

**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark
2023 Company Scorecard**

Company name Woodside Petroleum
Sector Extractives
Overall score 21.6 out of 100

Theme score	Out of	For theme
1.9	10	A. Governance and Policy Commitments
5.4	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
5.0	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
5.6	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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: The Human Rights policy states that 'Woodside conducts business in a way that respects the human rights of all people, including our employees, the communities in which we are active, and those working within our supply chains. These rights are principally preserved in the International Bill of Human Rights'. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Commitment to UNGPs: The policy also indicates that 'our business conduct is informed by the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which defines the accountabilities of governments in protecting human rights, and of business in respecting human rights'. However, 'informed by is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] Not Met: Commitment to OECD MNE Guidelines
A.1.2.a	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Commitment to ILO core principles: The Company indicates that it will achieve the objectives of the Human Rights policy by 'Respecting the rights and principles contained within the International Labour Organization Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, to the extent that these rights and principles are reflected in domestic laws, rules and regulations'. It is not clear, however, it is not clear if it is committed to the ILO Declaration in case it's

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>conventions are not reflected in domestic laws. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] & [Code of conduct, 12/2022: woodside.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles: The Principles of the Human Rights policy include: 'Opposing the occurrence of modern slavery including forced labour, child labour, bonded labour or human trafficking in our operations or supply chain'. The Code of conduct contains commitments to non-discrimination and freedom of association: 'we recognise that a talented and diverse workforce is a key competitive advantage and strive to create an environment which is safe, rewarding and free from all forms of unlawful discrimination, harassment or inappropriate behaviour. We respect your right to freedom of association. Our policy is to recruit and manage our employees on the basis of competence and performance regardless of factors [...]'. However, no evidence found of a policy statement containing a commitment to respect collective bargaining. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] & [Code of conduct, 12/2022: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO core principles: The Company indicates that it will achieve the objectives of the Human Rights policy by 'Respecting the rights and principles contained within the International Labour Organization Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, to the extent that these rights and principles are reflected in domestic laws, rules and regulations'. It also adds that 'Responsibility for the application of this Policy rests with all Woodside employees, contractors and joint ventures engaged in activities under Woodside's operational control. Where we are not the operator, we will seek to influence our joint venture participants so that the joint operation adopts commitments similar to those of this Policy'. However, as indicated above, it is not clear if it is committed to the ILO Declaration in case it's conventions are not reflected in domestic laws. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] • Not Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles for BPs/JVs: The supplier code reflects the Company's commitments on human rights, which are also required to 'suppliers, contractors and joint ventures engaged in activities under Woodside's operational control'. 'We do not tolerate the occurrence of forced labour, child labour, bonded labour or human trafficking in our operations or supply chain'. It also states that 'we require our suppliers to treat everyone with respect and without discrimination. We expect you to take action to prevent and stop discrimination, bullying and harassment'. No evidence was found, however, in relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining in the supplier code. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] & [Supplier Code of Business Conduct, N/A: woodside.com]
A.1.2.b	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: Health and safety and working hours	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commitment to respect H&S of workers: The Company's Health and safety policy states that 'At Woodside we believe that process and personal safety related incidents, and occupational illnesses are preventable. We strive to be an industry leader in health and safety and are committed to managing our activities to minimise adverse health and safety risk related impacts'. [Health and safety policy, 12/2022: woodside.com] • Not Met: Commitment to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to H&S of workers: The supplier code (for suppliers and contractors) states that 'We require a culture that delivers a sustainable, healthy, safe, environmentally appropriate, and productive work environment. You must perform your work in a manner which does not compromise this, or compromise your own health, safety and security, or that of others. You must understand the health, safety, security, environmental and quality risks that may arise in your work and have the right designs, plans, systems, actions and people in place to manage them effectively'. [Supplier Code of Business Conduct, N/A: woodside.com] • Not Met: Expects BPs/JVs to commit to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week
A.1.3.a.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the sector – land, natural	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to respect land ownership/natural resources as in VGGT: The Indigenous communities policy indicates that 'we acknowledge the unique connection that First Nations communities have to land, waters and the environment'. It includes, among its principles: 'Complying with laws relevant to First Nations communities' rights, interests and obligations where these apply'. However, no evidence was found of a policy statement where it commits to

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	resources and indigenous peoples' rights (EX)		<p>respecting land ownership and natural resources, as set out in the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure. [Indigenous Communities Policy (First Nations Communities Policy), 12/2022: woodside.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to respect land ownership/natural resources as in IFC Performance Standards • Not Met: Commitment to respect indigenous rights or ILO No.169 or UN Declaration: The principles of the Indigenous Communities policy include 'being guided by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples'. The Human Rights policy states that 'we acknowledge the unique relationships that Indigenous communities have to land and waters and our engagements are guided by the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples'. However, to 'be guided by' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Indigenous Communities Policy (First Nations Communities Policy), 12/2022: woodside.com] • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments: Although the policy indicates that 'responsibility for the application of this Policy rests with all Woodside employees, contractors and joint ventures engaged in activities under Woodside operational control', as indicated above, the wording used around the relevant rights and initiatives is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Indigenous Communities Policy (First Nations Communities Policy), 12/2022: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to obtain FPIC or zero tolerance to land grabbing: The Principles of the Indigenous Communities policy include 'engaging with affected communities of First Nations in ways that are consistent with the principles of seeking Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)'. However, 'consistent with', and 'seeking' are not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Indigenous Communities Policy (First Nations Communities Policy), 12/2022: woodside.com] • Not Met: Commitment to respect the right to water • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make these commitments
A.1.3.b.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the sector – security (EX)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commitment to Voluntary Principles on Security and HRs: The Principles of the Human Rights policy include: 'Managing security in a way that respects human rights, as reflected by our commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights'. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to commit to these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to remedy adverse HRs impacts: The document 'our approach to human rights' states that 'woodside is committed to remedying any adverse human rights impacts on individuals, workers and communities that we identify we have caused or contributed to'. However, this is not the Company's official human rights policy statement, but a stand alone document that develops the Company's approach to human rights. This source is not considered suitable for policy commitments according to CHRB methodology, which expects that policy commitments are placed in policy documents. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to make this commitments • Not Met: Commitment to collaborate with judicial or non-judicial mechanisms • Not Met: Commitment to work with EX BPs on remedy: The document 'our approach to human rights' states that 'If we are directly linked to an adverse impact through our supply chain or other business relationship, we will consider whether we play a role in remediation'. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Zero tolerance of threats/attacks on HRDs • Not Met: Expects BPs to make this commitment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to working with HRDs to create safe and enabling environment

