compliance, such as related to pricing, safety, drug and alcohol policy compliance, invoicing and travel expenses. A supplier’s contract may be subject to termination if the supplier is not meeting our expectations’. However, it is not clear how human rights performance is taken into account in the in decisions to renew, expand or terminate business relationships, including business partners. This subindicator looks for evidence of how, once they are already working for the Company, their human rights performance affects their relationship. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.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 webpage section Respecting Human Rights notes: ‘We help train security providers on the goals of the VPSHR and provide targeted training for ExxonMobil personnel in global affiliates where host government security forces are engaged. The training focuses on our expectations for host government security deployment, including identification of the risks of security-related human rights impacts in communities’. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with affected stakeholders	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: Describes how workers and communities identified and engaged in the last two years: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: ‘We interact with these groups [stakeholders] through community meetings, digital and social media,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>corporate publications and one-on-one discussions. Open dialogue enables us to hear concerns, discuss approaches and share plans. Across a range of stakeholder groups, including communities, non-governmental organizations, employees and shareholders, we continue to see broad interest in our impact on the communities we serve'. As for community engagement, it notes: 'We consult with local groups and individuals regularly and we seek to have our stakeholders effectively represented as community concerns are discussed and decisions are made. Our engagement process is tailored to local communities to help provide effective, accessible and culturally appropriate channels for exchanging information and proactively identifying issues or concerns. Examples of activities in our engagement process include open houses, community gatherings and individual meetings. [...]' Our ongoing community engagement includes a grievance-management process that provides a diverse set of platforms for individuals or communities to raise concerns. They include direct, in-person and electronic engagement and the use of third-party proxies such as civil society organizations and nongovernmental associations'. The 2022 ESG Sustainability Report explains: 'EMPNG's [ExxonMobil PNG Limited – a subsidiary] National Content Strategy is based on creating shared, long-term value for its many stakeholders. This is why the company is committed to actively and regularly engaging with community stakeholders, all levels of government and civil society organisations'. It notes that 'During 2022, some 12,310 engagements were conducted with communities throughout the PNG LNG [Papua New Guinea Liquefied Natural Gas] area of operations. Of these, 3390 were formal engagements and 8920 were informal engagements involving 49,900 stakeholders'. However, although the Company indicates that there has been recent engagement in one of its subsidiaries, it is not clear whether these engagements were in the context of human/labor rights or include issues related to these topics. Moreover, it is not clear the process by which it identifies the stakeholders with whom to engage, particularly in relation to human rights. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses stakeholders whose HRs may be affected • Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders: The 2022 ESG Sustainability Report explains: 'During 2022, some 12,310 engagements were conducted with communities throughout the PNG LNG [Papua New Guinea Liquefied Natural Gas] area of operations. Of these, 3390 were formal engagements and 8920 were informal engagements involving 49,900 stakeholders'. However, it is not clear whether these engagements were in the context of human/labor rights or include issues related to these topics. The Company provides additional comments on this subindicator where it points out at different types of engagement, including: engagement regarding recycling and engagement with students. The Company is expected to provide at least two examples of its engagement with stakeholders whose human rights have been or may be affected by its activities (or their legitimate representatives or multi-stakeholder initiatives) in the last two years. [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com] & [Exxon News, 30/03/2023: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <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: As for the results of engagements, the 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'By integrating the results of these discussions into our decisions, we can help avoid or reduce potential impacts on communities, enhance benefits, support effective investments, avoid delays and resolve issues at the local level'. However, it is not clear how affected stakeholders' views have influenced the development or monitoring of its human rights approach. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

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	<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 Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'ExxonMobil identifies, assesses and manages human rights risks and opportunities through practices that support due diligence and access to remedy. We have three focus areas: communities and people; security; and workforce and supply chain. [...] Our practices support early identification and assessment of potential human rights impacts, along with other socioeconomic impacts and opportunities associated with our activities. [...] As part of our Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment and Management process we conduct initial country assessments that include early identification of qualitative human rights risks. We also apply a human rights risk screening tool to support our analysis of these potential risks at country, project and operations levels, incorporating elements aligned with key global human rights principles'. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Describes process for identifying risks in EX BPs: As indicated above, the process includes de supply chain (business partners). [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes global risk identification system incl. stakeholder consultation: As indicated above, 'Our socioeconomic management practices are guided by our corporate Environmental Aspects Guide (EAG) and are consistent with our Environment Policy and Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS)'. Moreover, the 2021 Sustainability Report notes: 'We use core processes to systematically identify, assess, manage and monitor environmental and socioeconomic risks and opportunities throughout the life cycles of our assets including: [...] Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment. Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Management Plans. We engage with local communities and stakeholders to incorporate feedback, scientific understanding and other due diligence into these processes to enable safe and responsible operations. We periodically update these assessments to reflect any changes to operational complexity or socioeconomic sensitivities, amending management plans where needed'. However, it is not clear the Company has a global system to identify Human Rights risks and impacts that involves consultation with internal or independent external human rights experts. The webpage section Respecting Human Rights adds: 'As part of our Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment and Management process we conduct initial country assessments that include early identification of qualitative human rights risks'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Describes how risk identification system is triggered by new circumstances: The 2021 Sustainability Report notes: 'We typically perform an Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment for major capital projects. We use our Environmental Aspects Guide to identify and evaluate environmental and socioeconomic risks and impacts throughout the life of each asset or project. [...] We use core processes to systematically identify, assess, manage and monitor environmental and socioeconomic risks and opportunities throughout the life cycles of our assets including [...]. We engage with local communities and stakeholders to incorporate feedback, scientific understanding and other due diligence into these processes to enable safe and responsible operations. We periodically update these assessments to reflect any changes to operational complexity or socioeconomic sensitivities, amending management plans where needed'. The Environmental Aspects Guide provides further information on Environmental Aspects Assessment. However, no description found of how its process to identify human rights risks and impacts are triggered by new country operations, relationships, new human rights challenges or conflict affecting particular locations. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Sustainability Management - Environmental Aspects Guide, 2019: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Describes risks identified in relation to new circumstances
B.2.2	Assessing human rights risks and impacts	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes assessment process and discloses salient HRs risks: The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'ExxonMobil identifies, assesses and manages human rights risks and opportunities through practices that support due

