

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Archer Daniels Midland
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
Overall Score (*) 29.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
2.3	10	A. Governance and Policies
10.2	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
4.2	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
2.8	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
6.7	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
3.8	10	F. Transparency

(*) 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 2018 Methodology document. 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 Policies (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 • Met: General HRs commitment: The Company explains on the website that 'we have a responsibility to respect human rights' and in their HR policy document it indicates that 'ADM colleagues are united through six values that demonstrate our insistence on achieving the right results, the right way: integrity, respect, excellence, resourcefulness, teamwork and responsibility. ADM's commitment to human rights embodies and reflects these company values, and specifically respect.' [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] Score 2 • Not met: UNGPs: Though the HR policy refers to the Global Principles, it does not explicitly say it is committed to it. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: In its 2016 sustainability report, the CEO letter mentions that they are proud to be "participant in the UN Global Compact and remain committed to its Ten Principles, which are focused on upholding responsibilities in the areas of human rights. [Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com] • Met: All four ILO for AG suppliers: The supplier expectations document contains a explicit commitment to each ILO core area for suppliers. [Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: All four ILO Core: HR policies explicitly mention all the 5 ILO core labour standards and health and safety of their workers (4.1.5) and expect it from their suppliers [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: See above [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: Mentioned in their supplier expectation [Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com]
A.1.3.a.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG)	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: Respect land ownership and resources: In the HR policy, it mentions 'Respect land-tenure right and the rights of indigenous and local communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to operations on lands to which they hold legal rights'. And in Article 4.2 – they expect their suppliers to do the same. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: Respecting the right to water: Their HR policy mentions their respect of the right to water [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights: Their HR policy mentions that suppliers are also expected to respect it [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC Performance Standards • Met: FPIC for all: Their HR policy mentions "Respect land-tenure right and the rights of indigenous and local communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to operations on lands to which they hold legal rights" [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Met: Respecting the right to water: see above [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights: See above [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com]
A.1.3.b.AG	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - people's rights (AG)	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: Women's rights • Not met: Children's rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company commits to stakeholder engagement in the context of supply chains: 'work collaboratively with stakeholders to improve working, environmental and safety conditions in agricultural supply chains', and also has a specific grievance mechanism for external stakeholders. However, no evidence found of a general commitment to engage (proactively) with affected stakeholders (workers, their families, local communities, etc.) including also its owned operations. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com & Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: Although the Company engaged with Deloitte to develop a materiality matrix based on stakeholder engagement and feedback, it is not clear whether it regularly engages in material matters with affected stakeholders including workers, their families, local communities, etc. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company has a grievance mechanism specifically for external stakeholders in relation to human rights and deforestation; however this is a passive mechanism. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: Although the Company discloses a log of the cases reported by external stakeholders through the Grievance mechanism, no evidence found of regularly engagement with affected stakeholders and legitimate representatives in the development or monitoring of

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			the policy approach, as this seems a passive mechanism. [Grievances and resolutions summary table, 07/2018: assets.adm.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy: However, it has a specific grievance mechanism for external stakeholders to deal with issues related to human rights for its own operations and those of its supply chain. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts: Although through the Issues and resolutions protocol (grievance mechanism for external stakeholders related to human rights issues connected to the Company or its supply chain) the Company works with the supply chain, it is not clear if it is committed to work with suppliers to remedy adverse impacts through the suppliers own mechanisms or through the development of third party non-judicial remedies. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com]
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: CEO or Board approves policy: The CEO has signed the HR policy [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior responsibility fo HR (inc ILO): The Company indicates that 'sustainability efforts are led by our Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO). The CSO is supported by a Sustainability Council made up of senior management and company officers representing our strategy, law, human resources, technology and operations teams. Regular reports on implementation efforts and progress are given to the Board of Directors'. However, it is not clear whether this senior responsibility also includes human rights. [Corporate sustainability report, 2017: assets.adm.com & Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition to the corporate group mentioned above, the Company states that 'we have regional teams in North America, South America and EMEA supporting sustainability initiatives and implementation on the ground. However, as mentioned above, it is not clear whether these teams deal also with human rights-related issues. [Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility in supply chain
