

## Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2023 Company Scorecard

**Company name** Rio Tinto  
**Sector** Extractives  
**Overall score** 43.9 out of 100

### CHRB Special Process for Major Catastrophic Events assessment

Following Rio Tinto's involvement in the 2020 destruction of the Juukan Gorge rock shelters, the CHRB has applied the 'special process for major catastrophic events' to evaluate whether and the extent to which the company has taken steps to assess the causes of the event and prevent similar episodes from occurring in the future, and provided remedies to the affected stakeholders. For more information on the methodology and results, please refer to [the assessment](#). As a result of this assessment, Rio Tinto's CHRB score is capped at 86%.

Theme score	Out of	For theme
5.8	10	A. Governance and Policy Commitments
14.7	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
11.5	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
15.3	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
3.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations

Please note that any small differences between the Overall Score and the added total of Measurement Theme scores are due to rounding the numbers at different stages of the score calculation process.

Please note also that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2022 Methodology document for the sector concerned. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

## Detailed assessment

### A. Governance and Policy Commitments (10% of Total)

#### A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: General HRs commitment: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect internationally recognised human rights including those set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Commitment to UNGPs: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We are committed to implementing the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs)'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.2.a	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Commitment to ILO core principles: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect internationally recognised human rights including those set out in the [...] ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the labour rights of our workforce and the workers in our value chain, including relating to [...] non-discrimination, freedom of association and collective</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>bargaining [...]. We reject any form of modern slavery including forced labour, debt bondage, forced marriage and trafficking; child labour; or other labour exploitation in our activities and value chain'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO core principles: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect internationally recognised human rights including those set out in the [...] ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. It also adds: 'This Policy applies to all of our directors, officers, employees and core contractors as well as our managed operations and projects'. It explains that core contractors 'refers to category 1 and category 2 contractors and any external contractors, agents, consultants and other service providers who perform internal duties or roles having access to internal systems or who otherwise act for and on behalf of Rio Tinto'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles for BPs/JVs: The Company's Human Rights Policy covers each ILO Core commitment: discrimination, forced labour, child labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining, as indicated above. The Policy also applies to contractors. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Commitment to respect H&amp;S of workers: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the labour rights of our workforce and the workers in our value chain, including relating to health and safety'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Commitment to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the labour rights of our workforce and the workers in our value chain, including relating to [...] working hours'. The Group Standard Fitness for work in safety critical jobs notes: 'Fatigue management must also consider: [...] the monitoring and control of working hours that includes a call out / overtime procedure to manage fatigue; shift design / roster assessment that takes into account the effect of lack of sleep and/or excessive working hours on worker fatigue; the effects of activities carried out during rostered and overtime hours'. The Supplier Code of Conduct states: 'In line with core international business and human rights standards, we are committed to respecting internationally recognised human rights, including those set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labour Organisation Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator, however, the source was not considered a valid source as commitments are expected to be placed in Company policy documents. This subindicator looks for an explicitly commitment to respect ILO conventions on working hours (which contains specific provisions for the extractive sector). No further evidence found. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to H&amp;S of workers: As indicated above, the Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the labour rights of our workforce and the workers in our value chain, including relating to health and safety'. It also applies to contractors. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week: As indicated above, the Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the labour rights of our workforce and the workers in our value chain, including relating to [...] working hours'. It also applies to contractors. The Supplier Code of Conduct states: 'In line with core international business and human rights standards, we are committed to respecting internationally recognised human rights, including those set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labour Organisation Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. We expect our suppliers to respect internationally recognised human rights by: Working to implement core international business and human rights standards, including the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Not using forced or compulsory labour [...]. Preventing the use of child [...]. Providing fair remuneration and work conditions for all workers. Promoting humane treatment and preventing harassment and unfair discrimination. Respecting workers' rights to lawfully and peacefully form or join trade unions of their choosing and to bargain collectively. [...]'. However, no formal commitment about respecting the ILO conventions on working hours was found. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.3.a.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the sector – land, natural resources and indigenous peoples' rights (EX)	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commitment to respect land ownership/natural resources as in IFC Performance Standards: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the livelihoods and health of communities impacted by our operations, [...] rights relating to the ownership or use of land and natural resources [...]. We are committed to implementing [...] the IFC Performance Standards'. The webpage section Communities indicates: 'We use the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability; our CSP [communities and social performance] standard commits us to compliance with the following IFC Performance Standards: [...] Impacts IFC PS5: Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement'. Although the second source is not a formal commitment [which is a CHRB requirement for this indicator], it is used here to further illustrate the Company's commitment to IFC. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Communities_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Commitment to respect indigenous rights or ILO No.169 or UN Declaration: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We acknowledge and respect the internationally recognised human rights of Indigenous Peoples, including those established under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments: See above. The policy also applies to contractors. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Commitment to obtain FPIC or zero tolerance to land grabbing: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We are committed to demonstrating progress towards, or achievement of, Free, Prior and Informed Consent of affected Indigenous communities across all stages of the asset lifecycle in accordance with the ICMM Indigenous Peoples and Mining Position Statement'. However, the Company seems to be committed to demonstrating progress or achievement rather than being committed to obtaining FPIC. It is not clear it is committed to FPIC. Also, commitment through the ICMM position is no longer considered a formal commitment to FPIC under CHRB revised approach. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Commitment to respect the right to water: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the livelihoods and health of communities impacted by our operations, their right to clean drinking water and sanitation'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments: See above. However, it is not clear the Company expects extractive business partners to commit to Free, Prior and Informed Consent [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Commitment to Voluntary Principles on Security and HRs: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We are committed to implementing the [...] Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (Voluntary Principles)'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Uses only ICoCA members as security providers</li> <li>• Not Met: Commits to International Humanitarian Law: The 2022 VPSHR Report indicates: 'Our security and human rights Group procedure requires our sites to report, record and investigate any incidents involving actual or alleged security and human rights abuses in accordance with the HSES incident management Group procedure. This includes violations of international humanitarian law'. The Business Integrity Standard adds: 'Every business decision must comply with the following key principles: it is permitted by and complies with all applicable laws and regulations'. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator, however, some of its content has not been found in publicly available sources. This subindicator looks for a publicly available policy statement committing it to respect international humanitarian law (IHL). Moreover, only policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [2022 VPSRH Report, 2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Business Integrity Standard, 01/07/2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Expects EX BPs to commit to these rights: See above. It also applies to contractors. However, it is not clear it expects extractive business partners to commit to respecting international humanitarian law (IHL). The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator, however, some of its content has not been found in publicly available sources. It also made reference to the 2022</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			VPSHR Report, however, reports are not considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ]
A.1.4	Commitment to remedy	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"> <li>Met: Commitment to remedy adverse HRs impacts: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'Where we identify we have caused or contributed to an adverse human rights impact, we are committed to providing for, or cooperating in, its remediation through legitimate processes'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>Met: Expects EX BPs to make this commitments: See above. It also applies to contractors. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Met: Commitment to collaborate with judicial or non-judicial mechanisms: As indicated above, the Human Rights Policy states: 'Where we identify we have caused or contributed to an adverse human rights impact, we are committed to providing for, or cooperating in, its remediation through legitimate processes'. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources. This subindicator looks for a formal policy commitment to collaborate with both judicial and non-judicial mechanisms. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>Not Met: Commitment to work with EX BPs on remedy: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We may play a role in remediating harm that we are directly linked to through our products, services or operations'. However, no evidence was found of a formal commitment to work in collaboration with business partners to remedy adverse impacts which are directly linked to the company's operations, products or services. 'May play a role' is not considered a formal commitment according to CHRB standards. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator noting that its Human Rights Policy is line with the UNGPs. It also quotes some parts of the UNGPs and of the UN Interpretative Guide. However, this subindicator looks for an explicit Company commitment [found in a Company policy statement] to work with suppliers to remedy adverse impacts which are directly linked to the company's operations, products or services. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.5	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Zero tolerance of threats/attacks on HRDs: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the rights of human rights defenders and the peaceful exercise of their rights relating to our activities. We do not condone, and are committed to not causing or contributing to, threats, intimidation or attacks against them in exercising these rights. We also recognise the importance of engaging our business partners on rights-respecting treatment of human rights defenders relating to our activities'. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>Met: Expects BPs to make this commitment: See above. The Policy also applies to contractors. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Met: Commitment to working with HRDs to create safe and enabling environment: See above. Moreover, the statement on the Role of civil society organisations adds: 'We support the existence of an open civic space, value these diverse objectives, and work with civil society organisations in a variety of ways. By highlighting concerns about environmental, social and governance issues, and advising on how to improve, civil society organisations can be an important advocate for change. We believe that significant progress in preventing and addressing many complex and multifaceted environmental, social and governance challenges, such as climate change, human rights violations, bribery and corruption, will only be achieved through genuine dialogue and engagement between governments, business, investors, consumers and civil society. In order to build trust and sustain public support, we also recognise that it is vital that all parties adopt high standards of integrity, transparency and accountability in their work and that civil society organisations maintain their independence from party politics'. However, the subindicator looks for an explicit commitment to working with human rights defenders to create safe and enabling environments for civic engagement and human rights at local, national or international levels. No further evidence found. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Role of civil society organisations, N/A: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

## A.2 Board Level Accountability (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The 2022 Annual Report indicates: ‘The Sustainability Committee oversees strategies to manage social and environmental risks, including management processes and standards. The Committee reviews the effectiveness of management policies and procedures relating to safety, health, employment practices [...], relationships with neighbouring communities, environment, security and human rights, land access, political involvement and sustainable development’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes HRs expertise of Board member: Regarding Ngaire Woods CBE, an Independent Non-Executive Director BA/LLB, DPhil: ‘As a recognised expert in public policy, international development and governance, she has served as an adviser to the African Development Bank, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, the Center for Global Development, the International Monetary Fund, and the European Union’. Ben Wyatt is an independent Non-Executive Director LLB, MSc: ‘He held a number of ministerial positions and became the first Indigenous treasurer of an Australian parliament. His extensive knowledge of [...] Indigenous affairs brings valuable insight and adds to the depth of knowledge on the Board’. The Company has provided further comments regarding this subindicator on activities the Board members took part at in the last reporting year. However, this subindicator looks for a description of the human rights expertise of the Board member or Board committee tasked with that governance oversight. No further evidence found. [Ngaire Woods CBE_WEB, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Ben Wyatt_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Board member/CEO signal importance of HRs in their communications: The Company discloses a press-release regarding the Juukan Gorge case: ‘Simon Thompson, chairman of Rio Tinto, said “While the review provides a clear framework for change, it is important to emphasise that this is the start of a process, not the end. We will implement important new measures and governance to ensure we do not repeat what happened at Juukan Gorge and we will continue our work to rebuild trust with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people. We fully recognise traditional owners must be treated as equal partners which includes regular, open and respectful dialogue. We look forward to continuing our engagement with the PKKP on a joint initiative to learn the lessons from Juukan and to strengthen our partnership. It is clear that no single individual or error was responsible for the destruction of the Juukan rock shelters, but there were numerous missed opportunities over almost a decade and the company failed to uphold one of Rio Tinto’s core values – respect for local communities and for their heritage. We are determined to learn, improve and rebuild trust across various internal and external partners. I look forward to working with J-S, Chris and Simone to drive change and improvements in order to re-establish Rio Tinto’s credentials and strengthen heritage management across the business.”’. [Rio Tinto publishes board review of cultural heritage management, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
A.2.2	Board responsibility	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"> <li>• Met: Process to review HRs strategy at board level: The Sustainability Committee Terms of Reference indicates: ‘The Committee shall have oversight of the following areas: Safety; [...] Health; [...] Communities and social performance, including: (i) community relations, including with traditional owners and other indigenous peoples on whose lands we operate; (ii) cultural heritage management; (iii) the economic and social development of the communities in which we operate, including employment, training and development, and local supply chain development; sustainable development issues as they relate to suppliers and supply chains, including modern slavery; (v) security (being the security of the Group’s people and assets, including business resilience, but excluding cyber security); and (vi) human rights monitoring and issue management’. Moreover: ‘The Committee shall meet not less than four times a year, and at other such times as any member, or the secretary of the Committee, shall require’. [Sustainability Committee Terms of Reference, 13/12/2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Example of HRs issues/trends discussed in last reporting period: In 2021, the Sustainability Committee: ‘Reviewed progress on development of the Group’s 2022 Statement on Modern Slavery. Approved the revised Human Rights Policy. Received a report on progress against the CSP strategy’. It also: ‘Received an update on the Juukan Gorge remediation project’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Meets both requirements under score 1</li> <li>• Met: Describes how affected stakeholders / HRs experts inform board discussions: It also indicates: 'The Committee [Sustainability Committee] oversaw the rebuilding of a constructive relationship with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people, the ongoing rehabilitation works at Juukan Gorge, the progress on an agreement for a co-management of Country approach, and a comprehensive remedy agreement. The Committee also reviewed the progress made towards reaching modernised agreements with the Yinhawangka, Yindjibarndi and Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura peoples in the Pilbara and the Pekuakamiulnuatsh First Nation in Canada'. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator including information on site visits by Board members. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: At least one board member incentive linked to HRs commitments: The 2022 Annual Report indicates its Remuneration Policy applicable to the Company's executives. In 2022, it included a Short-term incentive plan (STIP). ESG performance represented 35% of its overall performance criterion and out of it, safety represented 20% of it. It expands on its STIP measures: 'Safety measures make up 20% and include a standalone binary fatality measure (40%), with the remainder split between all-injury frequency rate (AIFR) (20%) and measures relating to our safety maturity model (SMM) (40%)'. The CEO is also a Board member. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&amp;S: The 2022 Annual Report indicates that the Strategic scorecard for the 2023 STIP includes a 'Safety Index 10%: All-injury frequency rate (AIFR) as a lag indicator and safety maturity (SMM) of our assets as a lead indicator which includes maturity of safety leadership including psychological safety with conformance to GISTM (global tailings standard) as an underpin'. It also includes: 'Diversity 5% Improving representation of women in our company'. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public: See above. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Review of other board incentives for coherence with HRs policies: See above. The 2022 Annual Report indicates that 'Discretion' is part of its Remuneration Policy. It 'Ensures pay outcomes reflect the Group's overall performance and risk appetite', which implies: 'The Committee reserves the right to review all remuneration outcomes arising from mechanistic application of performance conditions and to exercise discretion to make adjustments where such outcomes do not properly reflect underlying performance or the experience of shareholders or other stakeholders. The Committee may at its discretion adjust and/or set different performance measures if events occur which cause the Committee to determine that the measures are no longer appropriate or in the best interests of shareholders or other stakeholders, and that amendment is required so that the measures, as far as possible, achieve their original purpose. Such discretion will be exercised judiciously and clearly disclosed and explained in the Implementation report'. In the light of the destruction of the Juukan Gorge, the 2020 Annual Report notes: 'Following the events that occurred at the Juukan Gorge, the Board conducted a review of our cultural heritage management processes, procedures, reporting and governance. [...] The Board concluded that the Chief Executive, Chief Executive Iron Ore and Group Executive Corporate Relations were however ultimately responsible for implementing fit for purpose management systems and would not therefore receive any 2020 short-term bonus. In addition, for the Chief Executive, a further reduction of £1 million would be applied to the vesting of his 2016 long term incentive plan (LTIP) award'. As for its Everyday Respect task force [related to different forms of workplace discrimination], launched in 2021, the 2021 Annual Report explains: 'In recognition of the findings in the Everyday Respect report, the management team recommended that a downward adjustment be made to the 2021 STIP payments. The Committee concluded that a reduction of 5% should be applied to the total STIP payment for current Executive Committee members and an equivalent adjustment be made to the 2020 unvested Bonus Deferral Awards (BDA) held by former Executive Committee members. The STIP for 2022 will also include objectives linked to the recommendations arising in the report'. The Company has been going through a short-term incentive plan redesign [for the year 2023]. It notes: 'In 2022, we undertook a review of our incentives and performance</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>management framework grounded in a belief that to deliver our ambitious strategy, we need to change the way we work. We believe there is an opportunity for incentives to be aligned to our strategic priorities that focuses as much on “how” we deliver as well as “what” we deliver, and to be more engaging so that they are better understood by participants. We are moving to a much simpler design, where the STIP for approximately 24,000 employees will be based upon one Group scorecard rather than the diversified scorecards previously operated across the business – this aligns the goals of all STIP participants which will aid the business in its pursuit of financial success driven by our four objectives. The new STIP design maintains the existing weighting and measures on our Group financials while aligning with our four objectives – achieving impeccable ESG, excel in development, best operator and social licence – as well as people and culture’. It discloses the key areas of change and the rationale for the change. The old performance metrics were: ‘Executive Committee and Managing Directors: Financial = 50%; ESG (safety) = 12%; ESG (fatality) = 8%; ESG (other) = 15%; Individual = 15%’. It also contained the metrics for General Managers and below. The new metrics consist on: ‘All participants: Financial = 50%; Strategic = 50% (including 10% on safety index); Individual modifier = +/-25% of scorecard based on values, behaviours and delivery of results; 10% deduction is applied to the total scorecard in the event of fatalities’. It also explains changes in ‘Positioning of business performance’ and ‘Positioning of individual performance’. However, although the Company uses ‘discretion’ in its Remuneration Policy, and it shows evidence that Executive Board incentives have been compromised by performance, and that there has been short-term incentive plan redesign, no evidence found that it has reviewed other Board performance incentives to specifically to ensure coherence with its human rights policy commitment (this subindicator looks for evidence that the Company has reviewed that other incentives are not conflicting with human rights). [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Annual Report 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p>
A.2.4	Business model strategy and risks	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Board process to review business model and strategy for HRs risks: The Company indicates: ‘The Sustainability Committee has overarching accountability for our approach to human rights. [...] Our Group Internal Audit (GIA) team reviewed the design of our modern slavery controls and presented summary observations and opportunities to the Sustainability Committee in October 2022. The internal audit identified opportunities to enhance management of third-party risks across non-financial domains (including modern slavery); to improve governance over the management of modern slavery risk; and to further improve Board visibility of modern slavery disclosures. This was part of a three-year phased approach to provide assurance across our human rights programme. [...] We also reframed the scope of work of our Sustainability Committee. The Committee will split its time between the critical task of closely monitoring our shorter-term environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance (including safety and tailings), while at the same time considering longer-term strategic issues on sustainability. Finally, in support of the objective to strengthen our social licence, we have stepped up our plans as a Board for stakeholder engagement in 2023 and beyond. Separately, we are also considering how we can bring additional and dedicated focus to enhancing the Group’s social licence in key strategic countries’. It adds: ‘The Board is ultimately responsible for risk management and internal controls, and for ensuring that the systems in place are robust and take into account the principal risks faced by the Group. The Board delegates certain matters relating to the Group’s risk management framework to the Audit &amp; Risk Committee, which provides updates to the Board on matters discussed at each meeting. The Sustainability Committee advises the Board on risk appetite tolerance and strategy with respect to sustainable development risks’. The Company has provided comments to CHRB including further information on its stakeholder engagement and its Sustainability Committee activities during the last reporting year. However, this subindicator looks for a description 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. Current evidence found refers to how the Company reviews its sustainability management system and controls (including HR), not how it adapts or reviews business model due to Human rights risks. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes frequency and triggers for reviewing business model: The Company has provided comments to CHRB including information on its Sustainability Committee activities during the last reporting year. However, this</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>subindicator looks for a description of the frequency of and the triggers for reviewing its business model or strategy and potential impacts on human rights. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1</li> <li>• Not Met: Example of actions resulting from reviews: The Company has provided comments to CHRB including information on matters discussed in 2022 at Board level and activities carried out by the Sustainability Committee during the last reporting year. However, no example found of an action taken as a result of a discussion and review of its business model and strategy for inherent risks to human rights at Board level or a Board committee. The Company is expected to provide an example that reflects a change in business model or strategy because of specific human rights risk. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