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>diligence and access to remedy. We have three focus areas: communities and people; security; and workforce and supply chain. [...] Our practices support early identification and assessment of potential human rights impacts, along with other socioeconomic impacts and opportunities associated with our activities. [...] As part of our Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment and Management process we conduct initial country assessments that include early identification of qualitative human rights risks. We also apply a human rights risk screening tool to support our analysis of these potential risks at country, project and operations levels, incorporating elements aligned with key global human rights principles. Our socioeconomic management practices are guided by our corporate Environmental Aspects Guide (EAG) and are consistent with our Environment Policy and Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS)'. It adds: 'As part of our Environmental, Socioeconomic and Health Impact Assessment and Management process we conduct initial country assessments that include early identification of qualitative human rights risks'. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes how process applies to EX BPs: As indicated above, it also includes the Company's supply chain. Extractive partners are assumed among them. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Public disclosure of results of HRs risk assessment <p>Score 2</p> <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	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: Describes system to prevent, mitigate and remediate HRs issues: The webpage section Management systems, standards and controls indicates: 'we launched a top-to-bottom review of our operations and then implemented a system that today guides every operating decision we make on a daily basis. That system is called OIMS (Operations Integrity Management System). [...] The OIMS framework contains 11 elements related to leadership, operations and maintenance, community relations, emergency response, incident investigation and information and documentation, among others. It also provides protocols and guidance for mitigating risk'. The 2021 UK Slavery and human trafficking statement adds: 'The Operations Integrity Management System under which the Company operates its business plays a role in managing ongoing risks in the area of human rights'. However, no description found on how the system works to develop action plans to mitigate human rights salient issues. [2021 UK Slavery and human trafficking statement, 07/09/2022: exxonmobil.co.uk] & [Management systems, standards and controls_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Describes how global system applies to EX BPs: See above. 'ExxonMobil monitors the performance of joint ventures and company assets operated by others against OIMS expectations and encourages them to consider improvements, as appropriate'. However, it is not clear that protocols and guidance for mitigating risk and impacts, including extractive business partners. [Management systems, standards and controls_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HRs issue: The 2020 ESG Annual Report indicates: 'A pre-construction survey was conducted along the Hides Spine in 2020 to assess households at risk of landslips. During the survey, 17 gardens associated with three households were identified as being located within the Hides Spine exclusion zone. The exclusion zone was determined during routine inspections along the pipeline ROW, which found the potential for landslips at certain locations of the Hides Spine. While no immediate safety risks have been identified, if a landslip occurred it could impact nearby communities. The Hides Spine exclusion zone consists of five areas, four of which are outside the PNG LNG area of operations, and are used primarily for gardens. During 2020, the 17 garden owners identified within the exclusion zone were asked to relocate for safety reasons. Compensation payments will be made to these garden owners in 2021'. [Environmental and Social Report 2020, 2021: pnglng.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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: The Company provides comments on an engagement with Indigenous Peoples in Cold Lake, Alberta. However, the Company is expected to describe its system of how it involves affected stakeholders in the in decisions about the actions to take in response to its salient human rights issues rather than a single example of engagement. No further evidence found.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes system for evaluation effectiveness of actions: The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'To monitor our effectiveness, we have processes to track performance across the specific areas associated with communities and people, security, workforce and suppliers. Additionally, through monitoring and evaluation of feedback, as well as grievance mechanisms and emerging trends at our project and operating sites, we are able to develop or enhance associated management plans and incorporate learnings into our training programs'. However, no further details found, including the process to track performance. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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	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: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders: The Company provides data on ExxonMobil PNG Limited community grievance mechanism. However, this indicator looks for two examples demonstrating how it communicates with affected stakeholders regarding specific human rights impacts raised by them or on their behalf. It focuses on how the Companies ensure meaningful information reaches affected stakeholders, how it responds, in communication terms, to issues raised by stakeholders and about their access to those communications. No further evidence found. [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.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	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: Grievance mechanism accessible to all workers: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'ExxonMobil encourages employees and contractors to ask questions and voice concerns, and we insist on the reporting of any alleged violations of company policies. In addition to our open-door communication procedures, we have several confidential mechanisms for reporting'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and workers made aware: The Code of Ethics indicates: 'Employees receive training on our ethics policy every four years through business practices reviews'. It contains provisions on the hotline. The 2021 Sustainability Report notes the channels are: 'accessible and culturally appropriate [...]'. We make these available through our community and operations-level grievance management processes, as well as our complaint procedures and open-door communication for employees'. It is assumed that operations-level grievance mechanisms are available in local languages. [Code of Ethics_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Describes how workers in EX BPs access grievance mechanism: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'ExxonMobil encourages employees and contractors to ask questions and voice concerns, and we insist on the reporting of any alleged violations of company policies. In addition to our open-door communication procedures, we have several confidential mechanisms for reporting'. Moreover, 'Consistent with international standards, we help provide effective, accessible and culturally appropriate channels for individuals or communities to raise concerns in a way that seeks to support confidentiality and non-retaliation'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs: Extractive business partners are expected to 'Impose similar terms and conditions on their subcontractors'. [Our global supply chain [Sustainable procurement]_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Consistent with international standards, we help provide effective, accessible and culturally appropriate channels for individuals or communities to raise concerns in a way that seeks to support confidentiality and non-retaliation. We make these available through our community and operations-level grievance management processes'. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and affected stakeholders made aware: As it is indicated above, the channels are: 'accessible and culturally appropriate [...]. We make these available through our community and operations-level grievance management processes'. It is assumed that operations-level grievance mechanisms are available in local languages. The Company provides additional information on the Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan for its Papua New Guinea LNG Project, which explains, for instance, how it publishes the mechanism. However, it is not clear how affected external stakeholders at its own operations are made aware of it. The subindicator expects a company-wide description. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [PNG LNG Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan, 2016: pnglng.com] • Not Met: Describes how external individuals/communities access grievance mechanism: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Consistent with international standards, we help provide effective, accessible and culturally appropriate channels for individuals or communities to raise concerns in a way that seeks to support confidentiality and non-retaliation. We make these available through our community and operations-level grievance management processes'. The Company provides additional information on the Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan for its Papua New Guinea LNG Project. However, it is not clear that external individuals and communities have access to it, in order to raise Complaints or concerns about human rights issues at the Company's extractive business partners. The subindicator expects a company-wide description. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [PNG LNG Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan, 2016: pnglng.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 • 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: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Our grievance management practices are guided by the World Bank International Finance Corporation and Ipieca'. The Company provides additional information on the Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan for its Papua New Guinea LNG Project which provides some timescales for the acknowledgement of grievances. However, no description found of company-wide procedures for managing the complaints or concerns, including timescales for addressing the complaints or concerns and for informing the complainant. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [PNG LNG Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan, 2016: pnglng.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: The Company provides additional information on the Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan for its Papua New Guinea LNG Project. However, this subindicator looks for a company-wide explanation of the type of outcome to the complainant through use of the grievance mechanisms. [PNG LNG Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan, 2016: pnglng.com] • Not Met: Describes escalation to senior levels / independent adjudicators