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The document Our Approach to human rights states that 'Woodside's approach to human rights is overseen by our Board and the Executive Committee. The Board's Sustainability Committee is responsible for reviewing and making recommendations to the Board on Woodside's human rights policy and performance'. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Not Met: Describes HRs expertise of Board member <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Board member/CEO signal importance of HRs in their communications: In its speech of the Annual General Meeting, the CEO states the following: 'The health and safety of our people is our highest priority, and it was pleasing that across our global business in 2022 we recorded no Tier 1 loss of primary containment process safety events, although we did record one low-risk Tier 2 event. Our injury performance, however, continues to be challenged. Our total recordable injury rate of 1.80 per million hours worked remains above our target of 1.0. We know we need to improve and we are making progress. Our focus is on safety culture, leadership and applying human and organisational performance principles to help us learn and return to leading safety performance. Partnering with First Nations communities to create positive outcomes that leave a lasting legacy also remains one of Woodside's foremost priorities. Highlights for the year included successful negotiations with Ngarluma Aboriginal Corporation for an Indigenous Land Use Agreement to support the proposed Woodside Solar Project, and approval of the Scarborough project Cultural Heritage Management Plan following extensive consultation with Traditional Custodians. We continued to fund air monitoring on the Burrup Peninsula in support of the Murujuga Rock Art Strategy, and provide support for Murujuga's World Heritage Listing'. [AGM Address by Chair Richard Goyder and CEO Meg O'Neill, 28/04/2023: woodside.com]
A.2.2	Board responsibility	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Process to review HRs strategy at board level: The Company states that 'The Board's Sustainability Committee is responsible for reviewing and making recommendations to the Board on Woodside's human rights policy and performance. The Sustainability Committee meets at least four times per year and receives relevant human rights updates annually. Human rights issues are discussed by the Sustainability Committee including performance against human rights commitments and updates to the Human Rights Policy, our salient human rights risks and our modern slavery risk management activities and reporting'. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Met: Example of HRs issues/trends discussed in last reporting period: The Sustainability report indicates that 'In 2022, the Committee oversaw the publication of the 2021 Reconciliation Action Plan report, changes to the Health and Safety Policy, Environment and Biodiversity Policy and First Nations Communities Policy (formerly Indigenous Communities Policy). It also endorsed for Board approval Woodside's 2021 Modern Slavery Statement'. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Describes how affected stakeholders / HRs experts inform board discussions
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: At least one board member incentive linked to HRs commitments • Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public • Not Met: Review of other board incentives for coherence with HRs policies
A.2.4	Business model strategy and risks	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Board process to review business model and strategy for HRs risks • Not Met: Describes frequency and triggers for reviewing business model <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Example of actions resulting from reviews

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Met: Senior responsibility for HRs implementation and decision making: The Company indicates that 'Our Executive Vice President Strategy and Climate is responsible for overall management of our human rights approach and has deliverables relating to human rights as part of their performance agreement'. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes day-to-day responsibility for implementing HRs commitments: It adds that 'Day-to-day responsibility for Woodside's human rights performance is managed by the Head of Sustainability Strategy and Governance, who also oversees the Human Rights Working Group (HRWG). The HRWG consists of representatives from a range of functions across the business such as supply chain, environment, First Nations and communities, human resources and business integrity. The HRWG meets monthly to ensure that human rights risks are identified and effectively managed, throughout business operations in line with our commitment to respect human rights'. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own operations: As indicated above, 'The HRWG consists of representatives from a range of functions across the business such as supply chain, environment, First Nations and communities, human resources and business integrity. The HRWG meets monthly to ensure that human rights risks are identified and effectively managed, throughout business operations in line with our commitment to respect human rights'. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Not Met: Resources and expertise allocation with EX BPs
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Senior manager incentives linked to HRs commitments: The Company indicates that 'Our Executive Vice President Strategy and Climate is responsible for overall management of our human rights approach and has deliverables relating to human rights as part of their performance agreement'. No further details found, including the specific metrics to which the performance agreement is linked. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S: As above [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public • Not Met: Review of other senior management incentives for coherence with HRs policies
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HRs risks integrated as part of enterprise risk system • Not Met: Provides an example <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Risk assesment by Audit Committee or independent third party
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to workers and external stakeholders	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Met: Communicates HRs policies to all workers in own operations: The Sustainable Development report states that 'All directors, officers, employees, contractors and service providers are required to conform to our Code of Conduct and the expected standards of behaviours, as well as complying with all applicable laws [...]. The Code of Conduct training was updated in 2022 with enhanced sexual harassment content, including case examples, and that training has been delivered as part of the annual mandatory training refresh to all employees, third party contractors and service providers with access to our systems. All Woodside personnel must complete mandatory training on the Code of Conduct every year as part of their contract of employment. Personnel joining Woodside must also complete training on the Code of Conduct as part of their onboarding. Adherence to the Code of Conduct is part of each employment contract. In 2022, 100% of Woodside personnel were required to complete the Code of Conduct of Conduct refresher training'. The code contains commitments in relation to some ILO core