## B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence (25% of Total)

### B.1 Embedding Respect for Human Rights in Company Culture and Management Systems (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a</li> <li>• Met: Senior responsibility for HRs implementation and decision making: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: 'Our Executive Committee has cross-functional and multi-product group accountability for managing modern slavery risks. This includes management of the functions responsible for our overall human rights approach and broader communities and social performance; third-party due diligence, business integrity and external stakeholder engagement; projects; procurement; sales and marketing; and marine and logistics, led respectively under the leadership of Chief Executive Australia, Chief Legal Officer &amp; External Affairs, Chief Technical Officer and Chief Commercial Officer'. The 'owner' of the Human Rights policy is the 'Global Head of Communities and Social Performance'. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes day-to-day responsibility for implementing HRs commitments: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: 'Human Rights specialists in our Communities and Social Performance Area of Expertise have day-to-day oversight of our overall human rights approach, including in relation to modern slavery and supporting functions and product groups as they implement our commitments'. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own operations: The Company provided an example of resources and expertise for the day-to-day management of relevant human rights issues, in its webpage section Human Rights: 'Our Group Internal Audit (GIA) team reviewed the design of our modern slavery controls and presented summary observations and opportunities to the Sustainability Committee in October 2022. The internal audit identified opportunities to enhance management of third-party risks across non-financial domains (including modern slavery); to improve governance over the management of modern slavery risk; and to further improve Board visibility of modern slavery disclosures. This was part of a three-year phased approach to provide assurance across our human rights programme'. Moreover, 'In 2022, we enhanced our in-house human rights expertise by establishing a dedicated human rights team within the Communities and Social Performance Area of Expertise'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Resources and expertise allocation with EX BPs: The Company explains its Joint Venture and suppliers' expectations and well as its recognition of the importance of engaging our business partners on rights-respecting treatment of human rights defenders relating to its activities. It adds that it integrates human rights into the business through risk management, impact assessment and incident reporting processes, grievance mechanisms and training and that it prioritises actions around human rights salient risks. It also makes reference to the 2022 Annual Report, which notes: 'Rio Tinto participates on the boards of Halco and CBG, with representation on various shareholder oversight committees. Through our Board and committee roles, we monitor and support CBG's approach to environmental protection, community issues and human rights'. However, this indicator looks for information on how it allocates resources and expertise for the day-to-day management of relevant human rights issues within its supply chain. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Senior manager incentives linked to HRs commitments: The 2022 Annual Report indicates its Remuneration Policy applicable to the Company's executives. In 2022, it included a Short-term incentive plan (STIP). ESG performance represented 35% of its overall performance criterion and out of it, safety represented 20% of it. It expands on its STIP measures: 'Safety measures make up 20% and include a standalone binary fatality measure (40%), with the remainder split between all-injury frequency rate (AIFR) (20%) and measures relating to our safety maturity model (SMM) (40%)'. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&amp;S: The 2022 Annual Report indicates that the Strategic scorecard for the 2023 STIP includes a 'Safety Index 10%: All-injury frequency rate (AIFR) as a lag indicator and safety maturity (SMM) of our assets as a lead indicator which includes maturity of safety leadership including psychological safety with conformance to GISTM (global tailings standard) as an underpin'. It also includes: 'Diversity 5% Improving representation of women in our company'. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public: See above. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Review of other senior management incentives for coherence with HRs policies: The 2022 Annual Report indicates that 'Discretion' is part of its Remuneration Policy. It 'Ensures pay outcomes reflect the Group's overall performance and risk appetite', which implies: 'The Committee reserves the right to review all remuneration outcomes arising from mechanistic application of performance conditions and to exercise discretion to make adjustments where such outcomes do not properly reflect underlying performance or the experience of shareholders or other stakeholders. The Committee may at its discretion adjust and/or set different performance measures if events occur which cause the Committee to determine that the measures are no longer appropriate or in the best interests of shareholders or other stakeholders, and that amendment is required so that the measures, as far as possible, achieve their original purpose. Such discretion will be exercised judiciously and clearly disclosed and explained in the Implementation report'. In the light of the destruction of the Juukan Gorge, the 2020 Annual Report notes: 'Following the events that occurred at the Juukan Gorge, the Board conducted a review of our cultural heritage management processes, procedures, reporting and governance. [...] The Board concluded that the Chief Executive, Chief Executive Iron Ore and Group Executive Corporate Relations were however ultimately responsible for implementing fit for purpose management systems and would not therefore receive any 2020 short-term bonus. In addition, for the Chief Executive, a further reduction of £1 million would be applied to the vesting of his 2016 long term incentive plan (LTIP) award'. As for its Everyday Respect task force [related to different forms of workplace discrimination], launched in 2021, the 2021 Annual Report explains: 'In recognition of the findings in the Everyday Respect report, the management team recommended that a downward adjustment be made to the 2021 STIP payments. The Committee concluded that a reduction of 5% should be applied to the total STIP payment for current Executive Committee members and an equivalent adjustment be made to the 2020 unvested Bonus Deferral Awards (BDA) held by former Executive Committee members. The STIP for 2022 will also include objectives linked to the recommendations arising in the report'. The Company has been going through a short-term incentive plan redesign [for the year 2023]. It notes: 'In 2022, we undertook a review of our incentives and performance</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>management framework grounded in a belief that to deliver our ambitious strategy, we need to change the way we work. We believe there is an opportunity for incentives to be aligned to our strategic priorities that focuses as much on “how” we deliver as well as “what” we deliver, and to be more engaging so that they are better understood by participants. We are moving to a much simpler design, where the STIP for approximately 24,000 employees will be based upon one Group scorecard rather than the diversified scorecards previously operated across the business – this aligns the goals of all STIP participants which will aid the business in its pursuit of financial success driven by our four objectives. The new STIP design maintains the existing weighting and measures on our Group financials while aligning with our four objectives – achieving impeccable ESG, excel in development, best operator and social licence – as well as people and culture’. It discloses the key areas of change and the rationale for the change. The old performance metrics were: ‘Executive Committee and Managing Directors: Financial = 50%; ESG (safety) = 12%; ESG (fatality) = 8%; ESG (other) = 15%; Individual = 15%’. It also contained the metrics for General Managers and below. The new metrics consist on: ‘All participants: Financial = 50%; Strategic = 50% (including 10% on safety index); Individual modifier = +/-25% of scorecard based on values, behaviours and delivery of results; 10% deduction is applied to the total scorecard in the event of fatalities’. It also explains changes in ‘Positioning of business performance’ and ‘Positioning of individual performance’. However, although the Company uses ‘discretion’ in its Remuneration Policy, and it shows evidence that Executive Board incentives have been compromised by performance, and that there has been short-term incentive plan redesign, no evidence found that it has reviewed other Board performance incentives to specifically to ensure coherence with its human rights policy commitment (this subindicator looks for evidence that the Company has reviewed that other incentives are not conflicting with human rights). [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Annual Report 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p>
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: HRs risks integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The 2022 Annual Report discloses the principal risks and uncertainties ‘that could materially affect (negatively or positively) our ability to meet our strategic objectives’. The principal risks include: Building trusted relationships with Indigenous peoples; Building trusted relationships with communities; Preventing fatalities, permanent disablements and illness from a major hazard or safety event’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Provides an example: Regarding to its ‘Building trusted relationships with Indigenous peoples’ risk, it indicates some of its management response: ‘Strengthened consultation, meaningful engagement, and free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) processes. Set clear guidance on how we should conduct our business, no matter where we work or where we are from, through our updated Code of Conduct - The Way We Work (launched in early 2023), communities and social performance standard, and Human Rights Policy’. As for its ‘Building trusted relationships with communities’ risk it indicates some of its responses: ‘Strengthened community engagement through appropriately resourced and skilled Communities and Social Performance (CSP) teams, and clear accountability for relationships with host communities residing with the asset leader. [...] Implemented our revised Human Rights Policy and communities and social performance standard. [...] Implemented human rights due diligence to improve our understanding of potential harms and to mitigate their occurrence wherever possible’. Finally, it discloses some of its management responses for ‘Preventing fatalities, permanent disablements, and illness from a major hazard or safety event’: ‘Reported, investigated and shared learnings from Health, Safety, Environment and Security (HSES) incidents, such as PFIs, across the Group. We monitor HSES performance at the Group level monthly and discuss trends and actions at the quarterly Safety and Operations Committee’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Risk assesment by Audit Committee or independent third party: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: ‘In consultation with the Human Rights team, Group Internal Audit [GIA] developed a multi-year approach to provide greater assurance over our human rights and modern slavery risks.[...] Review of the design of modern slavery controls. 2022/23 – Review of human rights risk identification, assessment and documentation. A summary of observations and opportunities from the 2022 modern slavery controls design internal audit was presented to the Sustainability Committee in October 2022. The internal audit</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>identified opportunities to enhance management of third-party risks across non-financial domains (including modern slavery); to improve governance over the management of modern slavery risk; and to further improve Board visibility of modern slavery disclosures. We continue to implement the actions from the internal audit and provide further assurance over our human rights governance framework. This multi-year approach to assurance is one way to leverage specialist risk and assurance expertise as we continue to refine and identify new opportunities to integrate and operationalise human rights due diligence across the Group'. The 2022 Annual Report notes: 'The Audit &amp; Risk Committee monitors the independence and effectiveness of the Internal Audit function and external auditors'. The main duties of the Committee include: 'we oversee the work of GIA, and its head, who reports functionally to our Committee Chair'. However, although the Audit &amp; Risk Committee monitors the work of GIA, no evidence found it oversaw the human rights related reviews above mentioned [as the Sustainability Committee seems to have been in charge of it]. The methodology requires that the assessment is either overseen by the Board Audit Committee or conducted by an independent third party during the Company's last reporting year. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p>
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to workers and external stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a</li> <li>• Met: Communicates HRs policies to all workers in own operations: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'As human rights issues are complex, and not always readily apparent, we build our employees' understanding through general and tailored training. All our sites are required to provide human rights training to staff, contractors and visitors'. Local languages are assumed in training. See below further details on communication of policies to the Company's own employees. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to stakeholders: Although the Company indicates that visitors are also able to receive human rights training, it is not clear covers it affected stakeholders, including local communities and other groups. Moreover, the 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: 'In 2021 we regularly provided face-to-face training to our communities and social performance practitioners (CSP) including information on modern slavery. In 2021, we provided training to 109 colleagues in nine countries'. The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement notes: 'As part of our plan to operationalise our updated Human Rights Policy, we launched an internal campaign to promote greater awareness of human rights within the business. [...] In 2022, we shared our updated Human Rights Policy commitments with civil society organisations, investors and other interested stakeholders'. It includes information on work carried out on human rights with its workers and how it engages with its suppliers, through its SRM [Supplier Relationship Management]. However, although the Company indicates it provides training modern slavery, and trains its workers, this subindicator focuses on how its policy is communicated to affected stakeholders, including local communities and other groups. It points out that it has shared its updated Human Rights Policy commitments with civil society organisations, however, no further description of how it took place, and it is not clear it includes local communities. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Example of how HRs policies are accessible for intended audience: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement notes: 'As part of our plan to operationalise our updated Human Rights Policy, we launched an internal campaign to promote greater awareness of human rights within the business. Our initiatives included a video campaign with our employees speaking personally about what human rights means to them, a human rights safety share pack for leaders to use to start a discussion about human rights at our operations, and newsletter updates, among other things. During our campaign, we referred to labour rights and modern slavery as a salient human rights issue across the business. We also used this campaign as an opportunity to raise awareness about the launch of our global human rights e-learning modern slavery training model. [...] In 2022, we shared our updated Human Rights Policy commitments with civil society organisations, investors and other interested stakeholders. Their feedback indicated support for the updated commitment on human rights defenders, clearer accountabilities and focus on the implementation of the Policy'. Moreover, 'Our SRM [Supplier Relationship Management] engagements include regular meetings that are embedded for the life of the contract with key suppliers to collaboratively drive values as part of a</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>two-way relationship. SRMs are a key mechanism to initiate human rights and modern slavery discussions with our suppliers. In 2022 we focused on strengthening processes and awareness to support supplier relationship owners to initiate due diligence and embed consistent supplier engagement. We also carried out five SRMs across the mining equipment and contracted labour categories. In 2023, we will continue the delivery of our SRM engagements across the identified suppliers, which will: Encourage two-way dialogue on modern slavery and human rights risk. Communicate our human rights due diligence expectations. Highlight and share best practice. Discuss opportunities for further supply chain transparency. The Human Rights and Procurement teams are equipping supplier relationship owners to lead these conversations regularly as part of scheduled SRMs, so that we can better understand our supplier risk profiles and leverage industry best practice with our key suppliers'. However, this subindicator looks for an example of how it ensures the form and frequency of the information communicated is accessible to its intended audience and it should include local communities and potentially affected stakeholders. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p>
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a</li> <li>• Met: Describes steps to communicate HRs policies to EX BPs: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: 'Our SRM [Supplier Relationship Management] engagements include regular meetings that are embedded for the life of the contract with key suppliers to collaboratively drive values as part of a two-way relationship. SRMs are a key mechanism to initiate human rights and modern slavery discussions with our suppliers. In 2022 we focused on strengthening processes and awareness to support supplier relationship owners to initiate due diligence and embed consistent supplier engagement. We also carried out five SRMs across the mining equipment and contracted labour categories. In 2023, we will continue the delivery of our SRM engagements across the identified suppliers, which will: Encourage two-way dialogue on modern slavery and human rights risk. Communicate our human rights due diligence expectations. Highlight and share best practice. Discuss opportunities for further supply chain transparency. The Human Rights and Procurement teams are equipping supplier relationship owners to lead these conversations regularly as part of scheduled SRMs, so that we can better understand our supplier risk profiles and leverage industry best practice with our key suppliers'. However, it is not clear how the Company actively communicates its human rights policy commitments to its extractive business partners. The Company has provided an additional source to CHRB regarding this indicator. Also, the 2021 MS statement indicates that 'We share our expectations about human rights with joint venture partners through appropriate contractual arrangements and engagement protocols. [...] We expect our consultants, agents, contractors and suppliers to respect internationally recognised human rights and promote compliance via our SCOC and contractual arrangements'. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes how HRs policies are contractual/binding for suppliers: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: 'We share our expectations about human rights with joint venture partners through appropriate contractual arrangements and engagement protocols. [...] We expect our consultants, agents, contractors and suppliers to respect internationally recognised human rights and promote compliance via our SCOC and contractual arrangements'. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Requires EX BPs to cascade contractual/binding HRs policies to their BPs: See above, the Human Rights is a contractual requirement for suppliers. Moreover, the Supplier Code of Conduct adds: 'sets our expectations of you, your subsidiaries and subcontractors'. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery adds: 'Our KYTP [Know your third party procedure] procedure requires known subcontractors or sub-agents to complete baseline screening. Where the supplier is using subcontractors or sub-agents to perform a significant amount of work on their behalf, further due diligence may be required'. The screening includes Human Rights risks. However, it is not clear that this KYTP screening is a contractual responsibility of extractive business partners to conduct with their own business partners. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery notes: 'Our Supplier Code of Conduct (SCOC) [...] sets out our human rights expectations of suppliers, their subsidiaries and subcontractors, which includes committing to: [...] Encouraging their subcontractors to adopt and promote the commitments in the SCOC'.</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>However, 'encouraging' is not considered evidence that the SCOC is binding. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources. In order to meet the requirement of this indicator, the Company is expected to demonstrate it requires business partners to cascade the contractual or other binding requirements down their supply chain. Alternatively, the Company could disclose specific requirements ensuring that they will be held accountable of their own business partners performance. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p>
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a</li> <li>• Met: Describes how workers are trained on HRs policy commitments: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'As human rights issues are complex, and not always readily apparent, we build our employees' understanding through general and tailored training. All our sites are required to provide human rights training to staff, contractors and visitors'. Moreover, the 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery adds: 'Our online Group-wide human rights training programme includes information on labour rights, including modern slavery'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Trains relevant managers including security on HRs: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: '2021 our training course in line with the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPSHR) was mandatory for all private security personnel, including Rio Tinto security personnel, and provided to public security providers. In 2021, this training was updated to include a modern slavery module. More information is available on our website and our annual report on VPSHR implementation'. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a</li> <li>• Met: Meets both requirements under score 1</li> <li>• Met: Trains BPs to meet HRs commitments: See above, the Company indicates, in its Human Rights webpage that 'All our sites are required to provide human rights training to staff, contractors and visitors'. The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement discloses details of training programmes, including: 'We launched a new e-module on modern slavery and labour rights, with a focus on supply chains. Over 2,400 completions were recorded. See the case study below for more information about the development and the outcomes of this training'. It also discloses information on a training programme to the crew members of Anglo-Eastern and ASP Ship Management [managed by Rio Tinto-owned vessels]. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Discloses % suppliers trained: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: 'We provide face-to-face training to officers and crew members of Anglo-Eastern and ASP Ship Management Singapore Pte Ltd which manage Rio Tinto-owned vessels. In 2022, 185 crew, officers and shore team attended these workshops where the focus was on promoting effective grievance management and encouraging officers and crew to know, trust and use the range of grievance mechanisms available'. However, this subindicator looks for the percentage of business partners trained on human rights commitments. No further evidence found. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a</li> <li>• Met: Monitors implementation of HRs policy commitments across global ops and EX BPs: The webpage section Value Chain indicates: 'We are improving our knowledge of suppliers through enhanced due diligence and ongoing monitoring'. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery adds: 'We may decide to inspect or audit a supplier's premises and/or records at different stages of our relationship. This includes situations when we identify risks as part of the KYTP [know your third party procedure] procedure, as part of prequalification in some locations or if issues arise during the term of the contract. The Company also indicates that it has 'risk management framework includes human rights categories'. The Why Human Rights Matter guide the Company notes: 'CSP site managed assessments (SMA) ensure our businesses comply with our Communities standard and legislative requirements. The process evaluates the performance of a site against a number of</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>key performance areas [...]. It is an evaluation owned by the site and is intended to identify any actual or potential issues and areas for improvement. It is conducted regularly, usually every three years, and/or at key phases of the project cycle. It may also be initiated by special circumstances such as an allegation of a serious human rights abuse. [...] Our Communities standard requires that we develop and regularly update a 'fit for purpose' knowledge base. 'Fit for purpose' means that the project or operation has sound understanding of the social, cultural, environmental, economic and legal context within which it operates, including the conditions, trends, and social interactions, and likely social and human rights impacts'. [Value Chain_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Discloses % of EX BP's monitored</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes how workers are involved in monitoring</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes corrective actions process: The Why Human Rights Matter guide the Company notes: 'Corrective action should be taken where needed. [...] Monitoring and evaluation of human rights impacts and performance is essential in order to: [...] determine the cause, and provide a basis for corrective actions if our procedures, plans and activities are ineffective'. The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: 'In 2022, we supported the launch of the Walk Free and Human Rights Resources and Energy Collaborative (HREC) Response and Remedy Framework. This is a practical guide for companies on how to respond to modern slavery in their operations and supply chains, including suggested processes of providing a remedy for an adverse human rights impact and steps that can be taken to mitigate that impact or prevent the harm from reoccurring. We will use this framework to inform the ongoing development and improvement of our own policies and procedures and raise the profile of this guidance in our training initiatives in 2023'. However, this framework seems to cover only modern slavery issues. 'Following an internal review in 2021 that identified opportunities to improve our grievance mechanisms and management, in 2022, we updated our Complaints and Grievance Management guidance. Launched in February 2023, this guidance helps assets improve the way they receive, record, respond, review, remedy, resolve and report community grievances, including grievances with alleged human rights impacts. The guidance directs practitioners to forward any complaint or grievance alleging serious human rights abuse (including child labour, trafficking, or other forms of modern slavery) to the Business Conduct Office and myVoice'. The guidance could not be found. No description found of corrective action process. This indicator looks for the standard process (including steps) it has in place to implement corrective action plans where non-compliances are found as part of the monitoring process. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Discloses findings and number of correction action processes: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: 'In 2022, we received 1,459 reports through myVoice channels (up from 1,246 reports in 2021). Of these cases, 63% were substantiated, including 77 cases which were reports received in 2021. Issues raised through myVoice related to discrimination, bullying, harassment, sexual misconduct and sexual harassment, employee relations and benefits and compensation. In 2022, we received six reports relating to labour practices. All six investigations are ongoing. A number of reports involving suppliers related to alleged conflicts of interest between suppliers and employees. We are not aware of any modern slavery-related issues raised via myVoice or any asset level mechanism in 2022'. However, this subindicator looks for findings and number of corrective action process as a result of the monitoring rather than its grievance mechanism [which is assessed in a different part of the research]. The Company has provided additional information regarding this subindicator, where it discloses the findings of its Everyday Respect report. However, as indicated previously, this subindicator focuses on findings from monitoring processes and the number of corrective action processes that followed. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Report into Work Place Culture, 01/02/2022: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