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.5	Prohibition of retaliation for raising complaints or concerns	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: Public statement prohibiting retaliation against workers/stakeholders: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Consistent with international standards, we help provide effective, accessible and culturally appropriate channels for individuals or communities to raise concerns in a way that seeks to support confidentiality and non-retaliation'. However, it is not clear it prohibits retaliation as it indicates it seeks to support non-retaliation. The Standard of Business Conduct indicates: 'Individuals will not be subjected to harassment, intimidation, threats, coercion, discrimination, or retaliation for opposing any unlawful act or practice, or making a complaint, assisting or participating in an investigation or any other proceeding, or otherwise exercising any of the rights protected by this policy or any federal, state, or local EEO laws'. However, although the Standards of Business Conduct contains its health; harassment; and safety policies, it does not contain the Company's general Human Rights policy, hence it is not clear that the prohibition on retaliation against workers and other stakeholders (including those that represent them) for raising human rights related complaints or concerns is included. The Code of Ethics states: 'No action may be taken or threatened against any employee for asking questions, voicing concerns, or making complaints or suggestions in conformity with the procedures described above [on how to voice concerns], unless the employee acts with wilful disregard of the truth'. However, it is not clear it also expands to other stakeholders. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Standards of Business Conduct, 12/10/2017: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes practical measures to prevent retaliation: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Employees can submit concerns anonymously through a 24-hour hotline or a mailing address'. The Standards of Business Conduct states: 'All persons responding to employees' questions, concerns, complaints, and suggestions are expected to use appropriate discretion regarding anonymity and confidentiality, although the preservation of anonymity and confidentiality may or may not be practical, depending on the circumstances. For example, investigations of significant complaints typically necessitate revealing to others information about the complaint and complainant. Similarly, disclosure can result from government investigations and litigation'. However, it is not clear that other stakeholders can use the mechanism anonymously at their discretion. The Community Grievance Mechanism specifically developed to 'address grievances that originate from EEPGL [Esso Exploration and Production Guyana Limited] exploration, projects, and operational activities', indicates that 'Individuals providing feedback may also do so anonymously'. However, it is not clear if all affected stakeholders have access to mechanisms that allow anonymity (or alternative measure to prevent retaliation), as this is a local channel and the other seems to refer only to employees. [Community Grievance Mechanism_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.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: See above. However, it is not clear this prohibition of retaliation also covers individual stakeholders and communities at extractive business partners level, as it is not clear the mechanism is open to them.
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	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: Complainants not asked to waive legal rights • Not Met: Does not require confidentiality provisions <p>Score 2</p> <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	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes approach taken to remedy adverse HRs impacts: The 2022 ExxonMobil PNG Limited Annual Report indicates: 'During 2022, compensation payments for four households that were assessed in 2021 were completed. Eligibility assessments for livelihood restoration support were also completed for two of these households. The two eligibility assessments, which covered household gardens, found that no livelihood restoration support was required. One household that had previously been assessed was found to have an improved livelihood and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			standard of living'. [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com] 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) and incorporating lessons learned	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses number of grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcomes achieved: The Company has provided grievance mechanism data for one of its affiliates, ExxonMobil PNG Limited, with operations in Papua New Guinea. However, no further information found including the number of grievances about human rights issues filed, addressed or resolved and outcomes achieved for its own workers, for external individuals and communities that may be adversely impacted by the Company. The subindicator expects company-wide data. [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com] • 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: The Company provides additional information on the Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan for its Papua New Guinea LNG Project. However, no description found of the company-wide procedures it has in place to address delays or non-implementation of outcomes agreed with stakeholders. [PNG LNG Stakeholder Engagement Management Plan, 2016: pnglng.com]

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: The Statement on Labor and the Workplace indicates: 'ExxonMobil recruits its employees and provides working conditions, including payment of wages and benefits, that comply with applicable laws and regulations'. 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. [Statement on labor and the workplace (website), 03/06/2020: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Member of EITI: ExxonMobil is a founding member of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). [EITI - Exxon_web, N/A: eiti.org] • 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 • Not Met: Discloses % of total direct operations covered by CB agreements Score 2 <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: The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: ‘We identify, evaluate and manage health risks related to our operations that potentially affect employees, contractors or the public’. The webpage section Health and engaged workforce notes: ‘ExxonMobil Global Medicine and Occupational Health uses Centers of Excellence in clinical, infectious disease, industrial hygiene and health promotion with members from across the globe to develop processes that guide programs in operations around the world. This approach supports the health of workers and surrounding communities where we operate. Our health management systems have recently been enhanced to focus on high-priority health issues and safeguards. These elements enable ExxonMobil to address total workforce health more effectively’. As for safety, the webpage section Enhancing Process Safety states: ‘To help protect our employees, contractors, communities where we work and the environment, ExxonMobil uses a proactive, disciplined approach to managing risks inherent to our operations. Our Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS) serves as the foundation for managing process safety risks, establishing clear expectations. The safeguards built into OIMS are integral to how we design, operate and maintain our facilities. We work to verify and rigorously manage these safeguards through maintenance, inspection, operations testing, competency demonstrations and emergency preparedness drills’. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Healthy and engaged workforce_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Discloses injury rate or lost days for last reporting period: The Company indicates that in 2021 the Lost Time Incident Rate was 0.02 per 200,000 work hours. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Met: Discloses fatalities for last reporting period: It also indicates that there were zero fatalities among employees and one among contractors in 2021. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Discloses occupational disease rate for last reporting period <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Set targets for H&S performance • Met: Met targets or explains why not or actions to improve H&S management systems: The webpage section Health and engaged workforce notes: ‘To help drive further improvements in process safety, we recently introduced our Enhancing Process Safety Program and updated our OIMS framework with new and enhanced expectations related to leadership, scenario management, human performance principles, critical task execution, and event learning. [...] Our Enhancing Process Safety Program has helped reduce Tier 1 safety events. From 2016 through 2021, we achieved a 31% reduction. Each 2021 event was analyzed through our Learning from Incidents process and corrective actions were identified to guide further improvement. For example, improvements were made to our risk detection processes and our operating procedures. In addition, as part of our Enhancing Process Safety program, we sharpened focus on our highest consequence risks and improved our management process. This includes validation of our critical safeguards and leveraging human performance principles throughout our risk management processes’. [Healthy and engaged workforce_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples' rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Process to identify/recognise indigenous rights holders: The webpage section Indigenous Peoples indicates: 'ExxonMobil is committed to conducting meaningful consultations with Indigenous peoples, incorporating traditional knowledge and land