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>areas and a general statement of commitment to respect human rights of all people. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] & [Code of conduct, 12/2022: woodside.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to stakeholders: The Company has provided feedback to CHRB regarding this subindicator. However, no evidence found in relation to the requirements of this subindicator. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] • Not Met: Example of how HRs policies are accessible for intended audience: The Company has provided feedback to CHRB regarding this subindicator. However, no evidence found in relation to the requirements of this subindicator. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com]
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes steps to communicate HRs policies to EX BPs <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes how HRs policies are contractual/binding for suppliers: The Company states that its contractual terms and conditions include modern slavery provisions that provide warranties from suppliers and give it the right to audit and terminate supplier contract. The scope of the supplier code also include contractors and other partners. [Supplier Code of Business Conduct, N/A: woodside.com] & [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Not Met: Requires EX BPs to cascade contractual/binding HRs policies to their BPs
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Met: Describes how workers are trained on HRs policy commitments: The Company states that all employees, contractors, and service providers undergo mandatory training on the Code of Conduct when they join the company and annual compliance training thereafter. The Code of Conduct includes information about the Company and its employees' responsibilities to respect human rights. The Company also has an online Human Rights Awareness training module for its employees in high-risk areas of the business. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Not Met: Trains relevant managers including security on HRs: The Company states that it respects human rights through its security arrangements by delivering and maintaining security and human rights training for Woodside personnel responsible for security and private security providers. Nevertheless, no description was found on the actual training conducted. The Sustainable development report indicates that 'we continued to train our employees and contractors on human rights including their roles and responsibilities. In 2022, we contributed to the Ipieca Human Rights Introductory Awareness training video. We will use this to refresh our awareness training in 2023'. However, no specific details found in relation to how it trains all security personnel on human rights. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] & [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Trains BPs to meet HRs commitments • Not Met: Discloses % suppliers trained
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Monitors implementation of HRs policy commitments across global ops and EX BPs • Not Met: Discloses % of EX BP's monitored • Not Met: Describes how workers are involved in monitoring <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes corrective actions process • Not Met: Discloses findings and number of correction action processes
B.1.7	Engaging and terminating business relationships	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HRs performance affects selection EX BPs: The Company indicates that 'We also undertake human rights due diligence in the assessment of new and various existing business opportunities. This involves identifying and evaluating

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>actual or potential human rights risks to inform investment decisions and prevent or mitigate adverse impacts'. No details were found, however, in relation to how human rights performance affects selection of potential extractive business partners, pre-screening new suppliers (extractive business partners). [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: HRs performance affects ongoing BPs relationships: The Company reports that contractual terms and conditions include modern slavery provisions that provide warranties from suppliers and give the Company the right to audit and terminate supplier contract. If the Company identifies adverse human rights impacts in its supply chain, it would not immediately terminate the relationship, it will consider whether the Company can play a role in remediation. If the supplier was not receptive to remedying the impact and improving their practices, then the Company may terminate the relationship. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes positive HRs incentives for business relationships • Not Met: Works with EX BPs to meet HRs requirements
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with affected stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes how workers and communities identified and engaged in the last two years: The Company states that its stakeholders are identified through an iterative process that is continuously revisited. This process involves consideration of geography, legality, and nature of impacts in relation to its activities. In its Sustainable Development Report, the Company has listed up all affected stakeholders and explained how it listens to, what matters and what it does for each category of stakeholder. The Company reports that during 2021, it continued to host quarterly Karratha Community Liaison Group meetings. Key topics discussed at the meetings included housing, local participation, regulatory approvals, new energy, climate and the environment. It also engaged a variety of local stakeholders including Traditional Owners and Custodians, government representatives, community partners, industry and local suppliers and contractors and participated in forums hosted by community and non-government organisations. Engagements included business round table events, participating in the City of Karratha Safer Communities Partnership, Roebourne community discussions, senior leader meetings with the City of Karratha, school and community presentations and social investment partnership meetings. [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] & [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders: The Sustainable Development report indicates that 'In Australia, we maintain relationships with First Nations communities in the Pilbara, Kimberley, South West and Perth. Our approach has been extended to the diverse range of environments we are operating in as a global company, which include the United States, Mexico, Trinidad and Tobago, and New Zealand'. It reports in performance during 2022. In relation to Scarborough project, it states: 'Consultation with stakeholders such as MAC [Marujuga Aboriginal Corporation] commenced in 2018. A broad range of consultation activities were undertaken as part of this process. This included external communication including on our website, factsheets, direct emails to stakeholders and other communication tools such as advertising in local, state and national newspapers. We held community forums and group meetings with a broad range of stakeholders including First Nations stakeholders. We also held one-on-one meetings between environment, stakeholder and project management representatives [...] This year, Woodside in consultation with MAC completed the CHMP for the Scarborough project and provided it to the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation for approval, which was confirmed in January 2023. The CHMP [cultural heritage management plan] is designed to ensure that impacts to heritage sites and values, including to Murujuga's National Heritage Listed and World Tentative Heritage Listed values, are adequately protected in a manner agreed between Woodside and Traditional Owners and Custodians represented through MAC'. As another example, it reports: 'In October 2021, Woodside commenced engagement with the South West Land and Sea Council on behalf of the Gnaala Karla Booja Aboriginal Corporation, one of the six Noongar regional corporations, in relation to the proposed H2Perth project in Rockingham and Kwinana (Australia). Early consultation is critical to upholding the principles of FPIC. Woodside entered into a Noongar standard heritage agreement with the Gnaala Karla Booja to provide a respectful framework for engaging on cultural heritage issues in the project area. Woodside has since received cultural heritage reports from the Gnaala Karla Booja Traditional Owners and Custodians which will form the basis for avoiding, protecting and minimising impacts to cultural heritage and we

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>will develop, in partnership with the Gnaala Karla Booja, a CHMP. Since the surveys were completed, the Gnaala Karla Booja Regional Corporation finalised selection of directors and members for their Cultural Advice Committee. Woodside has written to the Gnaala Karla Booja seeking a time to present on the project and to further progress the relationship including, among other things, the cultural heritage management process'.. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Analysis of stakeholder views on company's HRs issues • Not Met: Describes how stakeholders views influenced company's HRs approach