B.1.7	Engaging and terminating business relationships	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: HRs performance affects selection EX BPs: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: 'we screen all new joint venture partners for human rights under the KYTP [Know your third party procedure] procedure. [...] We prohibit engagement with "very high" risk suppliers. [...] For new suppliers rated "high" or "medium" risk, the business may decide not to proceed based on the risk profile'. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: HRs performance affects ongoing BPs relationships: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: Where an existing supplier has an updated risk rating to “high” or “medium”, our preferred approach is to work with suppliers to address human rights risks; terminating a relationship is generally our last resort. However, where risks cannot be sufficiently mitigated through our leverage, or where the supplier refuses to provide information or provides incomplete or inaccurate information to support our human rights due diligence, we will consider terminating the relationship. [...] In cases where an existing supplier has an updated risk rating to “very high” risk, the KYTP procedure requires us to take steps to terminate the relationship’. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describes positive HRs incentives for business relationships</li> <li>• Met: Works with EX BPs to meet HRs requirements: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates that 'In 2022 we introduced human rights and modern slavery topics into contract performance discussions with our top suppliers. This enabled ongoing dialogue with our strategic and high-spend suppliers through the Supplier Relationship Management (SRM) plan – a way to introduce human rights and modern slavery topics into performance conversations with our top suppliers. [...] ‘Our SRM [Supplier Relationship Management] engagements include regular meetings that are embedded for the life of the contract with key suppliers to collaboratively drive values as part of a two-way relationship. SRMs are a key mechanism to initiate human rights and modern slavery discussions with our suppliers. In 2022 we focused on strengthening processes and awareness to support supplier relationship owners to initiate due diligence and embed consistent supplier engagement. We also carried out five SRMs across the mining equipment and contracted labour categories. In 2023, we will continue the delivery of our SRM engagements across the identified suppliers, which will: Encourage two-way dialogue on modern slavery and human rights risk. Communicate our human rights due diligence expectations. Highlight and share best practice. Discuss opportunities for further supply chain transparency. The Human Rights and Procurement teams are equipping supplier relationship owners to lead these conversations regularly as part of scheduled SRMs, so that we can better understand our supplier risk profiles and leverage industry best practice with our key suppliers’. Finally, ‘We launched a new e-module on modern slavery and labour rights, with a focus on supply chains. Over 2,400 completions were recorded. See the case study below for more information about the development and the outcomes of this training’. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with affected stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes how workers and communities identified and engaged in the last two years: The Human Rights Policy states: ‘Wherever we operate, we engage with communities and other stakeholders, including civil society and workers’ organisations, to understand how we may impact on human rights. We prioritise consultation with potentially affected people and pay particular attention to impacts we could have on at-risk, marginalised or vulnerable groups’. The webpage section Communities indicates: ‘Our communities and social performance standard defines the way we engage communities’. The 2022 Annual Report discloses its different stakeholder groups and ‘explains how the Board takes account of stakeholder interests’. The webpage section Juukan Gorge notes: ‘In November 2022 we signed a remedy agreement with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Aboriginal Corporation and agreed to create the Juukan Gorge Legacy Foundation’. It includes: workforce, communities and suppliers. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery also discloses how it engages with key stakeholders to on Human Rights, it includes ‘Engaging with worker representatives’. The Why Agreements Matter guide the Company indicates that ‘Identifying relevant parties [...] involves engaging with land-connected groups and their chosen representatives. These include: Indigenous peoples with customary land connections in the area, Indigenous peoples with historic connections to the area; people with contemporary connections to the area [...]; all land owners and claimants, especially those who are likely to be affected by activities; those whose land rights, interests and formal claims may be impacted’. It also has a procedure for ‘Identifying parties to an agreement in diverse communities’. [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Communities_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders: As indicated above, the webpage section Juukan Gorge notes: ‘In November 2022 we signed a remedy agreement with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Aboriginal Corporation and agreed to create the Juukan Gorge Legacy Foundation’. Moreover,</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>The Iron Ore Heritage Management team has been working with Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Traditional Owners and Specialist Heritage consultants to plan the re-excavation since mid-2021. [...] Throughout our journey with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people, they have graciously shared their knowledge to ensure our remediation efforts deliver the best possible outcomes'. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Analysis of stakeholder views on company's HRs issues: The document Communities and Social Performance Commitment Disclosure, discloses the feedback given by Traditional Owners of their views of the Company's progress on their commitments related to managing Indigenous cultural heritage, especially in the light of the destruction in the Juukan Gorge. However, the Company is expected to provide either a summary of stakeholders' views on Company's human rights or at least two case studies. The 2022 Annual Report indicates: 'Our senior leaders regularly engage with CSOs [civil society organisations], and although our opinions may differ from time to time, we respect their views and value the challenges they set for us to improve performance across our business. We hold yearly roundtable discussions with CSOs in Australia, Europe and North America. In 2022, one of the key topics of discussion was our role in the world's transition to a low-carbon future'. Other topics of importance for the CSOs in 2022 include: Water management, Cultural heritage protection, Indigenous economic advancement, and community consultation and consent. Human rights and modern slavery. However, although the Company discloses topics of importance to CSOs, no summary analysis of the input/views given found. [Communities and Social Performance Commitment Disclosure, 10/2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes how stakeholders views influenced company's HRs approach: See above. Although the Company indicates senior leaders engage with CSOs, no description found of how these views have influenced the development or monitoring of its human rights approach. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying human rights risks and impacts	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes process of identifying risks in own operations: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'In 2022, several assets, including Simandou, Oyu Tolgoi and those in Gladstone, Queensland, Australia undertook risk assessments to review their priority human rights issues. [...] In line with the UNGPs, we undertake human rights due diligence to identify [...] adverse human rights impacts with which we may be involved. Human rights due diligence comprises four elements: identifying and assessing our impacts; integrating the findings from those assessments into relevant internal functions and processes and taking appropriate action; tracking the effectiveness of our response; and communicating how impacts are addressed'. Moreover, 'In 2021, we updated our salient human rights issues. This was informed by workshops with our product groups where we assessed potential human rights impacts and undertook a severity analysis in line with the UNGPs [...]. These workshops also provided an opportunity to conduct human rights refresher sessions with our teams, helping ensure we were starting with similar foundational knowledge and reinforcing our human rights commitments'. See below further description. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Describes process for identifying risks in EX BPs: The webpage section Value Chain indicates: 'We are improving our knowledge of suppliers through enhanced due diligence and ongoing monitoring'. The Code of Conduct adds: 'We are committed to responsible sourcing. During the supplier due diligence process, we consider the working conditions, environmental practices, safety standards and human rights policies of our higher risk suppliers and their supply chains'. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery notes: 'In 2021, we built on the labour rights risk assessment to define our risk-based supplier due diligence approach, with a focus on risk of labour exploitation to people and risk to Rio Tinto. Our approach is captured in our Responsible Sourcing Action Plan. The plan is informed by a cross-functional team including Ethics &amp; Compliance, Procurement, Logistics and Human Rights and continues to evolve'. [Value Chain_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Code of Conduct, 02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes global risk identification system incl. stakeholder consultation: See above. Also, the webpage section Human Rights indicates 'In line with the human rights due diligence process set out in the UNGPs, we manage our salient human rights issues through ongoing risk management processes. These aim to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how we address any involvement in adverse human rights impacts'. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery adds: 'To inform our labour rights risk assessment and in maintaining up-to-date high-risk country and activity lists for the KTYP [Know your third party procedure] procedure, we consider a range of labour rights indices. These include resources from the Walk Free Foundation, the United Nations and the United States Department of Labor, as well as proprietary audit data from the third-party provider that conducted the labour rights risk assessment'. It also notes: 'The ongoing dialogue between our Human Rights specialists and relevant functions and sites on modern slavery continues to help build internal capacity and strengthen the implementation of the KYTP procedure'. The Why Agreements Matter guide the Company indicates that in order to carry out due diligence process it should: 'Ensure that diverse voices of both women and men are heard and that vulnerable and 'at risk' groups can participate in engagement processes'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Describes how risk identification system is triggered by new circumstances: In the Why Human Rights Matter guide the Company discloses the 'New country entry' procedure to 'Integrating human rights due diligence through the project lifecycle'. Its explanation includes: 'Identify key human rights exposures based on the political, cultural and social context. Identify all vulnerable and 'at risk' groups. Engage with them inclusively at all stages. Review knowledge base on human rights-related country risk (available from External Affairs, including internal Prospect portal) and apply recommendations, according to project scope. Consider commissioning targeted country risk assessment'. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery adds: 'During the year, we focused our due diligence efforts on new suppliers in high-risk service categories and high-risk countries'. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes risks identified in relation to new circumstances: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: 'During 2022, our Commercial, Legal, Third-Party Risk Management and Human Rights teams developed a holistic decision-making framework for reviewing environmental, social and governance (ESG) risks and applied a risk-based approach to undertake enhanced due diligence on selected renewables suppliers, including solar panel providers. We created a Third-Party Risk Management Committee comprising senior executives to oversee this framework and support consistent, high-quality decision making. To meet evolving market conditions, social expectations and regulatory obligations, we have recently bolstered our in-house expertise in our Commercial, Third-Party Risk Management and Human Rights teams. To deliver on our commitment to transparency and strong governance, we also updated our Group Human Rights Policy, Communities and Social Performance Standard as well as our third-party risk management procedures [...]. We also delivered enhanced training for those operating in higher risk roles on the changing regulatory landscape alongside a newly launched e-module on modern slavery [...]. Responsible conduct in this space can be a challenging and complex issue, and we remain committed to engaging and collaborating with all third parties to advance respect for internationally recognised human rights'. This subindicator looks for evidence of risks identified in relation to new circumstances that triggered specific identification processes. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Describes assessment process and discloses salient HRs risks: When it enters in a new country or identifies terrains with geological potential it takes the following considerations: 'Identify key human rights exposures based on the political, cultural and social context. Identify vulnerable and 'at risk' groups. Engage with them inclusively at all stages'. Then, it develops and 'early stage business case' including the following considerations: 'review knowledge base on human rights-related country risk and apply recommendations. In carrying out the analysis, consider the need for a dedicated human rights risk analysis. [...] Ensure the project is compliant with the VPSHR and other relevant voluntary commitments including those related to resettlement plans and free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous peoples'. Assessments also included in the other stages of the project. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes how process applies to EX BPs: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: ‘Modern slavery can occur in every country. However, to prioritise our actions, our labour rights risk assessment [...] identified a targeted list of 28 higher-risk countries where our suppliers operate in or are incorporated; representing 10% of our contestable spend. The ten highest-risk countries represent 0.6% of our contestable spend in 2021. Our Third-Party Due Diligence (TPDD) team maintains systems classifying country risk and monitor country risk classifications throughout the year based on external developments’. It adds: ‘Our know your third party procedure (KYTP) provides the overarching due diligence process for our third-party risk management across our business and supply chains. The procedure is designed to identify a variety of responsible business conduct risks, including human rights’. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Public disclosure of results of HRs risk assessment: The Company discloses its salient Human Rights issues: ‘These issues, [...] consider our operational footprint, value chain and external contexts and remain unchanged from 2021: Land access and use; Indigenous peoples’ rights; Security; Inclusion and diversity; Community health, safety and wellbeing; Workplace health and safety; Labour rights (including modern slavery); Climate change and just transition (respecting human rights while transitioning to a low-carbon economy)’. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Meets all requirements under score 1</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes how assessment involved affected stakeholders: The guide Why Human Rights Matter discloses questions that may be asked when considering human rights in a social risk analysis, for instance: ‘Is there sufficient internal expertise to understand our human rights risk, including through engaging with affected stakeholders as part of developing our knowledge base?’. It also includes a checklist to consider when integrating human rights considerations into community initiatives, with items such as: ‘Do planned activities involve inclusive engagement with communities?’ and ‘Do communication strategies enable participation, dialogue and engagement on an ongoing basis?’. The Communities and Social Performance Standard adds: ‘In undertaking SIA, assets must: [...] Engage with, and seek the joint participation, of affected people and communities in all stages of the impact assessment process; [...] Provide the full report or a summary of the SIA report to people, communities and other stakeholders who participated in, and/or were the subject of, the SIA’. However, although the Company indicates it should engage with affected stakeholders in SIAs and it has guiding questions that ensure they are engaged, no further description found of how affected stakeholders are actually involved in the assessment process. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Communities and Social Performance Standard, 08/2022: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Describes system to prevent, mitigate and remediate HRs issues: The document Why human rights matter guide indicates: ‘Human rights exposures identified in knowledge base studies, risk analyses and impact assessments need to be integrated into project-level policies, plans and procedures at every stage of a project lifecycle. This needs to be included within CSP [Communities and Social Performance] multi-year plans, as well as at the programme level for specific community initiatives. Human rights should also be considered across a number of discipline areas, including human resources, procurement and health and safety’. It discloses a plan checklist. [...] Each of our projects and operations must have a CSP multi-year plan (MYP) based on business objectives, and a robust analysis of community issues, risks and priorities (see Rio Tinto’s Communities and social performance multi-year planning guidance). These plans define mutually agreed initiatives with local communities, as well as identifying resource requirements, objectives, targets and indicators to achieve them. The plans assign specific responsibility for achieving objectives and targets to the appropriate management level and functional department. Multi-year plans should address human rights risks, impacts and opportunities that have been identified through knowledge base assessments. Any significant human rights risks or impacts should be recorded. Annual updates of our multi-year plans provide an opportunity to reflect on, learn from and respond to any changes in the human rights context as the project progresses through its lifecycle’. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Describes how global system applies to EX BPs: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: ‘In 2021, we built on the labour rights risk assessment to</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>define our risk-based supplier due diligence approach, with a focus on risk of labour exploitation to people and risk to Rio Tinto. Our approach is captured in our Responsible Sourcing Action Plan. The plan is informed by a cross-functional team including Ethics &amp; Compliance, Procurement, Logistics and Human Rights and continues to evolve. [...] Regardless of how the risks are identified, the TPDD [Third-Party Due Diligence] team escalates any human rights concerns to our Human Rights specialists. Our Human Rights specialists work with the TPDD team and the supplier relationship owner to recommend and agree on an appropriate response, including any mitigation actions'. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HRs issue: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: 'Our communities and social performance work, including Regional Economic Development (RED), is a mechanism to address the root causes of modern slavery in such communities. For example, at our Simandou iron ore project in Guinea, we have been working with communities to help them prepare for construction and future operations by identifying and managing our impacts. To address the risk of in-migration, we are designing and delivering local social investment and RED programmes with a focus on growth of non-mining economic opportunities, social infrastructure, livelihood restoration and community resilience initiatives'. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Meets all requirements under score 1</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes how stakeholders involved in decisions about actions taken: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator with the example of the Juukan Gorge case, explaining its process to rebuilt the relationship with the Puutu Kuntj Kurrama and Pinikura Aboriginal People. However, this subindicator looks for a description of a system of how it involves affected stakeholders in decisions about the actions to take in response to its salient human rights issues , rather than an example. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to 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"> <li>• Met: Describes system for evaluation effectiveness of actions: In the Why Human Rights Matter guide the Company devotes a section to monitoring and evaluation of actions. It indicates that evaluation is essential in order to identify whether plans are achieving objectives, whether risk mitigation measures are effective and determine cause and provide basis for corrective actions if procedures and plans are ineffective. The Company does this through 'Speak-OUT, the Rio Tinto business solution (RTBS) Incident reporting system [...] technical Evaluation Group reviews and the monitoring undertaking through annual compliance reports and compliance audit forums'. Also, CSP site managed assessments have a diagnostic with a specific key performance area on human rights. 'The findings of each SMA [site managed assessments] are owned by the business unit concerned and the recommendations go to the CEO of that business. Aggregate results are shared throughout Rio Tinto to ensure all business and divisions are aware and learn from them'. The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery adds: 'Since we implemented our updated TPDD questionnaire for new high-risk services suppliers mid-2021, in relation to the Approach to Labour Rights component we have begun to track: the number of questionnaires with corrective actions identified; the number of questionnaires with corrective actions closed out; and emerging key risk themes from the questionnaires to develop proactive approaches to risk mitigation'. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Example of lessons learned from evaluation effectiveness of actions: In its 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery, the Company indicates limitations found while establishing the 'responsible sourcing self-assessment questionnaire ("SAQ") pilot'. The Company also writes on 'Lessons learned from Juukan Gorge' at its webpage. However, none of the examples found are salient Human Rights risks identified during its Human Rights assessments. No example found of the lessons learned while tracking the effectiveness of its actions on at least one of its salient human rights issues as a result of its due diligence process. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator including information on its Everyday Respect project, which aims to address forms of discrimination at workplace. However, no example of the lessons learned while tracking the effectiveness of its actions. It has also made reference to the Juukan Gorge, which was already in use. Finally, some of its contents could not be found in publicly available sources. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1</li> <li>• Not Met: Involves stakeholders in evaluation effectiveness of actions: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator with the example of the Juukan Gorge case, explaining its process to rebuilt the relationship with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Aboriginal People. However, this subindicator looks for a description of a system of how it involves affected stakeholders in evaluations of whether the actions taken have been effective, rather than an example. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
B.2.5	Communicating on human rights impacts	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders: The webpage section Juukan Gorge explains the work done by the Company to address the incident. It includes information on how it engages with the affected communities in its remediation efforts. Regarding the Panguna Mine, in Papua New Guinea, it notes that since 2016, 'stakeholders have continued to raise concerns about impacts to water, land and health. We believe that the Impact Assessment and Committee will provide all parties with a clearer understanding of the impacts, so that we can consider the right way forward in consultation with relevant stakeholders and in line with our external human rights and environmental commitments and internal policies and standards. [...] In September 2020, the Human Rights Law Centre (HRLC), representing 156 residents of villages in the vicinity of the Panguna mine, filed a complaint with the AusNCP against Rio Tinto. The complaint alleges that Rio Tinto is accountable for significant breaches of the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD Guidelines) relating to past and ongoing environmental and human rights impacts allegedly arising from the Panguna mine. The complaint also alleges that, notwithstanding its divestment, Rio Tinto is accountable for remediating these ongoing impacts as it has an ongoing obligation to provide for or cooperate in remediation where it identifies it has caused or contributed to harm. [...] The AusNCP accepted the complaint and Rio Tinto, HRLC and community representatives have been engaging productively through the 'good offices' of the AusNCP since November 2020'. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Update on the Panguna Mine_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describes challenges to effective comms and how it is working to address them: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator disclosing information on the Juukan Gorge case and that a Board review found that it needs to transform its work culture to better reflect its values, and how it is addressing it. It has also made reference to grievances reported in the Panguna Mine. However, this subindicator looks for a description of challenge to effective communication that it may have identified following concerns raised and how it is working to address them. No further evidence found. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Update on the Panguna Mine_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