use information into our plans and promoting community engagement programs that respect traditions and cultures. Meaningful engagement is a key aspect of Free, Prior and Informed Consent, a specific right that pertains to Indigenous peoples and is recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples. One of our objectives is to determine how Indigenous peoples prefer to engage. Communities may decide whether they want us to meet with elected leaders, community elders or other representatives, and whether engagements are conducted in a public forum, either formally or informally. We enable communities to establish their preference for how often and how long their members meet with ExxonMobil representatives and who will provide their viewpoints or represent their wishes'. The webpage section Indigenous Engagement of its majority-owned Canadian affiliate Imperial Oil Ltd. notes describes the four pillar of Indigenous engagement. However, no evidence found of a description fo the process by which it identifies and recognise affected indigenous peoples (company-wide). [Indigenous peoples_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Indigenous engagement - Imperial_web, N/A: imperialoil.ca] • Met: Describes how indigenous communities are engage during assessment: Regarding resettlements, the 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'If physical or economic displacement occurs, we develop and implement location-specific and culturally appropriate resettlement action plans (RAPs). We consult with landowners and other potentially impacted individuals or households. We survey and map housing structures, gardens, wildlife, sources for nature-based products, harvesting areas and other assets to support the development of RAPs and effective livelihood restoration programs'. Moreover, as for Indigenous communities 'ExxonMobil is committed to conducting meaningful consultations with Indigenous peoples, incorporating traditional knowledge and land use information into our plans, and promoting community engagement programs that respect traditions and cultures. Meaningful engagement is a key aspect of Free, Prior and Informed Consent, a specific right that pertains to Indigenous peoples and is recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. One of our objectives is to determine how Indigenous peoples prefer to engage. Communities may decide whether they want us to meet with elected leaders, community elders or other representatives, and whether those engagements are conducted in a public forum, either formally or informally. We enable communities to establish their preference for how often and how long their members meet with ExxonMobil representatives, and who will provide their viewpoints or represent their wishes'. The Company has provided additional comments, however core evidence was already in use. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to FPIC: As indicated above: 'ExxonMobil is committed to conducting meaningful consultations with Indigenous peoples, incorporating traditional knowledge and land use information into our plans, and promoting community engagement programs that respect traditions and cultures. Meaningful engagement is a key aspect of Free, Prior and Informed Consent, a specific right that pertains to Indigenous peoples and is recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples'. Similar content is found in the webpage section Indigenous Peoples. However, although the Company indicates that meaningful engagement is part of the FPIC which is recognised by the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, it is not clear the Company commits to obtain FPIC itself. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [Indigenous peoples_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • 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)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes approach to indentifying lang tenure rights holders and negotiating compensation: The Land Access, Resettlement and Livelihood Restoration Management Plan – Production for its Papua New Guinea LNG Project notes: ‘Where involuntary resettlement is unavoidable, a census with appropriate socioeconomic baseline data to identify the persons who will be displaced by the project will be conducted, to determine who will be eligible for compensation and assistance, and to discourage the inflow of people who are ineligible for these benefits. Cut-off dates for eligibility will be established and will be well documented and communicated throughout the affected area. [...] Where negotiated settlements of economic displacement occur, procedures to offer the affected persons and communities compensation and other assistance that meets the objectives above, will be developed. In cases where affected persons reject compensation offers that meet the objectives outlined above, and as a result expropriation or other legal procedures are initiated, opportunities to collaborate with the responsible government agency will be explored’. It further explains its land access: ‘The land access and compensation process, [...] has five steps: IPCA, demarcation and mapping, Clan Agency Agreement (CAA), initial payment and annual deprivation payment. This process aims to ensure an open and transparent approach to gaining land access, resulting in agreements, which are satisfactory to customary landowners, are legally enforceable and sustainable. Land access agreements are made at a community level’. The In-Principle Compensation Agreement [IPCA] ‘is a general agreement between EMPNG and the community within the potential impact area, which establishes recognition of clans on the ground and their rights. It sets rates for actual damages that may be sustained to customary land. An IPCA contains information about: clan and village names; a general description of the subject land, including local names; the type of compensation to be paid; compensation rates based on the standard land access rates; and names of the clan leader. [...] The IPCA is executed with clan leaders, with compensation terms negotiated in advance of signing the agreement’. Demarcation and mapping ‘are part of the assessment process required for drafting and executing the CAA. [...] Once EMPNG land requirements are clearly identified, clan boundaries are identified and surveyed. Where there are multiple clans within a site, EMPNG works with clan leaders of adjoining clans or subclans to complete a boundary survey. From this process, a clan demarcation map is developed which is reviewed with clan leaders for accuracy and acceptance’. As for Land access consultation: ‘Implementation of the land access process requires consultation with affected communities. Meetings and clan engagements are conducted with the aim of achieving the participation of most of the affected clan members. This is through engagements held in the village and made accessible to clan members. All engagements have a focus on open and clear dialogue between EMPNG representatives and clan members, with respectful consideration of clan members’ opinions and concerns’. [PNG LNG Land Access, Resettlement and Livelihood, N/A: pnglng.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes approach to compensation including valuation: The 2023 Annual PNG LNG ESG Report [from a subsidiary in Papua New Guinea] explains its resettlement process: 'EMPNG aims to avoid resettlement resulting from construction activities. In situations where resettlement is unavoidable, the company's objective is to improve, or at least restore, the standards of living and livelihoods of displaced persons. During 2022, compensation payments for four households that were assessed in 2021 were completed. Eligibility assessments for livelihood restoration support were also completed for two of these households. The two eligibility assessments, which covered household gardens, found that no livelihood restoration support was required. One household that had previously been assessed was found to have an improved livelihood and standard of living. Pre-construction surveys were conducted along the main pipeline ROW at two river crossings [...] to assess households in areas identified for pipeline remediation works at the river crossings. Fourteen households were identified during these surveys as being eligible for compensation. By the end of 2022, 11 households had received compensation, with three remaining households to be compensated in 2023. These three households are also being assessed for eligibility for livelihood restoration support, with the outcome expected during 2023'. As for its compensation: 'Three Clan Agency Agreements [CAA] were signed with landowning clans during 2022 for land access along 2 kilometres of the pipeline ROW from Kaiam to Omati and an exclusion zone at Homa. Access was required for ongoing extension works and earthquake repairs along the ROW. By the end of 2022, 369 of the 372 annual deprivation payments were completed, with three payments outstanding due to clan group account payment processing issues. Since the start of PNG LNG construction, 17 clans have been involved in internal compensation disputes. Clans along Kilometre Point 270 to Kilometre Point 272 resolved their dispute during the year, while clan disputes remain for Gobe Spurline and the Homa Ridge Access Road. At the end of 2022, 84 percent of disputed payments were completed'. See above for more details on CAA. However, no further details found on its valuation methods and on how legitimate tenure rights holders were involved in the determining the valuation. [PNG LNG Land Access, Resettlement and Livelihood, N/A: pnglng.com] & [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com] • Not Met: Describes steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals: The 2021 Sustainability Report indicates: 'Our interactions with Indigenous peoples around the world are consistent with the goals of the following frameworks: [...] International Finance Corporation Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability'. However, it is not clear that if a state has been involved in the transaction, the Company follows IFC Performance Standard 5 on Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement. Moreover, the Company is expected to describe the steps it has taken to meet the standards with respect to legitimate tenure rights holders. [2021 Sustainability Report, 12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.7	Security (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: Describes security implementation (incl. VPs or ICOC) and provides an example: The webpage section Respecting Human Rights indicates: 'Since 2002, ExxonMobil has been a member of the Voluntary Principles Initiative [...]