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying human rights risks and impacts	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes process of identifying risks in own operations: The Company states that it periodically updates salient human rights risk assessment with the support of independent external business and human rights expert to identify the potential human rights at risk of the most severe negative impact through the company's activities and business relationships. This advice focuses on its potential impacts on people and their human rights, from the perspective of rightsholders rather than impacts on its businesses. The identification of the salient human rights risks guides human rights approach across its activities. In 2021, an expert business and human rights advisory firm conducted a company-wide salient human rights risk assessment. However, there is no description of the process the Company uses to identify and assess its human rights risks. <p>The Company further notes that 'In 2021, an internal audit was conducted on Woodside's Human Rights Policy commitments. The audit identified actions to strengthen our human rights approach, including a formal assessment of the risk of modern slavery in our supply chain, which was completed late in the year. To embed an integrated management approach to human rights across the business we developed and implemented a new Human Rights Procedure. Our Human Rights Procedure mandates that we conduct human rights diligence for our operated activities in countries considered to have high human rights risk every two years or when there is a significant change in our activity or the operating context. This country risk is determined through an annual review of all countries we have interests in through an analysis of independent data sources.'</p> <p>It also states that 'Human rights due diligence is mandatory for all operations and activities under our operational control in countries determined to have high human rights risk. Country risk is determined by a biannual desktop country human rights risk assessment. For non-operated activities and interests in high-risk countries, we request the operator provide the relevant human rights due diligence documentation or, if this is not available, we may undertake our own due diligence if necessary. We also undertake human rights due diligence in the assessment of new and various existing business opportunities. This involves identifying and evaluating actual or potential human rights risks to inform investment decisions and prevent or mitigate adverse impacts... 'We conduct social impact assessments for all major development activities to identify community impacts and opportunities, including those related to human rights.'</p> <p>'Our Human Rights Procedure mandates that we conduct human rights diligence for our operated activities in countries considered to have high human rights risk every two years or when there is a significant change in our activity or the operating context. This country risk is determined through an annual review of all countries we have interests in through an analysis of independent data sources, including the Global Slavery Index. In 2021, an expert advisory organisation completed a human rights risk analysis for offshore oil and gas operations in Myanmar, acknowledging that we had ceased activities in country due to political instability. The analysis considered labour rights and working conditions in Myanmar and identified a moderate risk of slavery, servitude or child labour within the supply chain workforce. Subsequent to the reporting period, we announced our decision to withdraw from our interests in Myanmar.' [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] & [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside.com]</p>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes process for identifying risks in EX BPs: The Company states that 'In 2021, an internal audit was conducted on Woodside's Human Rights Policy commitments. The audit identified actions to strengthen our human rights approach, including a formal assessment of the risk of modern slavery in our supply chain, which was completed late in the year. To embed an integrated management approach to human rights across the business we developed and implemented a new Human Rights Procedure. Our Human Rights Procedure mandates that we conduct human rights diligence for our operated activities in countries considered to have high human rights risk every two years or when there is a significant change in our activity or the operating context. This country risk is determined through an annual review of all countries we have interests in through an analysis of independent data sources.' <p>It further notes that 'Our supply chain human rights framework helps us to prioritise our due diligence activities. We focus our efforts on existing and potential suppliers that are considered high-risk, based on the category of product or service they provide which is informed by four main areas: Vulnerable populations; High-risk sectors; High-risk business models; High-risk geographies. Suppliers identified as high-risk are required to complete a modern slavery questionnaire and develop and implement a modern slavery management plan.'</p> <p>In addition, the Company explains that 'For contracts considered moderate to high priority for modern slavery risks as per our supplier framework, suppliers are required to complete a self-assessment due diligence questionnaire that enables us to assess their management maturity on the topic. This questionnaire was developed jointly with industry peers to avoid duplication and ensure consistency of requirements and messages.' [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] & [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes global risk identification system incl. stakeholder consultation • Met: Describes how risk identification system is triggered by new circumstances: The Sustainable development report indicates that 'Our identified salient human rights risks were considered in 2022 and no updates were required. We continue to implement recommendations from the 2021 salience assessment and in 2023 we will update the assessment to incorporate the merged portfolio'. The report from 2021 states that 'We have watched the political unrest in Myanmar with concern since the declaration of the state of emergency in February 2021. Our offshore exploration activities have since ceased, and with no producing assets in country, we have reduced our presence. In late 2020, a specialist advisory organisation commenced a human rights assessment for our activities in Myanmar. In response to COVID-19 restrictions and the political unrest in country, the scope was amended to a remote assessment'. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] & [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] • Met: Describes risks identified in relation to new circumstances: See above. The Company adds that 'In late 2020, a specialist advisory organisation commenced a human rights assessment for our activities in Myanmar. In response to COVID-19 restrictions and the political unrest in country, the scope was amended to a remote assessment. The resulting report, delivered in early 2021, identified human rights risks associated with offshore exploration activities in the north and development activities in the south. The recommendations from the report have been considered for integration into our management approach should we resume activities in Myanmar. In 2021 we provided humanitarian assistance through the Myanmar Red Cross Society, to support the country's COVID-19 Emergency Action Plan. In February 2021, we signed the Statement by Concerned Businesses Operating in Myanmar issued by the Myanmar Centre for Responsible Business and continue to work with industry partners and stakeholders to foster a business environment that respects human rights. Subsequent to the period, on 27 January 2022, Woodside decided to withdraw from its interest in Myanmar'. [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com]
B.2.2	Assessing human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes assessment process and discloses salient HRs risks: The Company states that it periodically updates salient human rights risk assessment with the support of independent external business and human rights expert to identify the potential human rights at risk of the most severe negative impact through the company's activities and business relationships. However, no description found on the process to determine saliency, including whether it considers any factor such as social, geographical, economical or other. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how process applies to EX BPs • Not Met: Public disclosure of results of HRs risk assessment: The Company reports that in late 2020, a specialist advisory organisation commenced a human rights assessment for its activities in Myanmar. In response to COVID-19 restrictions and the political unrest in country, the scope was amended to a remote assessment. The resulting report, delivered in early 2021, identified human rights risks associated with offshore exploration activities in the north and development activities in the south. The recommendations from the report have been considered for integration into its management approach should the Company resumes activities in Myanmar. In February 2021, it signed the Statement by Concerned Businesses Operating in Myanmar issued by the Myanmar Centre for Responsible Business and continue to work with industry partners and stakeholders to foster a business environment that respects human rights. On 27 January 2022, the Company decided to withdraw from its interest in Myanmar. However, it is not clear what are the specific human rights issues that the Company considers salient as result of huma rights assessments. [Sustainable Development Report, 31/12/2018: files.woodside] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Describes how assessment involved affected stakeholders
B.2.3	Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impact assessments	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes system to prevent, mitigate and remediate HRs issues: The Company states that it is committed to remedying any adverse human rights impacts on individuals, workers, and communities that it identifies it has caused or contributed to. If it is directly linked to an adverse impact through its supply chain or other business relationship, the Company will consider whether it can play a role in remediation. However, there is no details of the process or system to prevent or remediate its human rights risks. • Not Met: Describes how global system applies to EX BPs • Not Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HRs issue <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Describes how stakeholders involved in decisions about actions taken
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes system for evaluation effectiveness of actions • Not Met: Example of lessons learned from evaluation effectiveness of actions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Involves stakeholders in evaluation effectiveness of actions
B.2.5	Communicating on human rights impacts	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders: The Company provides the following information: 'On 22 September 2022, Woodside received a Joint Communication (Communication) from the Special Procedures Branch of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner Human Rights. The correspondence raised issues regarding our activities on the Burrup Peninsula (Murujuga) and impacts on climate change and on Aboriginal rock art [...] Woodside prepared a submission in response to the matters raised in the Communication to support a wider understanding of the projects in question and the way we conduct our business'. The report includes a link to both the United Nations Communication and the Company's response. The Company has provided an additional example regarding request and response in the contact of 'Scarborough Cultural Heritage Management Plan': 'One of the requests made by MAC during consultations was the addition of a mechanism in the CHMP to address any new ethnographic values identified through further heritage assessments. Woodside worked with MAC [Marujuga Aboriginal Corporation] to establish a Heritage Management Committee (HMC) whose role would be to consider the necessary mitigation measures required to address any new heritage information arising following certain milestones related to the Scarborough project. The HMC is expected to advise Woodside where any additional mitigation measures are recommended and of any other actions MAC or Woodside should consider. MAC responded to Woodside's proposal, specifying that membership of the HMC should include: MAC's Circle of Elders; MAC's Board and/or executive; MAC staff; Woodside; Appropriately qualified heritage experts agreed between MAC and Woodside. This year,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Woodside in consultation with MAC completed the CHMP for the Scarborough project and provided it to the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation for approval, which was confirmed in January 2023'. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes challenges to effective comms and how it is working to address them