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 for human rights • Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
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: HR part of enterprise risk system: The Company indicates that it faces risk of human rights violations, particularly in countries with lower HDI values. It indicates that it has established the human rights policy to address these risks. However, no evidence found of human rights risk management being integrated as part of the general Enterprise Risk Management system. [Corporate sustainability report, 2017: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	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: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: In the HR policy it mentions that employees will be trained on HR, and that the policy will be disseminated through intranet, workplace postings etc. The policy is available in 6 languages [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder: Although stakeholders have grievance channels available to communicate issues related to the Company's human rights policy, it is not clear how it communicates these policy commitments to stakeholders, including local communities and potentially affected stakeholders. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com & Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: In the HR policy "This policy will be communicated to suppliers through direct communication, posting in areas that are visible to suppliers, and inclusion in supplier contracts and/or incorporation via ADM's Supplier Expectation Guidelines [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Including to AG suppliers: In order to meet this indicator, the company must cascade the communications down the supply chain and there is no evidence to support this. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: In their HR policy, article 4.2 explains that if the supplier does not adhere to the company's HR standards, the company could terminate the contract with that supplier [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Including on AG suppliers: In their HR policy, article 4.2 explains that if the supplier does not adhere to the company's HR standards, the company could terminate the contract with that supplier. However, it does fail to require suppliers to cascade it down to their suppliers. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company indicates in its human rights progress reports that ADM colleague training presentations focus on three simple themes: 1. Our commitment to Human Rights Policy, 2. How to recognize potential human rights abuses; and 3. What to do when abuses are observed. The Company reports training carried (or to be carried out) in each periodic report. However, no evidence found of this training covering all employees or at least relevant managers and workers including procurement. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant managers including procurement: The training that the company provides includes high risk areas, but no evidence found of this training covering relevant managers including procurement. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The company has a system of monitoring the implementation of Human rights policies in high risk areas of its own operations and its suppliers. It publishes reports periodically. It also explains on going and future monitoring: "In 2018, ADM will continue assessing direct operations through Sedex and employee training." [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com] • Met: Monitoring AG suppliers: The reports which the company publishes periodically has information on the monitoring of its suppliers. In its last progress report it mentions its plan for supplier engagement and transformation and monitoring. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects selection of suppliers [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships: From the HR policy: "Upon discovery of any supplier, contractor, or business partner that does not satisfy the standards in 4.1 above or that misrepresents the conditions under which crops, goods or services have been produced, ADM will take appropriate action. If that party does not demonstrate a good-faith effort to address issues in a timely manner, those actions may include: exclusion from new direct contracts, termination of relationship. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with suppliers to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems: The Company reports affected stakeholder engagement in human rights in the context of the stakeholder grievance mechanism for human rights issues. However, no evidence found of a systematic approach to identify and engage affected stakeholders in the last two years, including workers in the supply chain and local communities. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com & Corporate sustainability report, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: It also indicates that it works with stakeholders along its supply chain to implement policies and identify sustainable sourcing options. The Human rights progress report also states that it works with stakeholders 'to address opportunities for improvement in the agricultural supply chain, including worker rights and conditions, on-farm health and safety, and the land rights of indigenous peoples. However, no evidence found of direct engagement in human rights issues including a description of frequency and triggers. [Corporate sustainability report, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Workers in SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the SC engaged Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identifying risks in own operations: The company has a system of identifying high risk areas which includes supply chain. The Company states that it uses the United Nations Human Development Index (HDI) as its source of data to prioritize implementation in high-risk geographic regions. This covered their supply chains. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers: The company has a system of identifying high risk areas which includes supply chain. The Company states that it uses the United Nations Human Development Index (HDI) as its source of data to prioritize implementation in high-risk geographic regions. This covered their supply chains. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: The Company started a 6 phase process. The first two were reported completed in the first half of 2016, including analysing global human rights issues and identification of high risk geographies, and analysing the supply chain, identifying priority geographies, activities and facilities with respect to issues and risks. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com] • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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: Salient risk assessment (and context): In its different progress reports it identified the in the human rights policy implementation progress report the assessment carried out through the United Nations Human Development Index. It also identified risk areas and KPIs to assess compliance with HR. The Company provides a list of countries analysed based in Human Development. It has facilities in 6 countries ranked as Medium Human Development, One facility in Myanmar (low Human Development) and in 15 of the 55 countries ranked as High Human Development. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company used the United Nations Human Development Index to prioritise countries at risk for human rights abuses. Particularly, it indicates that 'agricultural production, particularly in countries with lower HDI values, has a higher risk of using slave and child labor, not paying living wages, having unsafe working conditions and violating additional rights'. These practices threaten the development and livelihood of local communities'. [Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking 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: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Met: Example of Actions decided: The Company provides examples of actions taken at specific places following the implementation plan of its policy. It includes workshops with suppliers in Sabah, Malaysia, to protect children from child labour, in which attendees were informed of the risks related to children in plantation work and possible strategies to reduce the participation of children, including how to strengthen access to education, and an agreement in Brazil with a monitoring service to ensure suppliers in Brazil are not part of the Slave Labor List issues by the Brazilian Ministry of Labor. [Human rights progress report H2 2017, 2018: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Including in AG supply chain: Although examples refer to the supply chain, it is not clear that the Company has a comprehensive system to take action about salient human rights issues globally. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com & Human rights progress report H2 2017, 2018: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating 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: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	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: Comms plan re identifying risks: The Company publishes periodic reports explaining the different phases for implementing the policy. The first one consists in analysing global human rights issues and identify high risk geographies, the

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>second one analysing the supply chain, identify priority geographies, activities and facilities. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: The Company explains in its human rights periodic reports how it is going in the process of identifying risks and locations, and describes how many facilities are located in high risk countries. In the sustainability report it describes which are the human rights issues that it faces developing its agricultural activities. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com & Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Met: Including AG suppliers: The process described above includes the company's facilities and the supply chain. [Progress reports on HR, 2015-2017: adm.com & Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: The Company has a procedure to handle issues and resolutions for concerns raised by 'any external parties, including individuals, government organizations and no governmental organizations, regarding the implementation of and compliance with our commitment to No Deforestation and our Commitment to Respect Human Rights'. It discloses a document with the log of the cases reported, including date received, topic (deforestation and/or human rights), subject matter, stakeholders involved and the progress made/status of the grievance. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com & Grievances and resolutions summary table, 07/2018: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications: Although the Company has a public record of cases on its website including a summary of the status/progress, it's not clear how it progress is communicated to stakeholders in the field. [Grievances and resolutions summary table, 07/2018: assets.adm.com]

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from 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: Channel accessible to all workers: The Code of conduct describes different channels for communicating grievances and raise concerns for employees, including local resources, appropriate representatives, the Compliance and the ADM Helpline. The helpline is operated by a third party and is available worldwide on the website and it provides a list of phone numbers and online reporting. For employees in EU countries, the helpline is only available for reporting financial and corruption issues. If the report comes from these countries, and the employee wishes to report other type of matters, then the contact point is the regional compliance team, the human resources, or the legal department. In addition, the Company discloses on its website the contact of the VP of compliance. [Code of Conduct, February 2017: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: However, the Company keeps a publicly available log of grievances and resolutions from external stakeholders. [Grievances and resolutions summary table, 07/2018: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: Although the Helpline is available in more than 20 languages, in the European Union, employees can't use this line and need to contact regional teams. It is not clear whether there are teams in every relevant EU country or employees contact points are available in all appropriate languages. [External helpline on website, 07/2018: admway.alertline.com] • Met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers: The supplier expectations document includes human rights. For reporting potential misconducts, the code document provides several options for suppliers, including postal mail, email, telephone, and the external helpline services which is provided through internet. [Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In the company's 'Issues and Resolution procedure document' individuals/communities can raise concerns. The document states the following: 'We welcome correspondence from any external parties, including individuals, government organizations and non-governmental organizations, regarding the implementation of and compliance with our

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	individuals and communities		<p>Commitment to No deforestation and our Commitment to Respect Human Rights." [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: "The ADM Way Helpline telephone service is free. It is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week to those of us located in countries that have available access codes (see the back of our Code for details). Its operators speak nearly all languages" [Code of Conduct, February 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems: Though the company does publish its allegation phone number on the supplier code, it does not explicitly explain that it expects the suppliers to have the same [Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com] • Met: AG supplier communities use global system: The supply code mentions an address/phone number for complaints [Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com]