. Our standard security services contracts include provisions, where appropriate, requiring training for security personnel on expectations and responsibilities associated with one or more of the goals articulated in international principles, local laws and regulations [...]. These standard security services contract provisions require contractors to monitor, report and investigate credible allegations of human rights abuses. Contractors are required to immediately remove any of their personnel accused of violating human rights. ExxonMobil operates in places where engagement with host governments is needed to support security and respect for human rights in local operations. Where host governments require ExxonMobil to engage their official government security forces, we work to have written agreements with the host nations that include expectations for respecting human rights consistent with the goals of the VPSHR. We help train security providers on the goals of the VPSHR and provide targeted training for ExxonMobil personnel in global affiliates where host government security forces are engaged. The training focuses on our expectations for host government security deployment, including identification of the risks of security-related human rights impacts in communities'. The 2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited notes: 'By the end of the year [2022], 481 Papua New Guinean police officers and Defence personnel, and 688 contracted security personnel deployed at EMPNG sites, were trained in the Voluntary Principles of Security and Human Rights'. The 2021 Sustainability Report adds: 'Since 2016, we have supported the development and delivery of training on the goals of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights for more than 40,000 security service providers and members of government security forces'. [Respecting human rights_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com] • Met: Ensures Business Partners/JVs follow security approach: See above, how the Company's approach refers to security services contracts. Also, 'The webpage section Management systems, standards and controls indicates: 'we launched a top-to-bottom review of our operations and then implemented a system that today guides every operating decision we make on a daily basis. That system is called OIMS (Operations Integrity Management System). It consists of 11 separate elements that measure and mitigate safety, security, health and environmental risk to people, the environment and the communities in which we operate. [...]. ExxonMobil monitors the performance of joint ventures and company assets operated by others against OIMS expectations and encourages them to consider improvements, as appropriate'. [Management systems, standards and controls_web, 15/12/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes preventative/corrective action plans for water and sanitation risks: The webpage section Conserving water resources indicates: 'When sourcing water for our operations, ExxonMobil identifies and manages risks related to supply and quality. We regularly review our consumption and look for ways to use water more efficiently. ExxonMobil is piloting a tool to further enhance our understanding of risks associated with water, including wastewater discharge, water quality and supply and proximity to environmentally sensitive areas. The World Resources Institute (WRI) maintains a publicly available global database and interactive tool, the Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas (WRI water risk tool), which maps indicators of water-related risks. ExxonMobil uses the WRI water risk tool to increase our understanding of the baseline water stress as well as future projections of water stress in the areas where we operate. [...] To mitigate this risk to the local environment and to our business, we use site-specific management strategies that include the use of conservation technologies, alternate sources, and recycling of both municipal and industrial wastewater. When sourcing water for operations, we look for ways to minimize the impact of withdrawal, consumption and discharges. This requires us to consider local needs as well as local, alternative sources of supply'. The 2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited contains information on its water management, including: water consumption, water monitoring. [Conserving water resources_web, N/A: corporate.exxonmobil.com] & [2022 Annual ESG Report ExxonMobil PNG Limited, 2023: pnglng.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	0.5	<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 Harassment in the Workplace Policy [in the Standards of Business Conduct] indicates: 'The policy prohibits unlawful harassment based on [...] sex, [...] as well as any other form of harassment, even if the harassing conduct is lawful. [...] The Corporation specifically prohibits any form of harassment by or toward employees, contractors, suppliers, or customers. Under the Corporation's policy, harassment is any inappropriate conduct [...]. Harassment will not be tolerated. Forms of harassment include, but are not limited to, unwelcome verbal or physical advances and sexually, racially, or otherwise derogatory or discriminatory materials, statements, or remarks. All employees, including supervisors and managers, will be subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination for any act of harassment. Individuals who believe they have been subjected to harassment should immediately report the incident to their supervisors, higher management, or their designated Human Resources Department contacts. All complaints will be promptly and thoroughly investigated'. [Standards of Business Conduct, 12/10/2017: corporate.exxonmobil.com] • Not Met: Working conditions take into account gender issues • Not Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of employment: The 2022 Proxy Statement indicates: 'ExxonMobil seeks to have a diverse Board representing a range of backgrounds, knowledge, and skills relevant to the Company's business and the needs of the Board, and as part of the search process, considers highly qualified candidates, including women and minorities'. However, it is not clear the steps it takes to address any gender pay gap throughout all levels of employment and how it measures it. [Proxy Statement 2022, 07/04/2022: corporate.exxonmobil.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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Right to security of persons • Headline: Court allows Alien Tort Statute case over alleged complicity in human rights violations in Indonesia to proceed • Story: A lawsuit filed against ExxonMobil in the Federal District Court of Columbia alleges that the company assisted human rights violations including torture, murder and rape perpetrated by the Indonesian military in the territory of Aceh during unrest in the 1990s. The lawsuit, filed in 2001 by 11 Indonesians, alleges Exxon Mobil employed and provided material support to the Indonesian military forces. It claims soldiers were under ExxonMobil's direction and control, making the company liable. The lawsuit was dismissed by a federal judge in September 2009, but the decision was appealed. On 8 July 2011, the Court of Appeals reversed the district court's dismissal of the case, finding that a corporation should not be immune from liability under the Alien Tort Claims Act. ExxonMobil filed a motion with the Court of Appeals asking the court to rehear the case before all the judges of a court and not before a panel. In September 2014, the District Court had allowed plaintiffs to file for leave to amend their complaint in order to try to demonstrate that the facts of the case sufficiently 'touch and concern' the United States so as to overcome the presumption against extraterritoriality that applies to ATS cases. In a decision issued in July 2015, a US federal court ruled that the plaintiffs' claims sufficiently "touch and concern" the United States and may proceed in US court. In June 2019, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held that it lacked the power to recognize ATS claims against ExxonMobil because such claims had caused diplomatic strife with Indonesia. Following this decision, the lawsuit can continue regarding Indonesian tort law claims against ExxonMobil remain at issue. The decision of the US district court for the District of Columbia does not rule on the merits of the case, only on the jurisdiction. <p>In April 2022, a US judge ruled last week that Exxon pay \$288,900.78 in legal fees and expenses to the plaintiff's counsel following a botched 2020 deposition in which he "severely, repeatedly, and perversely obstructed his own deposition" and refused to answer questions, wasted time and provided inaccurate and evasive answers about whether he was reading from his notes and who prepared them.</p> <p>In July 2022, a US judge rules that ExxonMobil case about allegations of complicity in violence in Indonesia can go to trial after 21 years. [The Business & Human Rights Resource Centre,, 18/02/2014, "ExxonMobil lawsuit (re Aceh)": business-humanrights.org] [Climate Home News, 11/01/2017, "At State, Tillerson could get Exxon off human rights charges": climatechangenews.com] [The Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 25/04/2022, "US judge orders ExxonMobil to pay nearly \$290,000 to plaintiff's lawyer following botched deposition in lawsuit over company's alleged involvement in human rights abuses in Aceh, Indonesia": business-humanrights.org] [The Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 27/07/2022, "US judge rules that ExxonMobil case about allegations of complicity in violence in Indone</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: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response: ExxonMobil has denied being aware of any human rights violations and argued it cannot be held responsible for any abuses that did occur as it did not order or authorise them, calling the allegations "baseless" [The Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 25/04/2022: business-humanrights.org] [Climate Home News, 11/01/2017: climatechangenews.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The company did not provide a detailed response to the allegation, merely denying any knowledge of human rights violations.