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance mechanism(s) for workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all workers: The Company states that it encourages all stakeholders to speak up about misconduct. Stakeholders can lodge a grievance with the Company using a variety of channels as detailed on its website including telephone, mail, and email. It also has localised community grievance mechanisms across its operations which are accessible on its website. Its perception surveys and social impact and opportunity assessments also take stakeholder views into account. Besides, the Company has a whistleblower hotline (EthicsPoint), which provides multi-language and multi-jurisdiction capability and online functionality. All matters reported through EthicsPoint are assessed and investigated in accordance with the internal investigations process, overseen by a multi-discipline Investigations Steering Group. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and workers made aware: The Company states that in 2021, it implemented a new external whistleblower hotline (EthicsPoint) with multi-language and multi-jurisdiction capability and online functionality. A campaign was undertaken in the second half of the year to raise awareness of the service and to encourage personnel to speak up. [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] • Met: Describes how workers in EX BPs access grievance mechanism: The Company states in its Supplier Code of Business Conduct that 'If you are aware, or suspect, that one of our employees, suppliers or subcontractors is acting inappropriately, you must inform your Woodside representative, or you can anonymously contact the confidential Woodside whistleblower hotline service - EthicsPoint. Further details to submit a report online or by phone can be found at ethic point page'. [Supplier Code of Business Conduct, N/A: woodside.com] • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs
C.2	Grievance mechanism(s) for external individuals and communities	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all external individuals and communities: The Company states in 'Our Approach to Human Rights' that it encourages all stakeholders to speak up about misconduct. Stakeholders can lodge a grievance using a variety of channels including telephone, mail, and email. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and affected stakeholders made aware: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this subindicator, showing how it makes grievance mechanisms available to local communities in local languages. The sustainable development report indicates that 'Woodside's Community Grievance Framework is designed to ensure prompt and respectful receipt, investigation and response to community concerns from stakeholders in our operational areas. The associated local mechanisms are available to community members who feel Woodside's activities have impacted them. Translated versions of local mechanisms in Myanmar and Senegal are also available and for the Trion project in Mexico a local community grievance mechanism will be developed as part of the social impact assessment (SIA) work. For the First Nations communities in Western Australia, our grievance mechanism are communicated verbally, in respect to the communities strong spoken language and preference of the same. Community members can lodge grievances via the Community Concerns page on our website, the Woodside community phone line, via email or they may contact their closest Woodside office. Our regional offices support local teams to build trusting relationships with communities and receive feedback on a regular basis'. [Le dialogue avec les acteurs locaux est une priorité pour nous (in French), N/A: woodside.com] & [What we do - Sangomar, N/A: woodside.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how external individuals/communities access grievance mechanism • Not Met: Expects EX BPs to convey expectation to their BPs
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the mechanism(s)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how users engaged on design and performance • Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on design and performance <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how users engaged on improvement of mechanism • Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on improvement
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s) are equitable, publicly available and explained	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes procedure and timescales for managing complaints or concerns: The Company states that it has several steps of investigating reports of unacceptable conduct, including deciding person to investigate a report, an appropriate internal or external investigator. Then the Company described how an investigation is carried out. During the process, the Company points out that investigating should be proceeded with care and appropriate speed. After the investigation is finished, a verbal report will be made to the person who disclosed the matter. However, no details found in relation to timescales for addressing complaints. The Company's website on community concern states that 'We will endeavour to respond to the complainant with a proposed resolution within five to ten business days. If the complainant accepts the proposed resolution, the agreed actions will be implemented. If we are unable to agree on a resolution with the complainant, the case may be escalated for review and final decision'. It is not clear, however, how complainants are informed, and whether similar timescales are applied to other mechanism beyond community, as this mechanism seems to be exclusive for local community concerns. [Whistleblower Policy, 12/2022: woodside.com] & [Community concerns website, N/A: woodside.com] • Not Met: Describes technical, financial, advisory support to enable equal access <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe types of outcome to complainant through use of mechanism • Not Met: Describes escalation to senior levels / independent adjudicators
C.5	Prohibition of retaliation for raising complaints or concerns	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation against workers/stakeholders: The Company states that it is committed to protecting and respecting the rights of any Woodside person who reports unacceptable conduct in accordance with the Whistleblower Policy. The Company will not tolerate any actual or threatened (whether express or implied and whether or not there is any intention to carry out the threat or the Woodside person who receives the threat fears that the threat will be carried out) reprisals (including dismissal or demotion), discrimination, bias, harassment, intimidation, victimisation or any other injury or damage to any person suspected of making a report of unacceptable conduct, or, to the extent required by applicable law, against that person's colleagues, employer (if a contractor), relatives, or any other person where the reason for the detrimental conduct relates to the suspicion that a person has made, may make, or could make a report of unacceptable conduct. The Company provided feedback to CHRB regarding this subindicator. However, it was already awarded. [Whistleblower Policy, 12/2022: woodside.com] • Met: Describes practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company states in its Whistleblower Policy that anonymous reports of unacceptable conduct can be made to the Recipients identified in this Policy, or via EthicsPoint. A Woodside person who makes an anonymous report of unacceptable conduct may refuse to answer questions they feel could reveal their identity at any time. If, however, insufficient information is provided, Woodside may not be able to investigate the anonymous reporter's claims. If a Woodside person makes a report of unacceptable conduct under this Policy, Woodside will take steps to ensure that person's identity is protected from disclosure. Woodside will ensure that any records relating to a report of unacceptable conduct are stored securely and confidentially and are able to be accessed only by Woodside staff who are authorised to access the information for the purposes of assessing or investigating the report. It is illegal under Australian law for a person to disclose the identity of a Woodside person. The Company provided feedback to CHRB regarding this subindicator. However, it was already awarded. [Whistleblower Policy, 12/2022: woodside.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Specifies no legal action, firing or violence: The Company states that 'Woodside does not make retaliatory suits against persons who have brought or tried to bring a case against it involving credible allegation of adverse human rights impacts or against the lawyers representing them. We also will not terminate employment of any workers who have brought or tried to bring a case against us involving an allegation of human rights abuse or engaged in violent acts or threats to the livelihoods, careers or reputation of claimants or their lawyers. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] • Met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation against workers/stakeholders: Finally, following the statment of previous subindicator, the Company states that 'We also expect our business partners to not retaliate against people raising complaints'. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside]
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Complainants not asked to waive legal rights • Not Met: Does not require confidentiality provisions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Cooperates with state based non judicial mechanisms • Not Met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes approach taken to remedy adverse HRs impacts • Not Met: Describes how remedy would be provided if no adverse impact identified: The Company indicates that 'Woodside is committed to remedying any adverse human rights impacts on individuals, workers and communities that we identify we have caused or contributed to. If we are directly linked to an adverse impact through our supply chain or other business relationship, we will consider whether we play a role in remediation. This process is outlined in our Human Rights Due Diligence and Remediation Guideline'. However, no further details found, including the Guideline or alternative source where the steps to provide remedy are described. [Our approach to human rights, 07/2020: files.woodside] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes changes to systems, processes and practices to prevent future impacts • Not Met: Describes approach to monitoring/implementing agreed remedy • Not Met: Describes approach to learning from incidents if no adverse impacts identified
C.8	Communication on the effectiveness of grievance mechanism(s) and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses number of grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcomes achieved • Not Met: Example of how lessons from mechanism improved HRs management system <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes process to evaluate mechanism and changes made as a result • Not Met: Decribes procedures to address delays of outcomes agreed with stakeholders

