

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Equinor
Industry Extractives
Overall Score (*) 34.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
3.8	10	A. Governance and Policies
5.6	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
5.0	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
6.3	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
10.0	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
4.2	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	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: General HRs commitment: The Company states in its Human Rights policy that it will "conduct our business consistently with the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the ten principles of the United Nations Global Compact. We respect all internationally recognised human rights, including those set out in the International Bill of Human Rights, the International Labour Organisation Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and applicable standards of international humanitarian law." [Human Rights policy, 10/08/2015] Score 2 • Met: UNGPs: The Company states in its Human Rights Policy that it will conduct its business consistently with the United Nations Guiding Principles and provides links to the external voluntary codes it adheres to across its policy, code of conduct and its Business code - the "Equinor Book". [Human Rights policy, 10/08/2015 & The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017] • 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: ILO Core: The Company states in The Equinor Book that it is committed to respecting all internationally recognised human rights, in particular: 'Providing safe, healthy and secure working conditions', 'treating those working for us and those

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>impacted by our operations fairly and without discrimination’ and ‘opposing all forms of human trafficking, forced labour and illicit forms of child labour in our value chain’. The Company has also indicated that their policy commitment to the ILO declaration explicitly implies a commitment to respect and promote the principles and rights related to freedom of association and collective bargaining as this represents one of the four categories of rights explicitly covered by the ILO declaration. The Company’s commitment to conduct their business consistently with the UN Global Compact ten principles also explicitly implies such a commitment as principle 3 states that Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining. The Company also states that the policy 'sets out the principles for how we relate to our employees, contractors, suppliers, partners and communities affected by our business activities'. In addition it indicates that it requires 'hired contractors to comply with this policy and will offer capacity building to this end' and 'we expect our suppliers and business partners to follow the spirit and intent of this policy when working for or together with us'. 'We also endeavour to promote Statoil's principles for integrated impact management in joint ventures or partner-operated assets.' [The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Human Rights policy states that the Company will conduct its business consistently with the ten principles of the United Nations Global Compact. [Human Rights policy, 10/08/2015] • Met: All four ILO apply to EX BPs: The Company also states that the policy 'sets out the principles for how we relate to our employees, contractors, suppliers, partners and communities affected by our business activities'. [Human Rights policy, 10/08/2015 & Communication on Progress 2018, 27/03/2018] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: All four ILO Core • Met: Respect H&S of workers • Met: H&S applies to Ex BPs: The Company indicates that it requires 'hired contractors to comply with this policy and will offer capacity building to this end' and 'we expect our suppliers and business partners to follow the spirit and intent of this policy when working for or together with us'. 'We also endeavour to promote Equinor's principles for integrated impact management in joint ventures or partner-operated assets.' [The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017 & Communication on Progress 2018, 27/03/2018]
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (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"> • Not met: Based on UN Instruments • Met: VPs participant: The Company states in the Equinor book that it is committed to 'perform our security activities in line with our commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights' and is a signatory to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. [The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017 & Engagement commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] • Not met: Uses only ICoCA members • Met: Respecting indigenous rights: In addition, although it states that it is important to 'respect indigenous' peoples' rights', it does not disclose a commitment related to the ILO 169 convention or the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. [The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017] • Not met: ILO 169 • Not met: UNDRIP • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights: Although the Company requires in the Equinor book that 'hired contractors to comply with this policy and will offer capacity building to this end', regarding other business partners it only indicates that 'we expect suppliers and business partners to follow the spirit and intent of this policy when working for or together with us'. [The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017 & Engagement commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FPIC commitment • Not met: Vol Guidelines on Tenure • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expects BPs to respect all these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with 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: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that stakeholder engagement is a one of its four strategic enablers that will continue to support the business’s needs, saying it “engages with stakeholders to secure industrial