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: 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: Exxon refused demands to investigate, improve, or cease its security forces' abusive actions. As a result, the company does not

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. [Climate Home News, 11/01/2017: climatechangenews.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: Exxon refused demands to investigate, improve, or cease its security forces' abusive actions. In addition, there is no evidence that the company made changes to its management systems following the events and their human rights impacts. [Climate Home News, 11/01/2017: climatechangenews.com] • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken
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: 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 that Exxon was not aware of any human rights violations and it cannot be held responsible for any abuses that did occur as it did not order or authorise them. However, it did not present sufficient evidence to prove the company is not linked to the impact. <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(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Health & Safety <p>• Headline: COVID-19: Report by human rights NGOs claims Imperial Oil put workers at risk</p> <p>• Story: On 23 June 2020, Business & Human Rights Resources Center announced the publication of a report by civil society organisations (Earthworks, Institute for Policy Studies - Global Economy Program, London Mining Network, MiningWatch Canada, Terra Justa, War on Want, and Yes to Life No to Mining), that claimed Imperial Oil (a subsidiary of Exxon Mobil), among other companies, was putting workers at risk during the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>According to the report, the Company allegedly had an outbreak at a Northern Alberta oil sands site, which was linked to more than 100 COVID-19 cases across four provinces, raising fears that the disease could spread like wildfire through work camps that house thousands of oil and gas workers. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 24/06/2020, "Report argues mining industry is profiting from COVID-19 while putting workers, communities & defenders at risk; including co responses": business-humanrights.org] [Mining Watch, 02/06/2020, "Voices from the Ground: How the Global Mining Industry is Profiting from the COVID-19 Pandemic": miningwatch.ca]</p>
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response: Imperial Oil provided a response to the Report, stating that: "there is nothing more important to us than the safety and health of our workforce and our communities. This remains Imperial's priority as we continue to take actions to prevent further spread of COVID-19. There have not been any new cases associated with our Kearl operation since mid-May and the outbreak designation by Alberta Health Services has now ended". However, Exxon has not responded publicly to the allegations, nor has it pointed to Imperial Oil's comments in a public statement and, therefore, does not meet the requirements for this indicator. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 23/06/2020, "Response from Imperial Oil": business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: See above
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:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders: The company stated that it has "created an emergency support group, a cross-functional team activated to strategically support field response during an emergency situation" and "put in place preventive measures" to which the workforce adhered. However, there is no evidence suggesting that the company engaged with the affected stakeholders. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 23/06/2020: business-humanrights.org] • Not Met: Identified cause: The company does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: In its Corporate Sustainability Report, Imperial Oil states that: "In response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, Imperial created an emergency support group, a cross-functional team activated to strategically support field response during an emergency situation. This group took the lead to ensure workforce and community safety, while ensuring our essential business could continue. Extensive preventive measures have been put in place, with strict adherence to all government pandemic guidance measures, at all of our locations to help prevent the spread of COVID-19.[...] Based on an abundance of caution and care for our Kearnl workforce, Imperial worked with the Alberta Health Services (AHS) to make COVID-19 testing available on site". However, it is not clear whether Exxon Mobil has implemented improvements to avoid similar impacts in the future. [Imperial Oil Limited, March 2021, CORPORATE SUSTAINABILITY REPORT: imperialoil.ca] • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken
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 <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: Health & Safety • Headline: Two subcontractors and one citizen filed a lawsuit against Exxon Mobil alleging negligent practices caused a blaze at Baytown refinery, two other workers injured • Story: On December 29, 2021, press sources reported that two subcontractors have sued ExxonMobil for USD 10 million after being injured in an explosion and fire at the Company's Baytown plant. Two other workers were also injured in the incident on December 23, 2021. <p>In the lawsuit, the attorney, who is representing the two subcontractors, claimed Exxon issued a permit for the work despite knowing that the specific flange had erupted in flames on prior shifts. The permit also failed to provide protective equipment such as flash suits, face shields or continuous monitoring by a four-gas meter to monitor the combustibility of the air, he said, adding that Exxon also did not provide emergency rescue teams on standby.</p> <p>In December 26, 2021, another lawsuit has been filed by a woman who lives near the refinery. The lawsuit alleged that the woman has suffered hearing loss and related balance issues resulting from the concussive force of the blast at the gasoline-producing refinery unit.</p> <p>The lawsuit also alleged that unknown and potentially harmful chemicals were released into the air and into nearby residential neighbourhoods. [Heavy.com, 30/12/2021, "Injured Workers File \$10 Million Lawsuit After Baytown ExxonMobil Explosion": heavy.com] [CISION PR Newswire, 26/12/2021, "Baytown Woman Injured in Refinery Explosion Files Negligence Lawsuit Against Exxon Mobil": prnewswire.com] [Houston Chronicle, 29/12/2021, "Lawsuit details blaze at Baytown refinery": houstonchronicle.com] [CISION, 12/03/2022, "More Than 275 Baytown Residents Claim Injuries from December Refinery Explosion": prnewswire.com]</p>
E(3).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response: ExxonMobil media relations advisor Sarah Nordin told the Houston Chronicle, "ExxonMobil remains focused on the safety of our people and those in the surrounding community and continues to fully cooperate with authorities regarding this incident." <p>At a press conference the morning of the fire, ExxonMobil Baytown refinery manager Rohan Davis told reporters, "We're ensuring that these individuals are receiving the best care possible and we'll continue to support their families through this difficult time." [Heavy.com, 30/12/2021: heavy.com] [Houston Chronicle, 28/12/2021, "\$10 million lawsuit details moments before ExxonMobil fire in Baytown": houstonchronicle.com]</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The company responded in very general terms and did not address the allegation in detail.