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.1	Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Pays living wage or sets time-bound target • Not Met: Describes how living wage determined <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Achieved paying living wage • Not Met: Reviews definition living wage with unions

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> • Met: Member of EITI: The Company states that it joined the EITI in 2005 and became an EITI Supporting Company in 2008. [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: The Company released a Payments to Governments report for 2022 showing 'production entitlements', 'taxes', 'royalties', 'signature, discovery and production bonuses', 'fees' and total amount of payments for Australia, Canada, Mexico, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, and United States of America. It also discloses similar information broken down by project within each country. [2022 Payments to Governments report, 2023: woodside.com] • Not Met: Provides example of contracts for terms of exploitation for countries without disclosure requirements
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Measures to prohibit violence/retaliation against workers for joining trade union • Not Met: Discloses % of total direct operations covered by CB agreements <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts: The Company states that it implements systems to identify, assess and control health and safety risks to as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP), complying with relevant laws and regulations and applying responsible standards where laws do not exist. Regarding process safety management, the Company identifies process safety risks through design and operation to proactively manage the integrity of its facilities to prevent and mitigate a major accident event. It works to understand key risks and act to ensure work scopes are completed to maintain integrity. An example of this risk-based approach is its analysis of lower consequence events (i.e. Tier 3 loss of primary containment process safety events), which proactively identified valve stems as a risk area. [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] • Met: Discloses injury rate or lost days for last reporting period: The Company reports that in 2021, total recordable injury rate for employees was 1.25 and total recordable injury rate for contractors was 2.09. Frequency rates are calculated per million work hours. [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] • Met: Discloses fatalities for last reporting period: The Company reports that total number of fatalities for both employees and contractor was 0 in 2021. [Sustainable Development Report 2021, 2022: woodside.com] • Not Met: Discloses occupational disease rate for last reporting period <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company discloses targets for FY 2022, performance against 2022 targets and 2023 targets, which include 'one or fewer Tier 1 or Tier 2 loss of primary containment process safety events'; 'TRIR below 1.0'. However, the Company is expected to set targets for all the metrics required for this indicator (i.e. fatalities, occupational disease, Injury/frequency rate). [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] • Met: Met targets or explains why not or actions to improve H&S management systems: The Company reports 'Zero Tier 1 and one Tier 2 loss of primary containment process safety events'. 1.8 TRIR. The Company indicates that 'In 2022, we had zero Tier 1 and one Tier 2 loss of primary containment (LOPC) process safety events (PSE). The Tier 2 LOPC PSE involved 2,000 litres of diesel flowing into secondary containment as per design with no impact to people, the environment or the economy. Our total recordable injury rate (TRIR) of 1.80 increased with 30 recordable injuries in 2022 compared to 27 in 2021. The main injury types were lacerations, wounds and soft tissue injuries. Zero injuries were high-consequence work-related injuries. Three resulted in lost work time compared to seven in 2021. Our lost days due to lost time injury decreased from 457 days in 2021 to 154 days in 2022. Workforce exposure hours increased by 8% from 2021. Increase in exposure hours in 2022 is due to assets acquired through the merger with BHP's petroleum business and an increase in project activity. High potential incidents (HPIs) decreased to ten from 14 in 2021'. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples' rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Process to identify/recognise indigenous rights holders: The Company indicates that 'Woodside is committed to establishing and maintaining positive relationships with the First Nations peoples in the locations in which we work and live. The early engagement of the Gnaala Karla Booja from the south west of Western Australia, the establishment of our relationship with Ngāi Tahu iwi in New Zealand, and the agreement making process with the Ngarluma Aboriginal Corporation (NAC) in the Pilbara, Western Australia, is testament to this approach'. The Company then describes engagement with different rights holders in different projects. However, no details found of the process by which it identifies and recognises specific indigenous rights holders with whom to engage. [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] • Met: Describes how indigenous communities are engaged during assessment: The Company reports in relation to engagement with indigenous communities as part of the development of its proposed projects: For example, 'In October 2021, Woodside commenced engagement with the South West Land and Sea Council on behalf of the Gnaala Karla Booja Aboriginal Corporation, one of the six Noongar regional corporations, in relation to the proposed H2Perth project in Rockingham and Kwinana (Australia). Early consultation is critical to upholding the principles of FPIC. Woodside entered into a Noongar standard heritage agreement with the Gnaala Karla Booja to provide a respectful framework for engaging on cultural heritage issues in the project area. Woodside has since received cultural heritage reports from the Gnaala Karla Booja Traditional Owners and Custodians which will form the basis for avoiding, protecting and minimising impacts to cultural heritage and we will develop, in partnership with the Gnaala Karla Booja, a CHMP. Since the surveys were completed, the Gnaala Karla Booja Regional Corporation finalised selection of directors