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>legitimacy, its social contract, trust and strategic support from stakeholders. This engagement extends to internal and external collaboration, partnerships, and other co-operation with suppliers, partners, governments, NGOs and communities in which it operates." Our operational management system requires us to establish an open communication channel with community stakeholders to deal with any potential grievances (see also our Human Rights Approach). Our operations make use of public consultations, surveys, interviews, one-to-one meetings and community panels to better understand the expectations from local communities and to devise mitigation strategies and plans that best suit local conditions."</p> <p>[Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Engagement commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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: Commits to remedy: The Company indicates in its Human Rights policy that 'we will provide or cooperate in providing appropriate remediation, including, where relevant, effective grievance mechanisms, where we have caused or contributed to adverse human rights impacts'. However, it does not disclose a commitment on not obstructing access to other remedies or collaborating in initiatives that provide access to remedy. [Human Rights policy, 10/08/2015] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives: In its 2017 Sustainability Report, the Company states that it 'operated country specific grievance mechanisms in support of the Sheringham Shoal offshore wind farm in the UK, our activities in Tanzania, and our offshore oil and gas operations in Brazil. In 2017 there were no grievances reported through the mechanisms in Tanzania and Brazil. Two grievances were received in connection with our Sheringham Shoal wind farm both of which have been settled. For our activities in Canada and our offshore oil and gas activities in the UK we participate in grievance and remediation processes that form part of the local regulatory process or that are coordinated by industry representative bodies (e.g. Oil and Gas UK "Fisheries Legacy Trust Company" (FLTC)).' [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Not met: Work with EX BPs to remedy impacts
A.1.6	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 attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects EX BPs 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	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: CEO or Board approves policy: The Company's human rights policy has been approved by the board of directors, and is overseen by the Human Rights Steering Committee (HRSC) The HRSC's role is to oversee the implementation of human rights and is made up of senior leaders across the organisation. The HRSC reports into the Board of Directors Safety, Sustainability and Ethics Committee. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	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/Committee review of salient HRs: The Company indicates in its Sustainability Report that the Human Rights Steering Committee produces an annual report that is reviewed by the board of directors' Safety, Sustainability and Ethics Committee'. It does not specify what processes are in place to discuss and address human rights at board level. The Company has not published any documents describing examples of human rights issues discussed at board level either. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: The Company's Annual and Sustainability reports indicate that the CEO 's remuneration is linked to a set of corporate level KPI's including safety, security and carbon efficiency. It does not make clear whether these incentives include local community or partners. [Annual Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] Not met: At least one key EX RH 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 has a Human Rights Steering Committee. According to the Sustainability report 2017, its role is to 'oversee and provide advice on the implementation of the human rights policy and its further development. Its members include senior leaders from our corporate procurement, people and leadership, legal and communications functions and from the exploration and development and production international business areas.' However, the Company has not published a policy or any other public document committing to all ILO core areas specifically, including freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Day-to-day responsibility Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for EX BRs
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights: The Company states in its Annual and Sustainability report that safety is a strategic objective included in the variable incentives for top management. It is not clear which member's remuneration is linked to what strategic objective, or whether the performance indicators include local communities and partners. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Annual Report 2017, 31/12/2017] Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: HR part of enterprise risk system: It is stated in the 'Risk Management and Governance' section of the Company website that 'Human rights due diligence are integrated in all the Company's general systems for assessing and managing risks and impacts. In countries or contexts in which exposure to human rights breaches are particularly significant, dedicated human rights assessments may be carried out. Human rights are addressed as a part of our standard integrity due diligence research of third parties with whom we may enter into a business relationship' [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment: The Board Safety, Sustainability and Ethics Committee reviews the annual report of the Human Rights Steering Committee, however it is not clear what is included in the review and whether this reviews human rights in relation to the effectiveness of the Company's enterprise risk management systems. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017]
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company provides an e-learning course on human rights, available to all workers and consultants. Furthermore, during 2017, 500 people registered for the human rights e-leaning awareness training, giving us a running total for registration of 3,500, since its launch in 2016. This awareness training is made available to Statoil employees and consultants through the Statoil University.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Human rights focus sessions were included on the agenda of various management meetings during 2017. These sessions offered insight and practical examples on the human rights issues specifically relevant for these management teams. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: The Company states in The Equinor Book that 'we require all our employees and hired contractors to comply with this policy and will offer capacity building to this end'. However, the Company's policy does not mention explicitly freedom of association and collective bargaining (all ILO core areas are included in requirements for suppliers through the supplier declaration). In addition, the Company does not disclose the steps taken to communicate policy to extractive partners. [The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including to EX BPs • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on EX BPs