### C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance mechanism(s) for workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all workers: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: 'Our stakeholders have access to myVoice, our confidential, anonymous and independently operated whistleblowing programme, through which human rights grievances can be reported. [...] In addition to our site-level mechanisms, we have a confidential, anonymous and independently operated whistleblowing programme, myVoice, which is available to all employees and their families, suppliers, contractors, business partners and community members'. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and workers made aware: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement notes: ‘myVoice is available in multiple languages to our workforce, suppliers (and their employees and contractors), community members, other stakeholders and the public’. It also provides further information on grievance mechanism training for 185 officers a crew of some of its owned vessels. The Human Rights Policy states: ‘We integrate human rights into our business including through [...] grievance mechanisms and training. [...] We are committed to providing our workforce, community members affected by our operations, workers in our value chain, and others with access to effective grievance mechanisms’. The 2022 Annual Report adds: ‘Our online business integrity induction training provides all new joiners with an introduction to ethics and compliance as well as the tools they need to recognise and understand business integrity risks’. However, it is not clear that all workers receive this training. Workers receive Human Rights training. However, it is not clear that all workers are informed about grievance mechanisms (or whether the training on human rights includes grievance, as the HR policy does not seem to contain information on its grievance mechanisms, only its commitment to it). No further evidence found. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Describes how workers in EX BPs access grievance mechanism: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: ‘As a supplier to Rio Tinto, you and your workers have access to myVoice, Rio Tinto's confidential and independently operated multilingual whistleblowing service’. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: ‘Suppliers who work with Rio Tinto share our commitment to the principles raised in this Supplier Code of Conduct by adopting and promoting the commitments in the code and encouraging their subcontractors to do the same. [...] As a supplier to Rio Tinto, you and your workers have access to myVoice, Rio Tinto's confidential and independently operated multilingual whistleblowing service. [...] We strongly encourage any supplier (including their workers) who becomes aware of any circumstance or action that may not comply with this Supplier Code of Conduct or Rio Tinto's The way we work to discuss these concerns with their Rio Tinto contact or report it via myVoice’. Although extractive business partners have access to the Company's grievance channel, it is not clear the Company expects its extractive business partners to convey the same expectation on access to grievance mechanism to their own suppliers, as extractive business partners seem to be only ‘encouraged’ to convey the provisions of the Code down to their on suppliers. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all external individuals and communities: The webpage section Human Rights indicates: ‘Our stakeholders have access to myVoice, our confidential, anonymous and independently operated whistleblowing programme, through which human rights grievances can be reported. [...] In addition to our site-level mechanisms, we have a confidential, anonymous and independently operated whistleblowing programme, myVoice, which is available to all employees and their families, suppliers, contractors, business partners and community members’. [Human Rights_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and affected stakeholders made aware: The ethics channel is available in multiple languages. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator where it explains induction Ethics and Compliance training for new joiners. It also discloses the number of workers trained in human rights in 2022. However, it is not clear how the Company ensures all affected external stakeholders at its own operations are made aware of its grievance mechanisms. [Report an Incident - My Voice_web, N/A: <a href="https://app.convercent.com">app.convercent.com</a>] &amp; [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes how external individuals/communities access grievance mechanism: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: ‘As a supplier to Rio Tinto, you and your workers have access to myVoice, Rio Tinto's confidential and independently operated multilingual whistleblowing service. [...] We are committed to a culture of transparency and encourage employees, contractors, suppliers and other stakeholders to speak up about their issues and concerns’. The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement adds: ‘myVoice is available in multiple languages to our</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>workforce, suppliers (and their employees and contractors), community members, other stakeholders and the public'. In its feedback to CHRB, the Company makes reference to the webpage section myVoice. However, it is not clear that external individuals and communities have access to it in order to raise Complaints against the Company's extractive business partners (or to the Company's own mechanism to report in relation to business partners' behaviour). [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: 'We work with partners and suppliers who commit to: [...] Maintain policies and practices to allow violations, misconduct, or grievances to be reported by workers and addressed without fear of retaliation. [...] Suppliers who work with Rio Tinto share our commitment to the principles raised in this Supplier Code of Conduct by adopting and promoting the commitments in the code and encouraging their subcontractors to do the same'. However, it is not clear the Company expects extractive business partners to convey expectations [to have a channel from which external individuals and communities can access to raise Complaints or concerns about human rights issues at the Company's suppliers] on access to grievance mechanism(s) to their suppliers. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the mechanism(s)	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"> <li>• Met: Describes how users engaged on design and performance: Regarding its grievance process, the Why human rights matter guide indicates that 'The scope and scale of the process will vary according to the community context; nevertheless, they should all include consultation with stakeholder groups to ensure that it meets their needs and that they will use it in practice'. It also indicates that indicates that consultation to stakeholders to ensure that channel meets their needs includes 'facilitating community participation in resolution process, where appropriate'. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on design and performance</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describes how users engaged on improvement of mechanism</li> <li>• Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on improvement</li> </ul>
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s) are equitable, publicly available and explained	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"> <li>• Met: Describes procedure and timescales for managing complaints or concerns: The Why Agreements Matter guide discloses a chart indicating 'essential elements for an effective complaints, disputes and grievance process'. It includes a column with the 'typical level of business accountability and time for resolution', which can vary from 1-2 days if it is an 'officer' level, to 6/12 months if it reaches the President'. The documents MyVoice Procedure indicates: 'You will receive an acknowledgement when your report has been received by the Business Conduct Office, who will then review and assess the report and decide on next steps. [...] If you have provided contact details or are contactable anonymously through the myVoice Hotline, you will be updated if your case is allocated to investigation. [...] We will endeavour to provide you with appropriate progress updates, as necessary, subject to legal, privacy, and confidentiality considerations, and you will be informed when the case is ready to close'. [Why agreements matter, 03/2016: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [myVoice Procedure, 15/03/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes technical, financial, advisory support to enable equal access: The document myVoice Procedure indicates: 'Rio Tinto will also seek to protect you from detrimental conduct or retaliation by providing you with details of available support services, such as the Employee Assistance Program, and engaging with HR representatives if there are concerns about your health and wellbeing'. However, this subindicator looks for support provided towards ensuring equitable access to and participation in grievance processes by providing technical, financial, or advisory support. Also, evidence seems to cover only Company employees. [myVoice Procedure, 15/03/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describe types of outcome to complainant through use of mechanism: The document myVoice Procedure indicates: 'Investigation outcomes are confidential, and therefore you may not normally be told whether or not a particular concern has been substantiated'. However, this subindicator looks for an explanation of the type of outcome to the complainant through use of the</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>grievance mechanisms. No further evidence found. [myVoice Procedure, 15/03/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describes escalation to senior levels / independent adjudicators: The Why Agreements Matter guide discloses ‘essential elements for an effective complaints, disputes and grievance process. These procedures should include: [...] specified procedures that can escalate in a controlled way’. The document myVoice Procedure indicates: ‘Talk to any member of Ethics &amp; Compliance or Legal, who will escalate the matter to the Business Conduct Office’. However, it is not clear how complaints or concerns for workers and all external individuals and communities may be escalated to more senior levels or independent third party adjudicators or mediators to challenge the process or outcome at the complainant’s discretion. [Why agreements matter, 03/2016: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [myVoice Procedure, 15/03/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
C.5	Prohibition of retaliation for raising complaints or concerns	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation against workers/stakeholders: The documents MyVoice Procedure indicates: 'Rio Tinto strictly prohibits and does not tolerate detrimental conduct or retaliation in response to an individual holding or raising a concern'. [myVoice Procedure, 15/03/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Describes practical measures to prevent retaliation: The documents MyVoice Procedure indicates: 'We understand and respect that some people feel more comfortable not disclosing their identity, so you can report concerns anonymously and remain anonymous, if you wish'. [myVoice Procedure, 15/03/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Specifies no legal action, firing or violence: The document MyVoice Procedure states: ‘Detrimental conduct or retaliation includes threats, intimidation, humiliation, bullying, harassment, discrimination, harm including psychological harm, injury, dismissal or a negative impact on your position, change in duties or damage to reputation’. The Business Integrity Standard indicates: ‘To take no retaliatory action against a person who has raised a business integrity concern, and to speak up if others do so’. The Way We Work reaffirms it: ‘At Rio Tinto, we preserve confidentiality and keep those who voice concerns in good faith safe from retaliation’. myVoice webpage section adds: ‘We treat all reports confidentially and will endeavour to make you feel safe to raise your concerns and protect you from retaliation. We treat everyone respectfully and fairly’. Finally, the Human Rights Policy has provisions of non-tolerance to attacks against human rights defenders. [myVoice Procedure, 15/03/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Business Integrity Standard, 01/07/2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation against workers/stakeholders: The Joint Venture Policy states: ‘We expect our JV partners to support our corporate commitments and core principles as laid out in the Way We Work’. The Business Integrity Standard states: ‘No retaliatory action will be tolerated against anyone who has a reasonable basis for reporting an actual or suspected breach’. The Standard applies to ‘All employees, core contractors and associated persons acting for or on behalf of Rio Tinto’. The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: ‘Maintain policies and practices to allow violations, misconduct, or grievances to be reported by workers and addressed without fear of retaliation’. The Company has provided additional comments on the content of its Supplier Code of Conduct. However, it is not clear this prohibition of retaliation also covers individual stakeholders and communities at extractive business partner level, as it is not clear the mechanism is open to them. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 03/2022: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Joint Venture Policy, 06/2021: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Complainants not asked to waive legal rights: In the Why Human Rights Matter guide the Company indicates that ‘The Company’s internal processes should not undermine legal processes nor attempt to supplant criminal law, labour law or commercial matters. [...] A site-level process must not inhibit any individual or group’s access to judicial recourse, nor put them at undue risk’. It also indicates that, ‘in addition to project level procedures, external non-judicial and/or customary processes are also available, such as national human rights commissions, national ombudsman offices and/or a council of elders (or similar) in indigenous communities’. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Does not require confidentiality provisions</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Cooperates with state based non judicial mechanisms: In the Why Human Rights Matter guide the Company indicates that ‘Rio Tinto is committed to a</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>number of international conventions that provide for or require formal complaints, disputes and grievance processes [...] The Guidelines [OECD Guidelines] are supported by national contact points (NCPs) which provide a mediation and conciliation platform for resolving practical issues or 'specific instances' that may arise'. It also states that 'we should not impede or discourage stakeholders from accessing other judicial and non-judicial processes, if so they wish. If this occurs, the legal department or Rio Tinto Global External Affairs can work with the team concerned on a response'. [Why human rights matter guide, 01/2013: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</p>
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes approach taken to remedy adverse HRs impacts: In light of the destruction in the Juukan Gorge, the webpage section Juukan Gorge indicates: 'In November 2022 we signed a remedy agreement with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Aboriginal Corporation and agreed to create the Juukan Gorge Legacy Foundation. In accordance with the right to self-determination, the agreement reflects the desire of the Traditional Owners to create a foundation that supports the cultural, social, educational and economic aspirations of the group. The Foundation, to be led and controlled by Traditional Owners, will also enable the delivery of broader benefits through commercial partnership opportunities. Under the agreement, we will provide financial support to the foundation to progress major cultural and social projects including a new keeping place for storage of important cultural materials. In May 2022, we signed a co-management Heads of Agreement with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Aboriginal Corporation, which sets out how we will work together in partnership on a co-management approach to mining activities on Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Country. We are committed to building stronger relationships and working in partnership on-Country with all Indigenous people of the lands on which we operate. In July 2022, in collaboration and with Traditional Owner oversight, we commenced re-excavation on Juukan Gorge 2 at the request of the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people as part of the broader Juukan Gorge project. The Iron Ore Heritage Management team has been working with Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura Traditional Owners and Specialist Heritage consultants to plan the re-excavation since mid-2021'. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes changes to systems, processes and practices to prevent future impacts: The Company discloses some of its Lessons learned from Juukan Gorge, in the webpage with the same name: 'The destruction of two ancient rock shelters in the Juukan Gorge represented a breach of our partners' trust and a failure to uphold our values as a company'. It also indicates: 'In Iron Ore, our Integrated Heritage Management Process (IHMP) ensures heritage considerations are embedded throughout the mine development process, from early resource planning and studies through to closure. By the end of 2021, we reviewed over 2,200 heritage sites in the Pilbara, adding further protection controls. Through ongoing consultation with Traditional Owners, we have removed 100 million dry tonnes of iron ore from reserves in 2020 and 2021 through this process. The core principles from IHMP have informed the Cultural Heritage Group Procedure update and our cultural heritage global control library, and we continue to explore opportunities to embed these across the business'. Regarding the same case, the 2022 Annual Report adds: 'We have changed the way we engage with Indigenous communities. We are progressively working more closely in partnership with Indigenous peoples across our operations to preserve and protect cultural heritage. We are moving to a model of co-management to ensure Indigenous voices are heard as part of our decision making'. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes approach to monitoring/implementing agreed remedy: The webpage section Juukan Gorge indicates: 'Internal and external reviews of the events leading to the blasting of the rock shelters at Juukan Gorge have identified various deficiencies including how our partnership with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people was managed, a lack of integration of our heritage management with our front-line operational teams, and a work culture that was too focused on business performance and not enough on building and maintaining relationships with Traditional Owners. The archaeological and ethnographic reports received in 2013-14 should have triggered an internal review of the implications of this material new information for the mine development plans. Such a review did not take place. Following the completion of the archaeological surveys and other mitigation measures agreed with the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people in 2014, the site was reclassified as 'cleared' for mining and removed from relevant risk registers. As a consequence, knowledge and awareness of the location and</li> </ul>