E(3).2	The company has investigated and taken appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders: Exxon said that it had set up an information and claims line for community members affected by the incident. However, it is not clear if that line is used to engage with stakeholders in the investigation into the root causes of the incident. [Heavy.com, 30/12/2021: heavy.com] • Not Met: Identified cause: After the accident, officials with ExxonMobil said they're unsure what caused the explosion and that air quality monitoring has not revealed any issues. As of January 2022 a refinery manager said that ExxonMobil is "still collecting" information surrounding the fire. Thus, the company does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. [Houston Chronicle, 28/12/2021: houstonchronicle.com] [The Lanier Law Firm, 03/01/2022, "Fire at Texas ExxonMobil Oil Refinery Injures Several People": lanierlawfirm.com] Score 2 <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 or improved its Baytown refinery in any way following the events and their human rights impacts. • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: There is no evidence suggesting that the views of affected stakeholders were taken into account in the improvement of the company policies.
E(3).3	The company has engaged with affected stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy: ExxonMobil is reviewing and evaluating the claims in the suits, said media relations advisor Sarah Nordin. However, to date, There is no evidence suggesting the company provided remedy to the affected stakeholders. [Houston Chronicle, 28/12/2021: houstonchronicle.com] • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used
E(4).0	Serious allegation No 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Right to security of persons; Land Rights • Headline: ExxonMobil accused of human rights abuse in Kurdistan • Story: On January 20, 2020, the press reported that ExxonMobil was accused of employing local security forces in Kurdistan, who shot at civilians and killed two in 2013. <p>According to the press, a complaint was filed with the UN Human Rights Council by Yazidi politician Nallein Sowilo, accusing the Company of displacing about 5,000 local people from their home, and drilling for oil on the Yazidi land without compensation or consultation.</p> <p>Hitting back against Exxon's activities, the local Yazidi communities staged demonstrations against the Company, and in one case established a local assembly for the protection of the environment and public rights, according to the complaint. The assembly was intended to advocate against Exxon's drilling activities.</p> <p>[Kaieteur News, 21/01/2020, "Kurdish politician takes Exxon to UN Human Rights Council over abuses": kaieteurnews.com] [The Telegraph, 20/01/2020, "ExxonMobil accused of human rights abuse in Kurdistan region": telegraph.co.uk]</p>
E(4).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response: Responding to the complaint, Exxon described the allegations as "baseless". In a statement, the company said it actively promoted "respect for human rights", and was in compliance with "all applicable laws and regulations". [Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 16/12/19, "Company response from ExxonMobil regarding human rights concerns raised by members of the Yezidi community regarding the company's activities in the disputed territories of Northern Iraq": media.business-humanrights.org]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: In its response, the company generically refers to its policies regarding respect for human rights, but does not mention the forced displacement of Yazidis from their lands without prior consultation, nor the violent repression of protests that resulted in the death of two people. [Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 16/12/19: media.business-humanrights.org]
E(4).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: According to the complaint filed with the UN human rights Council, after the killing of two Yazidi activists, Exxon refused to take any action. As a result, the company did not engage with the affected stakeholders. [Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 15/07/2019, "Human Rights Council complaint form": media.business-humanrights.org] • Not Met: Identified cause: The company does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: ExxonMobil withdrew the exploration deal with the Kurdistan Regional Government in 2016. However, this cannot be considered an 'improvement' within the meaning of the methodology, i.e. to prevent the recurrence of human rights violations in the future. [Environmental Justice Atlas, 12/08/2018, "ExxonMobil oil explorations in Shawre Valley, Kurdistan Region of Iraq": ejatlas.org] • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: See above
E(4).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 the allegation, claiming that it is "baseless". However, the Company did not present sufficient evidence to prove the affected stakeholder did not suffer the alleged impacts. <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(5).0	Serious allegation No 5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: FoA/CB • Headline: The United Steelworkers union has accused Exxon Mobil of trying to dissolve seniority provisions and colluding to break the union • Story: On June 17, 2021, press sources reported that Exxon has locked out 650 union workers at its Beaumont, Texas, refinery and lubricants plant after failing to reach agreement on a new contract. On June 17, 2021, negotiators met for only the second time since the lockout but failed to make any headway and stopped talks after about two hours. <p>The union has accused Exxon Mobil of trying to dissolve seniority provisions, colluding to break the union and falsely claiming the union's seniority terms are unique.</p> <p>After Exxon tweeted the job-seniority terms it wanted were no different than those at the Company's Baytown, Texas, refinery, local 13-2001 union President Ricky Brooks called the tweet "factually untrue."</p> <p>According to the press, the United Steelworkers union (USW) has filed a complaint with the U.S. National Labour Relations Board (NLRB) claiming Exxon violated labour laws by improperly monitoring employees and used Company resources to launch an effort to dissolve the union.</p> <p>An employee has circulated information to gain support for a petition to decertify the local USW that represents Beaumont workers, according to the NLRB complaint. Exxon told employees seeking information to contact its human resources department or the NLRB. A vote can be called if 30% of covered employees sign a petition and file it with the NLRB.</p> <p>On 21 February 2022, Exxon Mobil has reached a contract agreement with its locked out Beaumont workers. Union members voted 214-133 to ratify the company's latest offer, which added holiday time off and updated job descriptions for some union positions. On 26</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>February 2022, Exxon Mobil Corp said the 10-month lockout of union workers at a southeast Texas refinery would end on March 7 following acceptance of a return-to-work agreement.</p> <p>The U.S. National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) said the 10-month lockout of workers at an Exxon Mobil Corp refinery in Texas was an "unlawful" effort to remove the United Steelworkers union representing the workers, according to a complaint issued on Monday.</p> <p>The NLRB asked an administrative law judge to issue back pay, among other remedies, to the more than 600 workers locked out of their jobs at Exxon's Beaumont, Texas, refinery and lube oil plant between May 2021 and March 2022. [Reuters, 18/06/2021, "Exxon, union try new approach to resolve increasingly bitter dispute" -: reuters.com] [Beaumont Enterprise, 17/06/2021, "Still no deal for locked out ExxonMobil workers": beaumontenterprise.com] [Houston Public Media, 22/02/2022, "Exxon Mobil has reached a contract agreement with its locked out Beaumont workers": houstonpublicmedia.org] [YahooFinance, 03/10/2022, "Exxon refinery lockout 'unlawful,' back pay sought by U.S. Labor Board": finance.yahoo.com]</p>
E(5).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response: With regard to the lockout, in June 2021, Exxon spokeswoman Julie King said "We continue to meet and bargain in good faith with the union. The company has at all times acted lawfully and will continue to do so." In a later statement, the company refuted Steelworkers' claims that Exxon refused to bargain and bargained in bad faith. It also said it continues to operate the chemical plant safely. <p>Exxon managers have repeatedly denied all the claims of unfair labor practices. "The Company remains confident that it acted lawfully at all times and will prevail against the Union's baseless allegations," Exxon said in a statement to the Texas Observer.</p> <p>In its reply to the U.S. National Labor Relations Board complaint, Exxon stated that the lockout of over 600 workers at its Beaumont, Texas, refinery was lawful. In the reply, Exxon said it "acted in good faith and has not violated any provision of the National Labor Relations Act." [Grist, 31/01/2022, "Exxon locked workers out of their jobs. Can workers lock Exxon out of a carbon capture deal?": grist.org] [Reuters, 18/06/2021: reuters.com] [Hydrocarbon Processing, 17/10/2022, "Exxon says Texas refinery lockout was lawful in reply to NLRB complaint": hydrocarbonprocessing.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The company stated on several occasions that it had always acted 'legally and in good faith' but never went into the details of the individual allegations. In particular, the company has never directly commented on the allegation that it has secretly—and illegally—helped orchestrate decertification campaigns in order to rid itself entirely of the unions.