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company states in its Sustainability report that during 2017, 500 people registered for the human rights e-learning awareness training, giving us a running total for registration of 3,500, since its launch in 2016. This awareness training is made available to Statoil employees and consultants through the Statoil University. Human rights focus sessions were included on the agenda of various management meetings during 2017. These sessions offered insight and practical examples on the human rights issues specifically relevant for these management teams. However, the Company's policy does not explicitly cover all ILO core areas, there is no evidence on whether training includes freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant managers including security personnel • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The Company indicates on the human rights section of its website that 'our human rights efforts cover topics such as community impact, labour standards and security. Human rights aspects are incorporated in our annual monitoring plans, as relevant, based on risk'. However, in order to meet this indicator, the Company must monitor all ILO core areas as a minimum, and include monitoring of extractive business partners and the proportion of them monitored. [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's • 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"> • Met: HR affects selection extractives business partners: The Company indicates in its Sustainability report that it expects that its suppliers and partners respect internationally recognised human rights. As it states in the risk management section of the website, 'in countries or contexts in which exposure to human rights breaches are particularly significant, dedicated human rights assessments may be carried out. Human rights are addressed as a part of our standard integrity due diligence (IDD) research of third parties with whom we may enter into a business relationship. Our standard contracts require adherence to national laws and regulations and, where necessary, all efforts are made to include specific provisions relating to human rights in contracts with partners and suppliers'. Although it provides details on human rights requirements for suppliers (the supplier declaration covers all ILO core) and security services (as stated in the sustainability report, 'we include human rights criteria as part of pre-qualification screening,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>integrity due diligence, and in contractual provisions and clauses, as appropriate'), no further details have been provided for extractive business partners and the human rights considered.</p> <p>In 2017 the Company indicates that it 'continued with our supplier human rights verification activities, while continuing to train suppliers and personnel in Statoil with responsibility for contract and supplier management. We also introduced a new compliance appendix for procurement contracts that is being rolled out globally for new contracts, covering, inter alia, human rights, ethics, anti-corruption and sanctions clauses. Work was also started during 2017 on the drafting of principles for sustainable supply chains that will provide suppliers with supplementary guidance for specific human rights-related contract requirements contained in the compliance appendix. This will be finalised and implemented during 2018.' It is not clear if this process extends to involvement in joint ventures. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018: equinor.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with business partners to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected 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: Stakeholder process or systems: The Company indicates in the engagement and dialogue section of its website that 'our operational management system requires us to establish an open communication channel with community stakeholders to deal with any potential grievances'. 'Our operations also make use of public consultations, surveys, interviews, one-to-one meetings and community panels to better understand the expectations from local communities, and to devise mitigation strategies and plans that best suit local conditions'. It has not published any documents describing how it identifies those at heightened risk of vulnerability and stating whether it engages with workers amongst its extractive business partners on Human rights issues. [Engagement commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company indicates on the risk management section of its website that 'human rights due diligence are integrated in all the Company's general systems for assessing and managing risks and impacts. In countries or contexts in which exposure to human rights breaches are particularly significant, dedicated human rights assessments may be carried out.' The Company also indicates on the human rights area of the website that 'we assess human rights aspects and potential impacts of our ongoing activities and new business opportunities in order to avoid adverse impacts on individuals and nearby communities potentially affected by our operations. Our human rights efforts cover topics such as community impact, labour standards and security. Human rights aspects are incorporated in our annual monitoring plans, as relevant, based on risk'. <p>The Company has not disclosed any public document with information regarding consultation with human rights experts, and details on when HRIAs or ESIA that include human rights are/will be carried out, nor how systems are triggered [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018: equinor.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: identifying risks in EX business partners: In relation to business relationship, the Company states 'Human rights are addressed as part of our standard integrity due diligence (IDD) research of third parties with whom we may enter into a business relationship' [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • 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)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: In the Company's Sustainability Report 2016, under the heading "Operationalising our Human Rights Policy" the Company states it uses risk and impact assessment processes and tools, scoped around the key elements included in the UNGP such as due diligence, training and remedy. Furthermore, the Company identifies three broad focus areas for human rights relative to the Company's activities, these include labour rights and working conditions of the workforce and suppliers, respecting human rights in security arrangements and respecting human rights of individuals in communities. [Sustainability Report 2016, 31/12/2016: equinor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company states in the "Risk management and governance" section of its website 'To manage risks in our day to day activities, we apply our Compliance and Leadership Model to ensure safe, consistent and high quality deliveries across the value chain', and details on the Compliance and Leadership Model approach can be found in the Equinor Book. It does not make clear whether human rights issues are incorporated in this risk management process. [Risk Management and governance, 25/05/2018: equinor.com & The Equinor Book, 01/03/2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Example of Actions decided Not met: Including amongst EX BRs Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: System to check if Actions are effective Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Including