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/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: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: AG suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	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: Response timescales: The company describes the work flow to address the complaints and in that document it includes the timescales for responses. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com] • Met: How complainants will be informed: The company describes in the work flow the process of how the complaints are dealt with and it includes how the complainants are informed. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	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: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: the company prohibits retaliation in their code of conduct booklet (p.8) "ADM will never tolerate any form of retaliation against you for making a good faith report of actual or potential misconduct". Moreover, the company allows anonymity "If you wish to make a report via the ADM Way Helpline, you may share your name or stay anonymous, where local law allows." [Code of Conduct, February 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: It allows anonymity which is a practical measure against retaliation "If you wish to make a report via the ADM Way Helpline, you may share your name or stay anonymous, where local law allows." However, it is not clear whether external stakeholders are covered by company's commitment. [Code of Conduct, February 2017: assets.adm.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to prohibit retaliation
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: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts 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: Describes how remedy has been provided: In their Issues and Resolutions Summary Table, they describe how they dealt with complaints on HR violations. There is however, no description of remedy for victims – only suspension of business relationship. [Issues and Resolution procedure, 9 May 2018: s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.1.a	Living wage (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Paying living wage • Not met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions
D.1.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts: The human rights policy, which also applies to suppliers, indicates that it expects standards that include ‘compensate workers in accordance with all applicable local laws and regulations – including those pertaining to a minimum age, minimum wage and hours worked – and provide working conditions that comply with all applicable laws and industry standards. However, no further detailed found in this or other policies affecting suppliers in relation with living wage guidelines (basic and discretionary income for workers and their families). [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com & Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices) • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights (purchasing practices) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.1.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of SP and why
D.1.4.a	Child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own agricultural operations)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Does not use child labour: The company states in its human rights policy that it prohibits child labour. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Age verification of applicants and workers: Though there is a prohibition of child labour, there is no age verification evidence. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remediation if children identified
D.1.4.b	Child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: In the HR policies there is a clear prohibition of child labour which is also in the supplier expectations but it does not have guidelines on verification of age and remediation programmes [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Met: How working with suppliers on child labour: ADM supported in 2017 a ‘workshop “children in the Plantations of Sabah: Stakeholder Consultation”, co-convened by TFT, Wllmar, ADM, and Nestlé in September 2017. The workshop offered an opportunity for suppliers to engage in dialogue on the challenges and solutions regarding children in plantations [...] Approximately 50 participants attended, including directors, managers, and executive level staff from small, medium and large plantations and mill companies in Sabah. Attendees were informed of the risks related to children in plantation work and possible strategies to reduce the participation of children, including how to strengthen access to education’. Concrete objectives of the workshop included raise awareness and build capacity among the suppliers toward efforts to prevent child labour on site, seek inputs from participants as to the actual participation of children in plantation activities, and possible ways to address it. [Human rights progress report H2 2017, 2018: assets.adm.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.a	Forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays workers in full and on time: Though the company does not allow bonded labour, there is no specific mention of paying the workers in full. • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.1.5.b	Forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: Yes. there is prohibition of bonded labour and the company: "Do not charge fees to job-seekers in exchange for employment or use labour brokers who charge such fees. Do not withhold collateral in the form of money, identification or other personal belongings – without workers' consent – as a condition of employment." [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.c	Forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own agricultural operations)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement: The Human rights policy includes the commitment to 'not withhold collateral in the form of money, identification or other personal belongings – without workers' consent – as a condition of employment'. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.1.5.d	Forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The company prohibits holding collateral such as identification and states that if a supplier is doing it, the company will cease its relationship with that supplier. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own agricultural operation)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights / Steps to avoid intimidation or retaliation: Although the Human rights policy contains commitments to 'respect workers' rights, including freedom of association and collective bargaining', no evidence found of commitment to not interfering with the rights of workers to do so. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining agreements: In the GRI index of the sustainability report the company provides the figure of 33%. However, no further details found and therefore it is not clear whether this actually are the percentage of the total workforce covered by collective bargaining agreements. [Corporate sustainability report, 2017: assets.adm.