E(5).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 • Not Met: Identified cause: The company does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: Despite the fact that the company reached an agreement with the union, the company did not accept to make any material changes to bargaining unit employees' terms and conditions of employment to significantly improve their situation. In addition, 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(5).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: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy: There is no evidence the company provided remedy to the affected stakeholders. In addition, the company failed to return to the workers their back pay and costs for the time they were locked out of the refinery, as recommended by the NCRB. • 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
E(6).0	Serious allegation No 6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used • Area: Right to safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment <p>• Headline: Exxon Mobil is facing protests over its failure to pay compensation for oil spillages in some communities in Abuja, Nigeria</p> <p>• Story: On July 21, 2017, Thisdaylive.com reported that an oil spill suspected to emanate from an ExxonMobil facility has triggered another protest by youths in Ibeno local government area of Akwa Ibom State. Protesters have blocked the Qua Iboe Terminal (QIT) facility of ExxonMobil at Mkpanak in Ibeno Local Government Area for three days. Exxon was notably urged by the protestors to negotiate how and when to clean the spill, and to make adequate compensations to people who were affected by the pollution of waters and farmlands caused by the frequent oil spill from its facility.</p> <p>On June 22, 2021, it was reported that the Federal High Court, Abuja, has ordered the Mobil Producing Nigeria Unlimited a subsidiary of Exxon Mobil and the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) to pay the oil communities in Ibeno Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom a cumulative damages of NGN 81.9 billion (approximately USD 198 million) over oil spillages.</p> <p>The judge ordered the oil companies to pay the money within 14 days, after which 8 percent interest would be accrued on the principal sum yearly.</p> <p>The judge believed the oral and documentary evidence adduced by the plaintiffs to support their claims that their lives were made miserable when their water and land were polluted through crude oil leakages from old oil pipelines.</p> <p>He noted the claims of Mobil that it did a clean up exercise and held that the Company failed to address the compensation that would have mitigated the economic losses of the people said to be mainly fishermen and farmers.</p> <p>He further held that both Mobil and NNPC were negligent by their failure to visit places of the leakages of the crude oil that led to the contamination of Rivers and creeks.</p> <p>The News Agency of Nigeria (NAN) recalled that Ibeno communities led by Obong Effiong Archianga and nine others had through their lawyers, Lucius Nwosu, SAN, brought the action against NNPC, Mobil Producing Nigeria Unlimited and ExxonMobil Corporation.</p> <p>On July 9, 2021, press sources reported that the Akwa Ibom State Cooperative Fisheries Association had protested against Exxon Mobil's failure to pay compensation for oil spillages in some communities at the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) office in Abuja, Nigeria.</p> <p>The president of the group said its demand for NGN 11 billion compensation was for damages associated with oil spills from the facilities of Exxon Mobil Unlimited between 1998 and 2012, which led to the destruction of fishing nets, equipment and other accessories.</p> <p>According to the press, the spills affected over 10,000 fishermen in Akwa Ibom State.</p> <p>The group pleaded with the Federal Government to do everything possible within the confines of the law to ensure that justice prevailed in this matter.</p> <p>On February 28, 2022, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) and Mobil Producing Nigeria Unlimited, a subsidiary of Exxon Mobile, were ordered by the Federal High Court in Abuja to pay a judgment debt of NGN 82 billion (approximately USD 197 million) owing to several communities in Akwa Ibom State in Nigeria.</p> <p>NNPC and Mobil were sued by communities in the state's Ibeno Local Government Area seeking the payment of NGN 100 billion (approximately USD 240 million) compensation for economic losses suffered from oil spillages caused by the defendants during exploration. The spill, which occurred between 1998 and 2012,</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>had reportedly led to the destruction of fishing nets, equipment and other accessories. In addition, 10,000 fishermen in Akwa Ibom State were affected.</p> <p>As stated by the press, the firms were ordered by the court to pay the communities within 14 days of the judgment failure date, with an annual interest rate of 8% on the principal sum.</p> <p>The Judge has dismissed all of the objections brought by the two oil companies which argued that the suit was statute barred in 2012. He found that Mobil failed to address the compensation that would have mitigated the economic losses of the people. He further ruled that both Mobil and NNPC were negligent by their failure to visit places of the leakages of the crude oil that led to the contamination of Rivers and creeks.</p> <p>[Thisdaylive.com, 21/07/2017, "ExxonMobil Denies Oil Spills in Ibeno as Youths Protest, Block Workers at QIT": thisdaylive.com] [Head Topics Nigeria, 22/06/2021, "Oil Spillage: Court Orders Mobil, NNPC To Pay N82bn Damages To Akwa Ibom Communities": headtopics.com] [The Guardian, 09/07/2021, "A'lbom group kicks over Exxon Mobil's alleged non-payment of compensation for spillages": guardian.ng] [Premium Times, 28/02/2022, "UPDATED: Court orders NNPC, Mobil to pay N82bn judgement debt to Akwa Ibom communities": premiumtimesng.com]</p>
E(6).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 denied the allegation. [Thisdaylive.com, 21/07/2017: thisdaylive.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response
E(6).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 does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. <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(6).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 <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

Disclaimer

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