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>significance of the site was progressively lost. Further opportunities to revise the mine plan were missed in 2018, when the final archaeological report was received, and again during 2019-20. The Sustainability Committee has been charged with overseeing the implementation of the recommendations set out in the Board Review and Parliamentary Inquiry, and with ensuring that these lessons are applied to our operations across Australia and the globe'. However, this subindicator looks of for a description of the system it has in place to monitor that the Company is implementing agreed remedies for victims. No further evidence found in the 2022 Annual Report. [Juukan Gorge_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describes approach to learning from incidents if no adverse impacts identified</li> </ul>
C.8	Communication on the effectiveness of grievance mechanism(s) and incorporating lessons learned	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Discloses number of grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcomes achieved: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement notes: 'In 2022, we received 1,459 reports through myVoice channels (up from 1,246 reports in 2021). Of these cases, 63% were substantiated, including 77 cases which were reports received in 2021. Issues raised through myVoice related to discrimination, bullying, harassment, sexual misconduct and sexual harassment, employee relations and benefits and compensation. In 2022, we received six reports relating to labour practices. All six investigations are ongoing. A number of reports involving suppliers related to alleged conflicts of interest between suppliers and employees. We are not aware of any modern slavery-related issues raised via myVoice or any asset level mechanism in 2022'. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Example of how lessons from mechanism improved HRs management system: The 2022 Annual Report indicates: 'The Business Conduct Office (BCO) is working to increase transparency and improve how we capture learnings from the myVoice programme by expanding the team to include a reporting and governance function. [...] The BCO is currently implementing two key recommendations from the Everyday Respect Report that was released in February 2022. We are setting up a discrete unit of experts who will support and care for our people who have been impacted by harmful and disrespectful behaviours. The team will also be available to support leaders and human resources professionals in how to respond, and other people who have been affected by those behaviours. Separately we are also redesigning our investigation process to make sure it is trauma-informed, caring and people-centred'. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes process to evaluate mechanism and changes made as a result: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: 'In 2021, our Group Internal Audit reviewed our site-level complaints and grievance mechanisms, including the extent to which they meet the UNGPs' effectiveness criteria. The review found opportunities for improvement, including in relation to governance and increased community engagement in mechanism design to help meet communities' needs, especially vulnerable groups. Follow-up actions include clarifying site-level roles and responsibilities, developing clearer guidance and training on the design and implementation of grievance mechanisms, and improved reporting'. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes procedures to address delays of outcomes agreed with stakeholders</li> </ul>