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.1.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: Though the company expects its supplier to allow FoA and CB in its supplier expectations, there is nothing regarding intimidation, harassment and violence [Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own agricultural operations)	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: In its sustainability report, it discloses the following: In 2016, we continued to make progress in achieving our goal of zero incidents, zero injuries. More ADM colleagues went home safely than ever before as we achieved a 17 percent reduction in our total recordable incident rate compared to 2015. Unfortunately, we also saw an increase of approximately 9 percent in our lost workday incident rate compared to 2015. However, since 2013, those incident rates have improved by 22 percent and 26 percent, respectively. Additionally, nearly 80 percent of our locations successfully completed the year with no recordable injuries, an improvement of nearly 4 percent from 2015. [Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Met: Fatalities disclosures Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Set targets for H&S performance • Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: Although the Company requires from suppliers to respect and promote the health and safety of all parties, no further guidelines found. [Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com & Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Injury Rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosure Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.8.a	Land rights: Land acquisition (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders: Though the company has a policy on respecting land rights, there was no evidence on how it in practice identifies legitimate tenure rights or works with communities [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: Approach to doing so if no recent land deals Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How valuation and compensation works • Not met: Steps to meet IFC PS 5 in state deals • Not met: Describes approach if no recent land deals
D.1.8.b	Land rights: Land acquisition (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts: They don't have own land transaction so the following statement is applicable to suppliers: "Respect land-tenure right and the rights of indigenous and local communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to operations on lands to which they hold legal rights" [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on land issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in the progress made
D.1.9.a	Water and sanitation (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks: Though the company has a policy on the right to water and sanitation, there is no information on its action taken to prevention those risks. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors • Not met: Reports progress and shows trends in progress made
D.1.9.b	Water and sanitation (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts: The human rights policy, which applies to suppliers, includes the commitment to 'respect the right to safe and clean drinking water and sanitation in our operations and supply chain'. No evidence found, however, of a commitment that includes refraining from negatively affecting access to safe water. [Human rights policy, 2017: assets.adm.com & Supplier expectation, 9 May 2018: assets.adm.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.10.a	Women's rights (in own agricultural operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Process to stop harassment and violence against women Not met: Working conditions take account of gender Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels of employment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Meet all requirements under score 1
D.1.10.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

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: Land rights in supply chain Headline: ADM supplier Wilmar involved in alleged violations of community land rights in Indonesia Sources: ft.com <p>RSPO website - Status of complaints - accessed 03/04/2016 Criminalization of Complainants to RSPO Complaints Panel" - Forest Peoples Programme - 20/05/2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allegation: Archer Daniels Midland (ADM) is a shareholder in Singapore-based Wilmar International Ltd (through Archer Daniels Midland Asia-Pacific Limited). According to ADM, Wilmar is its largest supplier of palm oil and palm kernel (providing 93% of its supply in N. America and 18% in Europe between July 2014-June 2015). <p>Since 2006 the NGO Forest People Programme (FPP) has issued two reports claiming Wilmar acquired the lands of the Minangkabau communities in Pasaman Barat without respect for their customary land rights and traditional authorities and systems of land allocation. On May 20, 2015 the FPP wrote to the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) Complaints Panel, alleging that since a meeting between the community, the NGO and Wilmar, the company has failed to engage the Kapa community to resolve the dispute over use of their lands or reach an agreement on a way to recognise the Kapa land rights in Indonesia (despite reportedly agreeing to do so in the meeting). Moreover, the FPP says that PT.PHP (a Wilmar subsidiary) acquired an HGU (temporary right to cultivate) over the Kapa community lands despite the known objections of the community and their complaint to the RSPO. Moreover, the FPP raises concerns about the intimidation and attempted criminalisation of leaders of the Kapa community and urges the RSPO to raise this matter directly with the Wilmar group.</p>
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Public response available: Wilmar reports transparently on this allegation and has engaged with the RSPO complaints panel as well as the complainants to cooperate on resolving this case. However, a response from ADM was not visible. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Response goes into detail
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Company policies address the general issues raised Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company, which holds over 20% of Wilmar's shares (as at 09/04/2018), states in its human rights policy that it commits to 'respect land-tenure right and the rights of indigenous and local communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent to operations on lands to which they hold legal rights'. The Company's policy also expects its divisions and affiliates to uphold these principles.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: Though Wilmar has engaged in the past with the community via RSPO, the FPP claim that it stopped doing so despite earlier commitments. • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders
E(2).0	Serious allegation No 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Forced Labour • Headline: ADM faces lawsuit in the US over child labour in cocoa supply chain in Ivory Coast • Sources: U.S. Supreme Court gives boost to child slave labor case against Nestle - Reuters - 13/01/16 - reuters.com The Guardian, 01/02/2016 - theguardian.com Business and human rights resource center - business-humanrights.org • Allegation: ADM is a defendant (along with Nestlé and Cargill) in a lawsuit alleging it sourced cocoa from suppliers in Cote d'Ivoire despite being aware of child labour and human trafficking concerns. Plaintiffs, alleged former child slaves from Mali, claimed that they were held captive, beaten and forced to work long hours with no pay. The case has split appeals courts but continues to make its way through the system. In June 2018, a three-judge Ninth Circuit panel allowed the lawsuit to be pursued. <p>The lawsuit was launched in 2005 by two human rights organizations, Global Exchange and the International Labour Rights Fund. In September 2010, the court dismissed the case finding that it could not be brought under the Alien Tort Claims Act. The plaintiffs appealed the dismissal and in December 2013 a federal appeals court overturned that ruling, allowing the plaintiffs to refile the lawsuit. In September 2014, the federal appeals court replaced its December 2013 opinion with an expanded one reversing and vacating the lower court's dismissal of the case. The new opinion sets out expanded reasoning for allowing the plaintiffs to amend their complaint to show the connection their claims have to the US (addressing the US Supreme Court's holding in Kiobel v. Shell). The court found that the plaintiffs had standing to bring an Alien Tort case because of the universal prohibition against slavery.</p> <p>In October 2015, ADM sold its cocoa business to Olam International.</p> <p>On January 12, 2016, the US Supreme Court refused to dismiss the charges against the companies. On March 10 2017 a Los Angeles federal judge dismissed the claim. However, later on a higher court upheld the appeal.</p>
E(2).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public response available: As far as CHRB was able to ascertain, the Company has not responded publicly to the allegation. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail
E(2).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: ADM's supplier expectation document states: "suppliers must also adhere to laws related to working hours, wages, human trafficking, and the prevention of child labor and forced labor". <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Its ADM supplier expectation document states: "suppliers must also adhere to laws related to working hours, wages, human trafficking, and the prevention of child labor and forced labor".
E(2).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders • Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders
E(3).0	Serious allegation No 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Child labour / forced labour • Headline: Archer-Daniels Midland faces social allegations over its palm oil sourcing in Indonesia • Sources: forbes.com amnesty.org amnesty.org.uk amnesty.org • Allegation: On November 30th 2016, Amnesty International (AI) published a report in which it accused Wilmar (in which Archer Daniels Midland (ADM) is a shareholder), as well as Wilmar's major clients including Unilever, Kellogg's, Reckitt Benckiser, Colgate-Palmolive and Nestlé of human rights violations in its palm oil supply chain processes in Indonesia. These companies are alleged to have been complicit in the use of child labour and forced labour, with workers subjected to poor working conditions. They are also accused of contributing to deforestation and the extinction of rare species in Indonesia, endangering workers' health through exposure to dangerous chemical herbicides and failing to provide safety equipment. In addition, labourers allegedly work for around 10 to 11 hours a day without adequate pay, while children allegedly work from the age of eight. Amnesty vowed to conduct a campaign to ask if the companies' products are issued from Wilmar activities in Indonesia. <p>In March 2017, Amnesty repeated its accusations claiming the situation had not been resolved and alleging that Wilmar was continuing to intimidate workers to prevent them from speaking out.</p>
E(3).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response available: ADM responded to Amnesty's report in a letter to the organisation which was published by AI. In that letter the company details its policy but does not specifically responds to the allegations. Wilmar responded to the Amnesty International report and it is publicly visible as an annex to the report. It has acknowledged the allegations stating "we recognize that these issues, including the ones raised in your letters, are systemic challenges shared by the industry". Regarding child labour, it refers to the issue in general in Indonesia. In its second letter to Amnesty, Wilmar reports on having started an investigation into the allegations in question. It has not responded on the issue of overtime in its response to Amnesty International. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail
E(3).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: ADM's supplier expectation document states: "suppliers must also adhere to laws related to working hours, wages, human trafficking, and the prevention of child labor and forced labor".
E(3).3	The Company has 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: Engages with affected stakeholders • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders • Met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: In its response to Amnesty International, Wilmar says that 'in addition to the supplier compliance work and ART programme with our collaborative partner The Forest Trust (TFT), as well as the supply chain surveillance work by an international NGO partner on more than 40 palm oil companies at plantation, mill or group level, our grievance procedure is the other platform used to identify, address and monitor potential supply chain non-compliance'. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	1.8 out of 4	Out of a total of 51 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Archer Daniels Midland made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 23 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 1.8 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company reports on GRI: The Sustainability report contains a GRI index [Corporate sustainability report, 2016: assets.adm.com]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Archer Daniels Midland met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 1 for D.1.1.a : Living wage (in own agricultural operations) • Not met: Score 2 for D.1.7.a : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own agricultural operations)

Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2018 Key Findings report for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice. The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB Ltd's appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and construed in accordance with English law and submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of England and Wales.

As CHRB Ltd, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.