EX BRs Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company indicates in its Code of Conduct that 'the Ethics Helpline is a multi-language service available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and provides a toll-free phone service and web submission portal. It is available for any person who has a legitimate concern. You may choose remain anonymous where allowed by law'. The human rights section of the code indicates to the employee to 'report any human rights abuse in our operations or in those of our business partners'. The Company indicates in its Sustainability report that 107 cases were received in 2017 including 24 reported concerns relating to harassment, discrimination and personal misconduct. The Company has not published any further details on the number of human rights grievance received and addressed or resolved, nor an evaluation of the effectiveness of the channel. [Equinor's Code of Conduct, 25/05/2018 & Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Opens own system to EX BP workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company indicates in its Sustainability report that 'the ethics helpline is available 24/7 to both employees and the general public'. In addition, the Company has a framework for community grievance mechanisms. As stated in the sustainability report, the Company 'operated country specific grievance mechanisms in support of the Sheringham Shoal offshore wind farm in the UK, our activities in Tanzania, and our offshore oil and gas operations in Brazil... For our activities in Canada and our offshore oil and gas activities in the UK we participate in grievance and remediation processes that form part of the local regulatory process or that are coordinated by industry representative bodies.' However, it has not disclosed any documents indicating whether these channels/mechanisms are accessible to all potential affected external stakeholders at all operations, including local languages. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects EX BP to have community grievance systems • Not met: EX BP communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Engages users to create or assess system: In the Company's Sustainability Report for 2016, under the heading "Community Grievance Mechanisms", it states that "these mechanisms are designed in collaboration with community representatives to reflect their needs, with the intention that that are culturally suited and do not impede communities access to their appropriate judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms." The Company also cooperates with other non-judicial and judicial remedy processes including the OECD National Contact Points and Ombudsman offices. Furthermore, the Company provides examples of how it engage with users in the design of these systems in the USA and Canada. [Sustainability Report 2016, 31/12/2016: equinor.com] <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: EX BPs in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are 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: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level: The Company only indicates in the Sustainability report 'the number and types of cases from the Ethics Helpline are reported quarterly to the board of directors.' [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017]
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	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 statement prohibiting retaliation: The Company states in its Sustainability report that the 'Ethics Helpline is structured to allow for anonymous reporting' and that the Company has a 'strict no-retaliation policy for anyone who reports in good faith,' [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects EX BRs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> • Met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms: The Company states that "cooperate, as appropriate, with other non-judicial and judicial remedy processes, such as the OECD National Contact Points and Ombudsman offices, as well as providing the applicable regulatory and legal processes for grievance handling and access to remedy." [Sustainability Report 2016, 31/12/2016: equinor.com] • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: The Company states in its Sustainability report that 'In 2017 there were no grievances reported through the mechanisms in Tanzania and Brazil. Two grievances were received in connection with our Sheringham Shoal wind farm both of which have been settled.' It does not explain what the grievances were about or what it did to resolve these issues. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <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.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: Living wage target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays living wages • Not met: Reviews living wages definition with unions
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 is member of the EITI and also discloses a specific report on payments to governments on its website. In its "Payments to Governments Report 2017", it discloses revenues, licenses, projects, taxes paid, etc. in the countries where it operates. [Payments to Governments Report 2017, 31/12/2017: equinor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Reports taxes and revenue by country: In its "Payments to Governments Report 2017", it discloses revenues, licenses, projects, taxes paid, etc. in the countries where it operates. [Payments to Governments Report 2017, 31/12/2017: equinor.com]
D.3.3	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation • Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: The Company has only disclosed that 73% of its employees in Norway are members of trade unions, according to the Sustainability report, which represents approximately 65% of employees globally. The Company has not published a policy or any other documents stating its commitment not to interfere with the right of workers to form or join trade unions and to bargain collectively. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.3.4	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company reports figures for the period 2013-2017 on: Serious incident frequency (0.8 in 2017); Total recordable injury frequency (3.8 in 2017); Lost time injury frequency (1.4 in 2017) and fatalities (5 employees, 0 contractors in 2017). [Equinor Sustainability data hub, 31/12/2017: sustainability.statoil.com & Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Met: Fatalities disclosures <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company states that 'The targets set in 2017 were 0.6 (number of incidents per million hours worked) for total SIF.' However, the Company has not set targets for lost days or fatalities. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Not met: Met targets or explains why not: The Company provides explanations to the performance on frequency, fatalities and injuries. However, the Company has not disclosed any public documents with health and safety-related targets.