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Pays living wage or sets time-bound target: The 2021 Statement on Modern Slavery indicates: 'We undertake an annual remuneration review to check that our people are being paid appropriately to their position and at a minimum in line with the legal minimum wage. While we do not have a public commitment to a living wage, we regularly monitor our pay against local/regional and national economic and labour conditions'. Similar information is found in its 2022 Modern Slavery Statement. 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 cover basic needs for employees and his/her family and/or depends plus some discretionary income. The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources. [Statement on Modern Slavery 2021, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Describes how living wage determined: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources.</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Achieved paying living wage: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources.</li> <li>• Not Met: Reviews definition living wage with unions: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources.</li> </ul>
D.3.2	Transparency and accountability (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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"> <li>• Met: Member of EITI: The Company is 'a founding member of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)'. [Transparency Statement, N/A: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: In its 2021 Tax Report the Company discloses a table with all tax payments. The table 'shows the total of all tax and other payments to governments for every country where the Rio Tinto Group paid at least \$100,000 in 2021. We do not earn any significant profit in countries not listed in this table. Within each country, total tax payments (net of refunds) are reported by the national, regional, or local government to which they are paid'. The table includes 30 countries. [Tax Paid - Our Economic Contribution 2021, 04/2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Measures to prohibit violence/retaliation against workers for joining trade union: The Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We respect the labour rights of our workforce and the workers in our value chain, including relating to [...] freedom of association and collective bargaining'. The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator referring to its position in relation to human rights defenders and indicating that its management system to implement its support to human rights defenders is not publicly available. However, no description found of the measures the Company puts in place to prohibit any form of intimidation, harassment, retaliation or violence against workers seeking to exercise the right to form and join a trade union of their choice (or equivalent worker bodies where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is restricted under law). [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Discloses % of total direct operations covered by CB agreements: The 2022 Modern Slavery Statement indicates: 'Recognising the links between respect for labour rights and preventing modern slavery, we engage in constructive dialogue with workers' organisations at local and global levels. This includes working sessions with our main union stakeholders. In 2022, there were two main meetings with IndustriALL in Pittsburgh and London. These meetings included broader discussion on ESG, the Everyday Respect Report and upcoming product stewardship certifications (which includes on modern slavery). With COVID-19 restrictions easing, the team will resume its regular engagement with the International Labour Organization, including on the topic of modern slavery'. However, no evidence found in relation to the percentage of total workers covered by collective bargaining agreements. [2022 Statement on Modern Slavery, 2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts: The Company indicates that its Health management includes ‘identifying and managing the key occupational health risks, vector borne and infectious diseases in the workplace’. The Company takes the following actions: ‘Address both current and future risks. Implement risk-based workplace monitoring to comply with our standards and legal requirements, as a minimum, and to determine the controls required to protect worker health. Implement medical surveillance programmes, consistent with local regulatory requirements and site health risks. Require an annual summary of occupational hygiene and medical monitoring results to be maintained for areas of our business where a risk assessment has indicated the need for those investigations. This information is used to prioritise work to further reduce worker exposure. Maintain robust record keeping (e.g a formal, confidential health monitoring/surveillance database) which facilitates monitoring of key trends’. As for its approach to safety management, discloses some of its actions: ‘Report and investigate all incidents, ensuring the learnings are shared and implemented across the organisation. Actively involve employees and contractors in all areas of safety management. Implement safety performance standards and expectations for managing critical risks associated with aviation, confined spaces, cranes and lifting, electrical works, isolation, vehicles and driving, and working at heights. [...] Measure and monitor our performance against the minimum safety standards. Maintain an appropriate safety assurance framework through a range of audits, reviews and verifications against our standards. Develop, implement and embed a focus on process safety and fatality prevention programmes’. [Our approach to health management, N/A: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ] & [Our approach to safety, N/A: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ] • Met: Discloses injury rate or lost days for last reporting period: The 2022 Annual Report indicates that in 2021, the all-injury frequency rate was 0.40. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ] • Met: Discloses fatalities for last reporting period: The 2022 Annual Report indicates that in 2021 there were zero fatalities. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ] • Met: Discloses occupational disease rate for last reporting period: Regarding Occupational health, it indicates: ‘2.8% increase in the rate of new occupational illnesses since 2021. [...] In 2022, we recorded a higher number of new occupational health illnesses compared to the previous year, with 69 (2021: 611)’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ] Score 2 • Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company discloses its health and safety targets: ‘To reach zero fatalities and to eliminate workplace injuries and catastrophic events. All-injury frequency rate target: 0.38. [...] To reduce the rate of new occupational illnesses each year’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ] • Met: Met targets or explains why not or actions to improve H&S management systems: It has reached its fatality target. Regarding the others, it indicates: ‘We continue to see serious incidents at our own operations. Our main risks relate to falling objects, fall from height, and vehicles and driving. Our all-injury frequency rate (AIFR) remained stable at 0.40, compared to 2021. We continue to see a disparity between the number of injuries among employees and contractors, so we remain focused on including contractors in our safety culture. Critical risk management (CRM) remains our primary fatality elimination tool by helping ensure that critical controls are in place and working where there is a fatal risk. In the last year, we continued to simplify our critical risk content, particularly for risks of rail impact or collision, mooring and drowning. To address risks related to vehicles and driving, in late 2021 we made significant changes to the Group procedure for mass transportation, a component of our vehicles and driving Group standard. These changes included the mandatory implementation of in-vehicle monitoring systems, and fatigue and distraction technology in all buses we operate, as well as increased safety feature requirements for vehicles purchased after January 2022. To tackle risks associated with falling objects, in the last year we also worked to improve the asset integrity of overhead cranes across our operations. In 2023, we will re-focus our attention on CRM to address the frequency of potentially fatal incidents (PFIs) across all critical risks’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a> ]

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)	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"> <li>• Met: Process to identify/recognise indigenous rights holders: In the Why Agreements Matter guide, the Company describes how to identify communities to engage with (including indigenous communities with customary land connections and historic connections) representative institutions. It indicates that 'Identifying the primary parties requires an understanding of the local community and context. In some cases this can be difficult and will require specialised knowledge. [...] Requiring a formal or legal claim or title to land may exclude some people from being party to the agreement. In many societies, land ownership resides only with men. [...] Agreement-makers need to consider all people with land-use interests in the impact area, and recognise the diverse socioeconomic and socio-political situations of these different groups'. For instance, in India, 'lower castes may not be recognised since they do not gave formalised legal land titles'. [Why agreements matter, 03/2016: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Describes how indigenous communities are engage during assessment: In the Why Agreements Matter guide, the Company that it seeks broad-based community support based on principles that include 'community participation in social and environmental assessment'. The Company states that 'communities themselves are valuable sources of knowledge and strong community involvement in knowledge base studies are essential. Social and economic impact assessments and anthropological studies benefit from communities having significant input into design and the content. [...] Specific techniques can be used to tap into the wealth and diversity of community knowledge. These include a Participatory Rural Appraisal or Rapid Rural Appraisal, which can be used to collect and analyse data in close cooperation with local people'. Agreement-related activities across life cycle include 'environmental and social knowledge base and impact assessments'. The Why Cultural Heritage Matters document indicates that 'we work hard to manage cultural heritage by engaging with relevant communities and stakeholders. This includes working with communities to identify, assess and manage places, objects and practices of cultural significance. [...] Information on cultural heritage feed into our Social Impact Assessment'. [Why agreements matter, 03/2016: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Why cultural heritage matters, 2011: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Commitment to FPIC: In the Why Human Rights Matter guide the Company indicates 'Rio Tinto seeks to operate in a manner that is consistent with the UNDRIP. In particular, we strive to achieve the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of affected Indigenous communities as defined in International Finance Corporation Performance Standard 7 (IFC PS 7) and its supporting guidance'. However, 'strive to achieve' is not considered a formal statement of commitment. Commitment through ICMM statement is no longer considered a proxy for this subindicator under CHRB revised approach. The Human Rights Policy states: 'We are committed to demonstrating progress towards, or achievement of, Free, Prior and Informed Consent of affected Indigenous communities across all stages of the asset lifecycle in accordance with the ICMM Indigenous Peoples and Mining Position Statement'. However, being committed to 'demonstrating progress towards' is not considered a commitment to FPIC. It provided further comments on its feedback to CHRB on this subindicator, however, no commitment to free prior and informed consent found.</li> </ul> <p>[Why human gender matter, 2009: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Recent example of obtaining FPIC or not pursuing indigenous people's land/resources: The 2022 Communities and Social Performance Disclosure indicates: 'For an FPIC process to be effective, in addition to genuine stakeholder engagements and trust-building, power imbalances and capacities of all parties to fully engage are important to address. Examples of how we do this in the Pilbara include supporting groups to build technical capacity and funding additional positions in Prescribed Body Corporates'. However, it is not clear the Company has obtained the FPIC. The 2022 Annual Report notes: 'Energy Resources of Australia (ERA) is rehabilitating the Ranger uranium mine in the Northern Territory, Australia. We are committed to the successful rehabilitation of Ranger to a standard that will establish an environment similar to the adjacent Kakadu National Park, a World Heritage site. We acknowledge the Traditional Owners, the Mirarr people's, consistent opposition to developing the Jabiluka uranium deposit and restate our full support for ERA's commitment that the deposit would never be developed without the Mirarr people's consent. Our utmost priority and commitment is to the rehabilitation of the Ranger Project Area in a way that is consistent with the wishes of the Mirarr people'. However, the Company seems to have been operating in the area. The subindicator looks for the most recent example where it has obtained free prior and informed consent (FPIC) or, alternatively, where it decided not to pursue the land or resources impacting on indigenous peoples. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Communities and Social Performance Commitment Disclosure, 10/2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Met: Describes approach to identifying land tenure rights holders and negotiating compensation: The Why Agreements Matter guide the Company indicates that 'Agreement-makers need to consider all people with land-use interests in the impact area, and recognise the diverse socioeconomic and socio-political situations of these different groups. [...] Identifying relevant parties for agreement-making is more than a social mapping exercise. It involves engaging with land-connected groups and their chosen representatives. These include: Indigenous peoples with customary land connections in the area, Indigenous peoples with historic connections to the area; [...] all land owners and claimants, especially those who are likely to be affected by activities; those whose land rights, interests and formal claims may be impacted'. It also mentions how some people might be excluded of the process (are more vulnerable). The guide provides an example on how it identified the relevant parties in the past'. Regarding negotiation, it notes: 'If any funding for negotiations is to be provided by Rio Tinto this should be outlined through a formal and transparent mechanism, such as a memorandum of understanding, which should: Give the community some security of funding. Outline agreed milestones and protocols to ensure that negotiations progress in a timely manner. Balance the need for efficiency and accountability with the flexibility to adapt to changing or unexpected circumstances. Include explicit agreements about the circumstances and processes that can lead to modification of funding arrangements. Under-resourced processes or ad hoc changes to support for community participation can impede the ability of communities to engage among themselves or with the company. [...] Tinto works closely with host communities to ensure they receive fair compensation and a share of benefits in exchange for secure access to land'. Regarding financial compensations: 'Community representatives must be well-informed about the business cycle, the nature of commodity markets and projections for the project or operation'. [Why agreements matter, 03/2016: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describes approach to compensation including valuation: The Why Agreements Matter guide explains how obligations, compensation and benefits work. The webpage section Communities indicates: 'Resettlement is a measure of last resort. From time to time, in order to run a safe, viable operation, we have to resettle communities. [...] we have policies and processes in place to make sure their standard of living and livelihood is sustainably restored or improved over the long term'. The Communities and Social Performance Standard states: 'Should resettlement be unavoidable: [...] the resettlement must comply with requirements of IFC PS 5 including development of a Resettlement Action Plan and/or Livelihood Restoration plan, and other requirements'. However, this subindicator looks for a description of how valuation and compensation works, and how legitimate tenure rights holders are involved in determining the valuation. [Why agreements matter, 03/2016: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Communities_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Describes steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals: Regarding land acquisition and resettlement, the webpage section Communities indicates: 'We ensure our practices are in line with the International Finance Corporation's Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement Performance Standard and our other international human rights commitments'. The Communities and Social Performance Standard states: 'Should resettlement be unavoidable: [...] the resettlement must comply with requirements of IFC PS 5 including development of a Resettlement Action Plan and/or Livelihood Restoration plan, and other requirements'. However, no description found of the steps it would take to meet the standards with respect to legitimate tenure rights holders. [Communities_web, N/A: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Communities and Social Performance Standard, 08/2022: <a href="http://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Describes security implementation (incl. VPs or ICOC) and provides an example: In its 2021 VPSHR Annual Report indicates: 'In 2021, we continued to promote and advance implementation of the VPSHR internationally by: Participating virtually in the 2021 Annual UN Business and Human Rights Forum and the 2021 Australian Dialogue on Business and Human Rights which both discussed how to respect human rights in times of crisis. Meeting regularly and sharing VPSHR tools and training with some of our joint venture partners, in particular our joint ventures in Brazil and Colombia. Participating in the Mining Security Working Group of Canada, which is a forum for subject matter experts and security practitioners within the extractive industry to collaborate and share insights and learnings of ongoing challenges and further the goals of industry initiatives such as the VPSHR. Participating in informal meetings with extractive industry peers considering membership of the VPSHR, advocating the benefits of membership and sharing an overview of our approach to implementation. [...] The Rio Tinto security standard mandates all sites to conduct an annual site security risk assessment to identify risks linked to abuse of force, weapons, firearms and other potential human rights abuse related to security'. Also, 'In 2021, we hosted a number of internal awareness-raising activities focused on security and human rights. During these sessions Group Security explained the business' commitment to the VPSHR amongst other core international business and human rights standards'. [2021 VPSHR Annual Report, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Ensures Business Partners/JVs follow security approach: It also discloses examples of 'promoting awareness of the VPSHR throughout the organisation, including across the value chain: In 2021, we continued to promote awareness of the VPSHR throughout the business by: Raising awareness of and implementing our security and human rights governance framework, through which we implement the VPSHR. We do this by supporting sites to implement the following standards and procedures: Security standard; Security risk analysis and management Group procedure (inclusive of security and human rights risks and mitigating controls); Security and human rights Group procedure; and Security and safety weapons and firearms Group procedure. Maintaining remote/virtual contact and engagement with high-risk sites on security and human rights issues as the COVID-19 pandemic persisted. Providing continuous support to high-risk sites in relation to the analysis and management of security risks (including security and human rights risks). Developing and delivering online VPSHR training for business leaders, site security champions, private security personnel, CSP personnel and joint venture partners operating in higher risk jurisdictions. Providing guidance to sites and Business Resilience Teams on conflict prevention and effective management of security and human rights risks. Engaging with product groups and functions to help them prevent and mitigate security and human rights risks. Supporting sites with due diligence checks, contracting and training of private security providers. Training our internal security auditors to assess site compliance with the Rio Tinto security standard (including the security and human rights requirements)'. Moreover, the Human Rights Policy indicates: 'We are committed to implementing the [...] Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (Voluntary Principles)'. The Policy also applies to contractors. [2021 VPSHR Annual Report, 2022: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Human Rights Policy, 01/2023: <a href="http://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Security and HRs assessment includes input from local communities: In its 2021 VPSHR Annual Report indicates: 'The Rio Tinto security standard mandates all sites to conduct an annual site security risk assessment to identify risks linked to abuse of force, weapons, firearms and other potential human rights abuse related to security. [...] Where a site is considered to have a high or critical inherent security and human rights risk (such as where armed security or public security forces are used), a site visit is conducted by Group Security to identify and assess potential security and human rights issues and to recommend adequate controls to manage these risks. Gaining a greater understanding of the security and human rights situation at a particular site is achieved through a range of actions from examining the preparedness of security personnel to respond to security and human rights incidents, through to interviews with key external stakeholders, such as local government officials, local police, military commanders, our private security suppliers and local community leaders. These interviews occur in consultation with local and Group Security and CSP functions (amongst others), to encourage both local ownership and alignment with Group-level standards'. [2021 VPSHR Annual Report, 2022: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Two examples of working with local communities to improve security</li> </ul>
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	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"> <li>• Met: Describes preventative/corrective action plans for water and sanitation risks: The webpage section Water indicates: 'We share water with the communities and nature surrounding our operations, so we aim to avoid permanent impacts on water resources, including lakes, streams and groundwater aquifers, by carefully managing the quality and quantity of the water we use and return to the environment. [...] To address this complexity, we adopt a catchment-level approach to developing potential solutions and managing our risks and impacts within our operations. We use baseline water stress as determined by the World Resources Institute to identify operational catchments of most concern. [...] To manage our water impacts, we first need to understand the specific risks at more than 50 operating sites, as well as our overall Group impacts. To do this, we have developed a water risk framework that considers: Water resource [...], Quantity and quality [...], Dewatering [...], Long-term obligations [...]. We use this framework to identify, assess and manage water risks. We use maximum reasonable consequence – the level of risk when no controls are in place – because it presents a clearer picture of the magnitude of the risk our sites must manage. This comprehensive approach extends beyond our mandatory reporting obligations and allows us to have relevant conversations about water risks internally and with stakeholders in the communities where we operate. Our Group water risk profile shows the level of exposure against each of the four risk categories. Most of our water risks sit in the "low" to "moderate" range. There are some in "very high" and "high" categories for each, however, regardless of the level of risk, we apply rigorous standards and processes to manage them'. The Company discloses the example of the Oyu Tolgoi in Mongolia: 'Oyu Tolgoi copper and gold mine located in the water scarce South province has recognised the importance of optimising the use of the scarce water resources and taking a stewardship approach to ensure the long-term future of mine, natural environmental systems and local herder livelihoods. In response to the situation, Oyu Tolgoi identified the Gunii Hooloi aquifer, a 150 metre deep resource holding around 6.8 billion cubic metres of non-drinkable saline water. [...] Oyu Tolgoi successfully maintained average annual water use efficiency below 550L/tonne of ore to concentrator over the previous water target period 2014-2018. With the operation expansion over the period 2019-2023 including the development and commissioning of the underground, Oyu Tolgoi will aim to maintain average annual water use efficiency below 550L/tonne of ore processing in concentrator over this next target period'. [Water_web, N/A: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Sets targets on water stewardship that consider water use by local communities: The 2022 Annual Report indicates: ‘Our water targets were set in 2019 and consist of one Group target and six site-based targets, reflecting our catchment-based approach and recognising that we manage vastly different water-related risks across our business. The site-based targets were chosen based on their water risk profile, our ICMM commitments, and local community and environmental interdependencies’. The groups target is ‘By 2023, we will disclose – for all managed operations – permitted surface water allocation volumes, annual allocation usage and the associated surface water allocation catchment rainfall-runoff volume estimate’. As for the site-based targets: ‘Pilbara operations, Iron Ore (Tier 1) - Our Iron Ore product group will complete six managed aquifer recharge investigations by 2023. Oyu Tolgoi, Copper (Tier 1) - Oyu Tolgoi will maintain average annual water use efficiency at 550 L/tonne of ore to concentrator from 2019-23. Kennecott Utah Copper, Copper (Tier 1) - Kennecott will reduce average annual imported water per ton of ore milled by 5% over the 2014-18 baseline of 393 gal/ton (1,487L/ton) at the Copperton Concentrator by 2023. Ranger Mine2, Energy Resources of Australia Limited (ERA), Closure (Tier 1) - ERA will achieve the planned total process water inventory treatment volume by 2023, as assumed in the Ranger water model’. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>Met: Reports progress in meeting targets and trends demonstrating progress: The Company reports of the status of each target mentioned above. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>
D.3.9	Women’s rights (in own extractive operations, which include JVs)	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Describes processes to stop harassment and violence against women: The 2022 Annual Report indicates: ‘In 2021, we commissioned an independent review of our workplace culture to better understand, prevent and respond to harmful behaviours across our operations’. The Company disclosed the review in 2022 [Report into Workplace Culture at Rio Tinto]. It contains a whole section discussing ‘issues relating to everyday sexism and gender inequality’. The review captures women’s voices and experiences about sexism into the workplace and tries to understand the issue in depth. The Code of Conduct describes the utility of grievance mechanism in the context of harassment: ‘Speak up if I have been subject to sexism, sex-based harassment, or sexual harassment or if I have witnessed or heard of someone who has’. It also has specific guidance to members of its team on how to act in order to prevent sexual harassment. [Report into Work Place Culture, 01/02/2022: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Code of Conduct, 02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>Not Met: Working conditions take into account gender issues: The 2022 Report into Workplace Culture at Rio Tinto indicates: ‘Women also spoke of fears about letting management know that they were pregnant; of obstacles in obtaining flexible work arrangements; of being denied gender specific facilities such as bathrooms; of being left out of decisions and overlooked for progression; and of being asked to take notes, get coffee, or even do a colleague’s washing’. Moreover, the article Rio Tinto adopts global paid parental leave standard notes: ‘Rio Tinto will implement a new global minimum standard for paid parental leave for all employees. The standard provides 18 weeks of paid parental leave at full pay following the birth or adoption of a child. To allow new parents maximum flexibility, 18 weeks’ leave will be granted to an employee designated as the child’s primary caregiver – it is not gender specific. Employees who elect to be the secondary caregiver will receive one week paid leave in the first year following birth or adoption. Employees taking paid parental leave can focus on family duties knowing their job will be protected while they’re away’. However, it is not clear how it takes into account differential impacts on women and men of working conditions, including to reproductive health (i.e protecting their physical security, protection and accommodation of pregnant and nursing workers, safety measures in relation to work post that may pose a risk to reproductive health, etc.). The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources. [Report into Work Place Culture, 01/02/2022: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>] &amp; [Rio Tinto adopts global paid parental leave standard_web, 2017: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of employment: The 2022 Annual Report indicates: 'Ensuring that employees with similar skills, knowledge, qualifications, experience and performance are paid equally for the same or comparable work is intrinsically linked to our commitment to inclusion and diversity. Our equal pay gap, the primary lens we use when assessing gender pay, measures the extent to which women and men employed by our company in the same location and performing work of equal value receive the same pay. In 2022, we further reduced our equal pay gap compared to 2021, which is now 1% in favour of men. Gender pay gap is a measure of the difference between the average earnings of women and men across the Group (excluding incentive pay), regardless of role, expressed as a percentage of men's earnings. In 2022, our gender pay gap was just over 1% in favour of women, consistent with previous years. We are committed to eliminating any residual pay inequities based on gender or other non-legitimate dimensions of difference'. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1</li> <li>• Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating closing gender pay gap: The 2022 Annual Report indicates: 'In 2022, we further reduced our equal pay gap compared to 2021, which is now 1% in favour of men'. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> </ul>