and members for their Cultural Advice Committee. Woodside has written to the Gnaala Karla Booja seeking a time to present on the project and to further progress the relationship including, among other things, the cultural heritage management process'. It also reports, in the context of a different project, that 'In 2022, a SIA was completed to identify impacts and opportunities from our operations and proposed activities in the Pilbara region in Western Australia. The work also extended to inform our early phases of the Northern Carnarvon carbon capture and storage project. The social performance dashboard for the Pilbara region, including review of emerging trends, key community indicators and stakeholder sentiment, was shared monthly with leaders to ensure the business was responding to community needs and aspirations and not contributing to adverse impacts. We aim to implement a similar dashboard for the Exmouth and Onslow (Australia) communities and continue to share information and grow knowledge about the social performance priorities with our teams and employees. An SIA and Social Impact Management Plan for these communities is underway. Interviews were undertaken with community stakeholders in November with findings to be delivered in 2023. A social baseline scan for the Broome (Australia) region was also completed to support proactive identification of evolving social issues, emerging regulatory or policy changes and any changes in societal expectations for the Browse development. Findings are anticipated to inform future social performance activities, including social impact assessment, stakeholder engagement and social contribution'. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to FPIC: The Company states that it engages with affected communities of First Nations in ways that are consistent with the principles of seeking Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). However, the Company does not have an explicit commitment to FPIC. [Indigenous Communities Policy (First Nations Communities Policy), 12/2022: woodside.com] • Not Met: Recent example of obtaining FPIC or not pursuing indigenous people's land/resources

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.3.6	Land rights: Land acquisition (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes approach to identifying land tenure rights holders and negotiating compensation: The Company states that it acknowledges the unique relationships that Indigenous communities have to land and waters and its engagements are guided by the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Company has provided a source to CHRB regarding this subindicator. However, no description found of the general process/steps it follows to identify the land holders, particularly those more vulnerable, and negotiates compensation with them. Evidence supplier refers to a specific documentation on a project in which the Company recognises the indigenous peoples' as traditional owners and discloses the agreement reached: 'The three Contracting Parties (comprising the Ngarluma-Yindjibarndi, Wong-Goo-Tt-Oo, and Yaburara Mardudhunera) received land entitlements and financial benefits as compensation for surrendering their native title rights and interests, and discontinuing their Native Title Determination Applications in the Federal Court, over the land and waters of the Burrup. This was documented by the WA Government with what is known as the BMIEA in 2003'. [Indigenous Communities Policy (First Nations Communities Policy), 12/2022: woodside.com] & [Woodside solar facility - referral supporting document, 02/2023: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes approach to compensation including valuation • Not Met: Describes steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals
D.3.7	Security (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes security implementation (incl. VPs or ICOC) and provides an example: The Company states that it conducts business in a way that respects the human rights of all people. It will achieve its human rights commitment by managing security in a way that respects human rights, as reflected by its commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights and implementing Security and Human Rights Framework to help ensure the security of people, assets, the environments in which we work and the communities with whom it interacts. The Company conducts security and human rights risk assessments where it has operations or activities in countries identified as high risk, with the timing of these assessments and reviews aligned to security risk assessments conducted for specific locations. It also conducts security and human rights due diligence on all private security providers prior to contracting, including a questionnaire process. Besides, the Company listed three examples of implementation in Australia, Myanmar, and Senegal. The Company reports that in Senegal, a conformity assessment was completed in early 2021, which included a review of compliance with VPSHR elements. The provider also conducts its own training of its staff on VPSHR. Engagement with contractors in relation to awareness of VPSHR is well established with major contractors, with monthly reporting on security status, including training. A VPSHR strategy document for the Sangomar Project field development was completed in early 2021, and has been promoted with the Senegalese Navy, private security provider in-country and major contractors, with commencement of offshore operations in mid-2021. [Human Right Policy, 04/2023: woodside.com] & [Voluntary Principles on Security & Human Rights Annual Report 2021: woodside.com] • Not Met: Ensures Business Partners/JVs follow security approach <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Security and HRs assessment includes input from local communities • Not Met: Two examples of working with local communities to improve security
D.3.8	Water and sanitation (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes preventative/corrective action plans for water and sanitation risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Sets targets on water stewardship that consider water use by local communities • Not Met: Reports progress in meeting targets and trends demonstrating progress
D.3.9	Women's rights (in own extractive operations, which include JVs)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes processes to stop harassment and violence against women • Not Met: Working conditions take into account gender issues