## 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"> <li>• Area: Land Rights</li> <li>• Headline: Rio Tinto's subsidiary Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée accused of land grab &amp; pollution in Guinea</li> <li>• Story: In March 2019, residents of 13 villages in western Guinea have filed a formal complaint against the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the World Bank's private-sector arm, for funding the expansion of a bauxite mine. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée is partially owned by Rio Tinto. The 540 complainants alleged that the company operating the mine has taken land, destroyed livelihoods and damaged the local environment. The complainants were seeking full and fair redress for the harms they have suffered, along with protection from future violations. They have asked the Compliance Advisor Ombudsman to facilitate mediations with the IFC and Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée to address their grievances. The villagers allege that have lost agricultural land, which has led to a significant decline in their incomes and quality of life. Villagers claim have also lost access to water resources, which have been polluted, among other negative impacts. The situation was reportedly especially perilous for the residents of Hamdallaye village, who have been told by the company that they will be imminently resettled, without their consent, in a former mining area that was not properly rehabilitated.</li> </ul> <p>On 19 June 2020, a report released by Guinean organizations Centre du Commerce International pour le Développement (CECIDE) and Association pour le développement rural et l'entraide mutuelle en Guinée (ADREMGUI), and the US-based Inclusive Development International, documents how (Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée) CBG's resettlement of Hamdallaye village violates the environmental and social requirements of the International Finance Corporation (IFC).</p> <p>According to the report, the dust and dynamite blasting from CBG's mining activities had made living conditions at the community's village unbearable and gave the residents little choice but to accept relocation. Residents of Hamdallaye village in the Boké region of Guinea said that Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée (CBG) moved them to an unfinished resettlement site without adequate housing, water and sanitation, or sufficient arable land and sustainable livelihood opportunities.</p> <p>Allegedly, the Rio Tinto-Alcoa joint venture has failed to meet international standards and its commitment to its lenders to provide the community with alternative "equivalent" farmland to compensate them for the land that it has taken in recent years.</p> <p>[Mines and Communities, 07/03/2019, "Guinea bauxite mine: Villagers launch complaint to World Bank": <a href="https://minesandcommunities.org">minesandcommunities.org</a>] [Business &amp; Human Rights Resource Centre, 19/06/2020, "World Bank-Backed Rio Tinto-Alcoa Joint Venture Relocates Guinean Village During Covid-19 Lockdown": <a href="https://business-humanrights.org">business-humanrights.org</a>] [Business &amp; Human Rights Resource Centre, 12/01/2021, "World Bank-Backed Rio Tinto-Alcoa Joint Venture Relocates Guinean Village During Covid-19 Lockdown": <a href="https://business-humanrights.org">business-humanrights.org</a>]</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"> <li>• Met: Public response: An update regarding CBG was published both in the 2022 Annual Report and the Rio Tinto website, in relation to this allegation, highlighting Rio Tinto's involvement in the complaint (through the 45% interest in Halco Mining Inc, which has 51% ownership in CBG). The company states that 'We are aware of the concerns regarding access to land and water, and the pace of livelihood restoration programmes as well as concerns regarding CBG's stakeholder engagement. [...] Both the Halco and CBG advisory committees are closely following CBG's response to a complaint made to the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Office of the Compliance Advisor Ombudsman (CAO). The mediation process facilitated by the CAO has conducted seven sessions in 2022 and through a collaborative approach the parties made important progress towards an agreement on the improvement of community access to water. Halco continues to participate in the mediation process as an observer, alongside the IFC'. [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>] &amp; [Update on CBG: <a href="https://riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Detailed response: The response does not address the details of the alleged rights violations. The Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> </ul>
E(1).2	The company has investigated and taken appropriate action	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Engaged with stakeholders: Rio Tinto supervised and provided support to the Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée in its discussions with the International Finance Corporation’s Office of the Compliance Advisor Ombudsman (CAO) and community complainants regarding the Sangaredi mine in Guinea. The company hired experts specialised in human rights and the resettlement of communities affected by mining operations to help find an outcome aligned with international standards and reach an amicable solution to the dispute with the local communities.</li> </ul> <p>The mediation process facilitated by the CAO reached an important milestone in 2021 with an agreement to adjust the mitigation measures related to blasting. [Business &amp; Human Rights Resource Centre, 12/01/2021: <a href="https://www.business-humanrights.org">business-humanrights.org</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Identified cause: The company does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. The Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Identified and implemented improvements: The Company states that 'In 2022, sustainability advisory committees at Halco and CBG levels met regularly, strengthening our oversight and providing support to CBG for the improvement of CBG’s social and environmental practices, including for the development of an ongoing human rights due diligence process.' [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</li> <li>• 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. The Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not Met: Provided remedy: There is no evidence suggesting the company provided remedy to the affected stakeholders. The Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> <li>• Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders</li> <li>• Not Met: Remedy delivered</li> <li>• Not Met: Independent remedy process used</li> </ul>
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area: Right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment</li> <li>• Headline: Rio Tinto hit with human rights complaint over Bougainville mine</li> <li>• Story: On March 31st, 2020, a report from the Human Rights Law Centre accused Rio Tinto of being responsible for multiple human rights violations after its Panguna mine on the island of Bougainville left people with a legacy of poisoned water, polluted fields and a ruined river valley. Communities who live in the river valleys have reported serious, long-running health impacts.</li> </ul> <p>The HRLC report says: “Polluted water from the mine pit flows unabated into local rivers, turning the riverbed and surrounding rocks an unnatural blue. The Jaba-Kawerong river valley downstream of the mine resembles a moonscape, with vast mounds of grey tailings waste and rock stretching almost 40km downstream to the coast.”</p> <p>Rio Tinto divested from the mine in 2016, giving its 53.8% interest in Bougainville Copper Limited (BCL) to the Papua New Guinea government and the autonomous Bougainville government. The HRLC report says the company “walked away without having contributed to the clean-up or rehabilitation”.</p> <p>The HRLC says the mining company has an obligation to return to the island, which has just voted in favour of independence from Papua New Guinea, for reparations and reconciliation.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>On 29 September 2020, 156 residents of Bougainville filed a human rights complaint against Rio Tinto with the Australian government. Raised by the Australian Human Rights Law Centre, the complaint alleges that the massive volume of mine waste pollution left behind at Panguna mine is putting communities' lives and livelihoods at risk.</p> <p>The complaint will be filed with the Department of Treasury's Australian OECD National Contact Point, which has the power to investigate complaints made against Australian companies operating overseas. The complaint alleges that, through failing to address these ongoing impacts of its of its operations, Rio Tinto is responsible for significant breaches of its human rights and environmental obligations under OECD guidelines.</p> <p>The group of Bougainville residents asked Rio Tinto to fund an independent environmental and human rights impact assessment of the mine and support a program to help address any issues and assist long-term rehabilitation efforts.</p> <p>On 23 July 2021, press sources reported that Special Mining Lease Osikaiyang Landowners Association (SMLOLA) landowners of the Panguana mine's site opposed Rio Tinto's assessment of its former mine's damages in Papua New Guinea. Indeed, the company and 156 Bougainville community leaders agreed to identify and analyze the legacy consequences of the Panguna copper-gold mine. However, SMLOLA landowners opposed that on the basis that Rio Tinto had not engaged with them despite the fact that they were the ones most affected by the environmental and social damage of the mine.</p> <p>Panguna landowners group Chairman Miriori said that the SMLOLA landowners had their land entirely devastated and villages and people forcibly evacuated, so Rio Tinto should be engaging with them as well when dealing with the mine's assessment. He further asserted: "we are all for a solution to this long standing issue of mistreatment and destruction of our lands, human rights issues, and are please Rio Tinto is finally stepping up to own its part in history, but how do they expect to settle this matter without properly engaging with those most affected in an independent process."</p> <p>[The Guardian, 31/03/2020, "Rio Tinto accused of violating human rights in Bougainville for not cleaning up Panguna mine": <a href="http://theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a>] [SBS News, 29/09/2020, "Human rights complaint urges Rio Tinto fix environmental disaster at Bougainville mine site": <a href="http://sbs.com.au">sbs.com.au</a>] [RNZ, 23/07/2021, "Landowners oppose Rio Tinto mine assessment in Bougainville": <a href="http://rnz.co.nz">rnz.co.nz</a>] [RNZ, 25/01/2022, "Rio Tinto and Panguna stakeholders start assessment on mine damage": <a href="http://rnz.co.nz">rnz.co.nz</a>]</p>
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Public response: On April 9, 2020, Rio Tinto provided a response to the invitation from the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre to respond to the report from the Human Rights Law Centre concerning the Panguna mine in Bougainville. In the response, the company stated: "We are aware of recent reports on Bougainville from some civil society organisations which allege environmental and human rights issues. We acknowledge these concerns. We believe that BCL was compliant with applicable regulatory requirements up until the mine's operations ceased in 1989. We are not able to provide any further comments on these allegations as it has not been possible for Rio Tinto to visit the mine site. We believe the best means of addressing any current issues is through the owners of the mine working directly with the people of Bougainville."</li> </ul> <p>At the first meeting of the Panguna Mine Legacy Impact Assessment Oversight Committee held in 2021, Rio Tinto also apologized saying they should have come back to assessing Panguna a little sooner but they clearly made the commitment to ensuring that the assessment is undertaken as soon as possible, as clarified by Rio Tinto's representative on the Committee, General Manager for Closure Delivery, Mr. John Dumbill. [Business &amp; Human Rights Resource Centre, 20/04/2020, "Rio Tinto's response": <a href="http://business-humanrights.org">business-humanrights.org</a>] [RNZ, 25/01/2022: <a href="http://rnz.co.nz">rnz.co.nz</a>] [ABG, 12/01/2022, "Panguna Mine Legacy Impact Committee holds first meeting": <a href="http://abg.gov.pg">abg.gov.pg</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Detailed response: A complete response by the company addressing all aspects of the allegation in detail was not found.</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> <li>• Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders: Rio Tinto has, since December 2020, been in discussions with the communities, represented by the Human Rights Law Centre.</li> </ul> <p>Following several months of constructive discussions facilitated by the Australian OECD National Contact Point, in July 2021, Rio Tinto and 156 Bougainville community residents, represented by the Human Rights Law Centre have reached an agreement to identify and assess legacy impacts of the Panguna mine on Bougainville.</p> <p>However, Rio Tinto did not engage in this process with SMLOLA landowners, the worst affected group. Spokesperson Philip Miriori says the SMLOLA landowners had their land completely destroyed and villages and communities forcibly removed, and Rio Tinto should be talking with them. He said "we are all for a solution to this long standing issue of mistreatment and destruction of our lands, human rights issues, and are please Rio Tinto is finally stepping up to own its part in history, but how do they expect to settle this matter without properly engaging with those most affected in an independent process."</p> <p>Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. [Australian National Contact Point, 21/07/2021, "Update July 2021 - Complaint by Human Rights Law Centre (on behalf of affected individuals) regarding Rio Tinto": <a href="https://www.ausncp.gov.au">ausncp.gov.au</a>] [RNZ, 23/07/2021: <a href="https://www.rnz.co.nz">rnz.co.nz</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Identified cause: In 2021, Rio Tinto publicly committed to fund an independent impact assessment of the mine site by a team of qualified local and international experts to map impacts. The Panguna Mine Legacy Impact Assessment will be carried out by an independent third-party company, unrelated to Rio Tinto or BCL. It will be overseen by the multi-stakeholder Oversight Committee which is supported by an Independent Facilitator and Secretariat. The impact assessment has not yet concluded.</li> </ul> <p>However, at the time this research was conducted no evidence was found suggesting the Company presented root causes of the alleged events. [ABG, 12/01/2022: <a href="https://www.abg.gov.pg">abg.gov.pg</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: Rio Tinto committed to fund the impact assessment following a human rights complaint. However, Rio Tinto has not committed to funding solutions to any mine-related risks or impacts identified through the impact assessment. In addition, there is no evidence the company implemented improvements in its policies/processes and/or made changes to its management systems following the events and their human rights impacts.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. [Human Rights Law Centre, 29/08/2022, "Early environmental report on Rio Tinto's former Panguna mine highlights clear risks for communities": <a href="https://www.hrlc.org.au">hrlc.org.au</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: The result of the company's engagement with the affected communities was the acceptance of funding the independent impact assessment. However, there is no evidence that the company has or intends to take any steps to implement its own policies.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Not Met: Provided remedy: Following the conclusion of the impact assessment, further discussions will be held between the company, community representatives and other stakeholders regarding the assessment's recommendations and next steps. However, to date, there is no evidence suggesting that the company provided remedy to the affected stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the complaint to the AusNCP also seeks commitments from Rio Tinto to contribute to a substantial, independently managed fund, to help address the harms caused by the mine and assist long-term rehabilitation efforts. To date, there is no evidence suggesting that Rio Tinto acted on this request.</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. [Australian National Contact Point, 21/07/2021: <a href="https://ausncp.gov.au">ausncp.gov.au</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders</li> <li>• Not Met: Remedy delivered</li> <li>• Not Met: Independent remedy process used</li> </ul>
E(3).0	Serious allegation No 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area: Land Rights</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Headline:</b> First Nations challenged Rio Tinto's control of Nechako River water flow in British Columbia</p> <p>• <b>Story:</b> On 9 July 2021, a trial was held against Rio Tinto Alcan by several First Nations near Vanderhoof, B.C., who said their rights and traditional ways of life have been devastated since the construction of the Kenney Dam.</p> <p>Water from the Nechako River has been blocked since 1952 following the construction of the Kenney Dam to create the Nechako Reservoir, which is used to generate electricity to power Rio Tinto Alcan's aluminium smelter in Kitimat. Saik'uz and Stell'aten First Nations launched legal action in BC Supreme Court in 2011 over issues with the diversion of the Nechako River. They claimed that the Nechako watershed was devastated in the process, and salmon and sturgeon stocks were almost wiped out.</p> <p>Stellat'en First Nation Chief Robert Mitchell said the river was taken away from First Nations "and converted into an industrial canal without any consultation or compensation. The communities argued about 70% of the water that would normally flow into the Nechako River is diverted as a result of Rio Tinto's Kenney Dam, causing "devastating effects" on the river's fish species - chinook salmon, sockeye salmon and Nechako white sturgeon.</p> <p>On 7 January 2022, the B.C. Supreme Court ruled that Rio Tinto Alcan's Kenney Dam has caused significant harm to the Nechako River and its fisheries, but rejected the request of local First Nations to restore the river's flow to previous levels.</p> <p>Because the dam was built with permits from the federal and provincial governments, this disruption was deemed to be a "tort of private nuisance." This means that Alcan was legally entitled to its actions on that land, but that those actions had caused harm to others.</p> <p>On 3 February 2022, two First Nations, Saik'uz and Stellat'en, said they will appeal parts of a British Columbia (B.C.) Supreme Court ruling released in January that rejected their bid for an injunction to restore the natural flows of the Nechako River.</p> <p>The river in central B.C. has been diverted for 70 years to generate hydroelectricity for Rio Tinto's aluminium division and the province's power grid. Justice Nigel Kent found Rio Tinto Alcan has complied with the terms of its water license and contracts with the Crown, which approved the river's diversion for the Kenney dam in the 1950s. Kent's ruling also said the dam has "caused or contributed to a substantial decline" in local sturgeon and salmon populations, and the B.C. and federal governments have an obligation to protect the First Nations' right to fish. Saik'uz and Stellat'en nations pursued the appeal to hold Rio Tinto responsible for the company's role in the harm to their fisheries.</p> <p>[Vanderhoof Omineca Express, 09/07/2021, "Nearly 200-day trial by northern B.C. First Nations against Rio Tinto winds down": <a href="https://www.ominexpress.com">ominexpress.com</a>] [The Vancouver Sun, 03/10/2021, "Mining giant Rio Tinto's control of Nechako River waterflow in B.C. challenged by local First Nations": <a href="https://www.vancouversun.com">vancouversun.com</a>] [Vancouver Sun, 09/01/2022, "Supreme Court of B.C. rules Nechako dam a 'nuisance' to Indigenous fishing rights": <a href="https://www.vancouversun.com">vancouversun.com</a>] [CBC News, 04/02/2022, "B.C. First Nations plan to appeal Nechako River ruling rejecting injunction to restore natural flows": <a href="https://www.cbc.ca">cbc.ca</a>]</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> <li>• Met: Public response: The company said in a statement: "Rio Tinto remains fully committed to working with the Saik'uz, Stellat'en Nations and other First Nations in the watershed to build mutually beneficial, respectful and transparent relationships in a spirit of reconciliation."</li> </ul> <p>In a prepared statement, a spokesperson for Rio Tinto said the company "actively supports efforts to improve the health of the Nechako River and is working with the Nechako First Nations, other First Nations and a wide variety of stakeholders to contribute to these efforts." The spokesperson said that governance of the flows on the Nechako River should be an "inclusive process that evolves over time."</p> <p>"Reservoir management is a complex matter where a number of interests must be carefully considered and balanced. For the past three years we have been working with a variety of parties at the Water Engagement Initiative for the benefit of the Nechako River. We are committed to working with the Nechako First Nations, other First Nations, government and stakeholders to review all aspects of the Nechako Reservoir management process." [Haida Gwaii Observer, 08/01/2022, "B.C. Supreme Court finds Nechako River 'dramatically' harmed by Kenney Dam": <a href="http://haidagwaiiobserver.com">haidagwaiiobserver.com</a>] [Times Colonist, 04/10/2021, "Mining giant Rio Tinto's control of Nechako River waterflow in B.C. challenged by First Nations": <a href="http://timescolonist.com">timescolonist.com</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Detailed response: The company responded in general terms and did not address the allegation in detail. Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> </ul>
E(3).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"> <li>• Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders: In a statement provided to The Narwhal, Rio Tinto noted it contributed \$13 million to white sturgeon conservation, through a recovery initiative bringing together federal and provincial biologists, First Nations, industry experts, local and municipal governments and more. However, there is no evidence the company engaged with the affected stakeholders as part of understanding the causes of the impacts alleged.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. [The Narwhal, 30/08/2022, "Trying to save our fish': B.C. First Nations appeal a court ruling in an attempt to restore the Nechako River": <a href="http://thenarwhal.ca">thenarwhal.ca</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Identified cause: The company does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: There is no evidence the company implemented improvements in its policies/processes and/or made changes to its management systems following the events and their human rights impacts. Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> <li>• Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken</li> </ul>
E(3).3	The company has engaged with affected stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Provided remedy: The company said it committed \$50 million to a fund set up in the late 1990s as part of an agreement between Rio Tinto and the province. However, there is no evidence that these funds, or any part of them, went to compensate affected communities, nor that Rio Tinto provided any form of remedy to these communities. [The Narwhal, 30/08/2022: <a href="http://thenarwhal.ca">thenarwhal.ca</a>]</li> <li>• Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link: Rio Tinto Alcan defended itself from liability, arguing that the project was approved by federal and provincial regulators when it was constructed in the 1950s. They contend that they have strictly complied with water release requirements and any negative impacts on the Nechako are the result of the regulations. However, this is not sufficient evidence to prove the company is not linked to the impact, since even the BC Supreme Court recognized that the company's operations caused or contributed to the substantial decline in local sturgeon and salmon populations.</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. [Vanderhoof Omineca Express, 09/07/2021: <a href="http://ominecaexpress.com">ominecaexpress.com</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders</li> <li>• Not Met: Remedy delivered</li> <li>• Not Met: Independent remedy process used</li> </ul>
E(4).0	Serious allegation No 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area: Discrimination</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Headline:</b> Inquiry revealed that Rio Tinto received 53 allegations of sexual harassment in its Western Australian mining camps since 2020</p> <p>• <b>Story:</b> On 20 August 2021, Rio Tinto revealed in a state government inquiry into sexual harassment at mining locations that it received 53 allegations of sexual harassment including one substantiated sexual assault and 29 of harassment since January 2020 at its FIFO (fly-in, fly-out) operations.</p> <p>The Western Mine Workers' Alliance, a union representing hundreds of workers in Pilbara quoted an unnamed woman who works at Rio Tinto said: "I reported harassment on numerous occasions and nothing was done".</p> <p>The Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union said male-dominated workforces, isolation, and availability of alcohol combine to make harassment more likely. Department of Mines and Energy WA chief executive Paul Everingham said: "the mining industry needed to recruit more women as the sector is currently composed of only 20 per cent female employees."</p> <p>On 20 October 2021, press sources revealed that Western Australia's (WA) Chamber of Minerals and Energy's executive director has expressed his outrage to the findings of the FIFO inquiry held on the different sexual harassment, discrimination allegations Fortescue Metal Group, BHP and Rio Tinto have been addressed.</p> <p>Women's accusations of discrimination, harassment, and sexual assault at the three giant companies' enormous operations in the north of Western Australia were disclosed this year, putting at stake the companies' internal policies.</p> <p>Paul Everingham, the influential WA Chamber of Minerals and Energy's chief executive, began his testimony before a WA state legislative inquiry investigating the matter by apologizing. Mr Everingham claimed that mining's long-standing male dominance had resulted in undesirable behavior, and that the remedy was a more diversified workforce. The problem for companies is attracting more women, especially because the shocking testimonials submitted to the committee demonstrate that working fly-in fly-out is a male-dominated industry.</p> <p>On 1 February 2022, press sources reported that Rio Tinto released an external review outlining a "culture of bullying, harassment and racism" at the company's global operations, including 21 complaints of actual or attempted rape or sexual assault over the past five years.</p> <p>Australia's former sex discrimination commissioner Elizabeth Broderick received survey responses from 10,000 of Rio's 45,000 employees and conducted 109 "group listening sessions" around the world. The study covered Rio workplaces in locations including Canada, the U.S., Mongolia, Singapore and Australia.</p> <p>Broderick said the majority of women who responded experienced "everyday sexism" such as being left out of meetings, not being provided with a women's toilet or "even being asked to take notes, get coffee, or even do a colleague's washing" while 21 women reported an actual or attempted rape or sexual assault in the past five years. She affirmed: "Bullying is systemic, experienced by almost half of the survey respondents".</p> <p>"Sexual harassment was a significant organizational challenge experienced by 43% of women working at fly-in fly-out (Fifo) and drive-in drive-out mine sites and 28% of women across the entire company. Women also spoke of the lack of consequences when they reported these incidents; and of having to carry the burden of managing the situation themselves, rather than receiving support from management or human resources."</p>