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of employment: The Company has the following 'deliverable': 'Continue to ensure controls and monitoring are in place to achieve equitable pay for all employees'. The Company reports progress as follows: 'Controls have been embedded in internal processes for external recruiting, internal resourcing and promotions focused on parity and addressing potential bias in remuneration. The merger with BHP Petroleum included a review of employee compensation, focused on competitiveness for employees in the new company'. The Company has provided further evidence, including a questionnaire submitted to the Australian government, where, in relation to pay equality in strategy, it states that 'To ensure no gender bias occurs at any point in the remuneration review process (for example at commencement, at annual salary reviews, out-of-cycle pay reviews, and performance reviews); To ensure managers are held accountable for pay equity outcomes; To implement and/or maintain a transparent and rigorous performance assessment process'. It also indicates that the following measures were taken 'as a result of your gender remuneration gap analysis': 'Created a pay equity strategy or action plan; Identified cause/s of the gaps; Reviewed remuneration decision-making processes; Analysed performance ratings to ensure there is no gender bias (including unconscious bias); Reported pay equity metrics (including gender pay gaps) to the executive; Trained people managers in addressing gender bias (including unconscious bias); Corrected like-for-like gaps.' [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com] & [2022-2023 Gender Equality Reporting submitted by Woodside (Australian Gov - WGEA), 29/05/2023: woodside.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating closing gender pay gap

E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Discrimination • Headline: A series of sexual harassment claims on FIFO sites • Story: A parliamentary enquiry has been told that Woodside Petroleum has heard 16 substantiated claims of sexual harassment over the course of five years. While none of the incidents led to legal proceedings, the Company has fired 12 workers in the context of the allegations. Of those fired six were Woodside employees, the other six were contractors. [News.com, 15/11/2021, "Woodside fired 12 workers for sexual harassment over past five years, inquiry told of cruel 'initiation' rituals": news.com.au] [Insurance Journal, 29/06/2022, "Probe Into Australia's Mining Sector Uncovers 'Horrific' Sexual Abuses": insurancejournal.com] [ABC News, 15/11/2021, "FIFO parliamentary inquiry hears WA police investigated 23 sexual harassment claims": abc.net.au] [Energy News Bulletin, 01/09/2021, "FIFO sexual harassment "out of sight, out of mind" for industry": energynewsbulletin.net]
E(1).1	The company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response: Woodside executive vice-president Fiona Hicks told the ongoing West Australian parliamentary inquiry that none of the cases had resulted in criminal charges but the company was reviewing all its sexual harassment policies and processes. She apologised to all those who were victims of inappropriate conduct, including sexual harassment. "Thank you to those people that have spoken up," Ms Hicks said. <p>Woodside provided a public submission to the Parliamentary Inquiry into sexual harassment against women in the FIFO mining industry. In the submission, the company stated it "maintain a zero-tolerance approach to such behaviour and actively encourage our employees to report any potential incidences" and "All FIFO accommodation facilities we use are situated in the local community and managed under procedures and practices to provide a safe environment and support a responsible approach to personal alcohol consumption" [ABC News, 15/11/2021: abc.net.au] [Woodside, 06/08/2021, "SUBMISSION TO THE INQUIRY INTO SEXUAL HARASSMENT AGAINST WOMEN IN THE FIFO MINING INDUSTRY ": parliament.wa.gov.au]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The company responded in very general terms and did not address all aspects of the allegation in detail. Furthermore, the Company

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment.
E(1).2	The company has investigated and taken appropriate action	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders: There is no evidence suggesting the company engaged with the affected stakeholders. Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. • Not Met: Identified cause: In its submission to the inquiry, the company states: "Allegations of discrimination, harassment and inappropriate behaviour are Investigated under the supervision of a cross-functional steering group". However, the company did not present investigative results on the underlying causes of sexual harassments allegations. Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. [Woodside, 06/08/2021: parliament.wa.gov.au] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identified and implemented improvements: Woodside fired a dozen workers after 16 substantiated incidents of sexual harassment over five years. <p>In its submission to the inquiry, Woodside noted that its induction procedures and annual code of conduct training include material to educate people on and prevent sexual harassment, saying "further action is being taken to further enhance those measures".</p> <p>In its 2022 sustainable development report the company indicates that 'We continue to be an active participant in industry working groups which are responding to the Enough is Enough report findings from the Western Australia parliamentary inquiry into Sexual harassment against women in the fly in fly out mining industry.'</p> <p>[News.com, 15/11/2021: news.com.au] [Energy News Bulletin, 01/09/2021: energynewsbulletin.net] [2022 Sustainable Development Report, 2023: woodside.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken
E(1).3	The company has engaged with affected stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy: There is no evidence suggesting the company provided remedy to the affected stakeholders. Furthermore, the Company provided feedback for this indicator. However, it was not material for the assessment. • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used

Disclaimer

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