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Broderick also noted that employees working for the company in South Africa experienced racism. Allegedly, people working in a country different to their birth experienced high rates of racism while nearly 40% of men who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander in Australia had experienced racism. One employee claimed in the survey: "Rio is a Caucasian oriented company".</p> <p>The survey found that 48.4% of employees experienced bullying – 53% of women and 47% of men. She said LGBTQ+ employees also experienced "significantly elevated rates of bullying, sexual harassment and racism".  [Reuters, 20/08/2021, "Sexual harassment rife in mine camps, Western Australian inquiry finds": <a href="https://www.reuters.com">reuters.com</a>] [The Sydney Morning Herald - Online, 22/10/2021, "FIFO inquiry hears 'horrific' evidence of widespread mistreatment of women": <a href="https://www.smh.com.au">smh.com.au</a>] [Reuters, 01/02/2022, "Report on Rio Tinto finds disturbing culture of sexual harassment, racism, bullying": <a href="https://www.reuters.com">reuters.com</a>] [ABC News, 01/02/2022, "Female mine workers report sexual assault, harassment to independent Rio Tinto review": <a href="https://www.abc.net.au">abc.net.au</a>]</p>
E(4).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Public response: Rio Tinto Chief Executive Jakob Stausholm said the results of the report published by Rio Tinto on its culture of harassment were "disturbing" and the company would implement all 26 recommendations from the report. "The eye opener for me was two-fold," Stausholm told Reuters. "I hadn't realised how much bullying exists in the company and secondly that it's quite systemic - the three issues of bullying, sexual harassment and racism ... that's extremely disturbing." [Reuters, 01/02/2022: <a href="https://www.reuters.com">reuters.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Detailed response: Rio Tinto engaged Elizabeth Broderick &amp; Co (EB &amp; Co) to conduct an external expert review (the Project) of workplace culture. However, the company never provided a detailed response to the allegations of sexual harassment.</li> </ul>
E(4).2	The company has investigated and taken appropriate action	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Engaged with stakeholders: More than 10,000 employees, nearly a quarter of its 45,000-strong workplace, shared with the company's reviewers their experiences and views for the study. The team of investigators also conducted 109 "group listening sessions" around the world and there were also 85 confidential one-on-one meetings. [The Guardian, 01/02/2022, "Bullying, sexual harassment and racism rife at Rio Tinto, workplace review finds": <a href="https://www.theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Identified cause: In March 2021, Rio Tinto commissioned a formal, independent review into company culture, conducted by Australia's former sex discrimination commissioner Elizabeth Broderick. The report identifies, and explains in detail, as reasons for the events considered the widespread macho and racist culture present in the mining sector, particularly in the context of people working on FIFO contracts. In addition, the report also list the reasons given for not reporting,  [Elizabeth Broderick &amp;co, "Report into Workplace Culture at Rio Tinto": <a href="https://www.riotinto.com">riotinto.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements: Rio Tinto has proactively commissioned the review, one of the largest of its kind within the resources industry. This demonstrates a commitment to increased transparency, accountability and action.</li> </ul> <p>Rio Tinto has committed to enacting all 26 recommendations made by the report aimed at preventing discrimination and an unacceptable workplace culture going forward.</p> <p>Rio said reforms will focus on a commitment from the company's leadership to create a safe and inclusive working environment, including by increasing diversity within the company. It would also ensure the company's remote mine site facilities are safe, and make it easier for staff to call out unacceptable behaviours.</p> <p>The company states it has started to implement the recommendations from the report. [Reuters, 20/08/2021: <a href="https://www.reuters.com">reuters.com</a>] [ABC News, 01/02/2022: <a href="https://www.abc.net.au">abc.net.au</a>] [2022 Annual Report, 22/02/2023: <a href="https://www.cdn-rio.dataweavers.io">cdn-rio.dataweavers.io</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken: The voices, views and suggestions of affected stakeholders were taken into account to formulate the recommendations to strengthen Rio Tinto's workplace culture and ensure sustained cultural change.</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> <li>• Not Met: Provided remedy: There is no evidence suggesting that the company has provided remedy to the affected stakeholders. Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.</li> <li>• Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders</li> <li>• Not Met: Remedy delivered</li> <li>• Not Met: Independent remedy process used</li> </ul>

**Disclaimer**

The terms and conditions as stated in WBA's disclaimer are applicable to this publication. Please consult our disclaimer via <https://www.worldbenchmarkingalliance.org/disclaimer/>