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"> • Met: Process to identify indigenous rights holders: The Company states in its Sustainability report that its 'activities in Canada involved engagement with Indigenous Peoples. For our onshore oil sands projects in Canada the engagement focused on the planned divestiture, including the transitioning out of some longer-term commitments. For our offshore activities in Canada, we focused on our planned exploration activities in the Flemish Pass, offshore Nova Scotia.' The Company has not either disclosed any documents describing its process to identify and recognise affected or potentially affected indigenous peoples. • Not met: How engages with communities in assessment <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to FPIC (or ICMM): The Company states in its Sustainability report that in 2017 'worked with our peers and external experts on building understanding of the differing regional and local expectations on free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and the rights of indigenous peoples and communities in specific regional and local contexts.' However, this is not sufficient as a commitment to FPIC. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017] • Not met: Gives recent example FPIC or dropping deal
D.3.6	Land rights (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: Approach to identification of land tenure rights holders • Not met: Describes approach to doing so if no recent deals <p>Score 2</p> <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 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: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC): The Company indicates in the Human rights section of its website that 'Statoil is an active participant in the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights Initiative and strives to respect and implement these principles in our operations. Our commitment to the principles is reflected in our policies and procedures for risk assessment, deployment, training and follow-up of private and public security providers in high-risk locations'. [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] • Met: Example of respecting HRs in security: The Company states 'Statoil uses armed security services provided by the local government in Tanzania and Nigeria. Human rights training is provided in each case. In addition, such training is provided for unarmed guards and security personnel protecting our operations in Algeria'. In its Sustainability report the Company states 'In the area of security and human rights, we worked on maritime and offshore activities, and engagement with public security in host countries.' [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com] • Not met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach: The Company's Human Rights Policy sets out the principles for how the company relates to 'our employees, partners, contractors and suppliers, as well as those communities affected by our business activities.' The Human Rights Policy states the companies commitment to conducting security activities in line with their commitment to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. The Company states 'Prior to procuring security services, we include human rights criteria as part of pre-qualification screening, integrity due diligence and contractual provisions and clauses as appropriate. Where needed, our security providers are given training that is commensurate with their duties.' However, there is no information regarding how the Company ensures Joint Venture partners follow this security approach. [Human Rights commitment, 25/05/2018: equinor.com & Human Rights policy, 10/08/2015] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Assesses and involves communities • Not met: Working with local community
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: Action to prevent water and sanitation risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Water targets considering local factors • Not met: Reports progress in meeting targets and shows 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: Health and safety • Headline: 13 people died after a helicopter crashed when it was in route to Bergen • Sources: Norway helicopter crash: 13 killed near Bergen - BBC News - 29/04/2016 Super Puma crash: Helicopter 'showed warning light' - BBC News - 01/05/2016 British father, 41, who was among 13 people killed in a helicopter crash in Norway - Mail Online - 02/05/2016 Name of Statoil employee released - Statoil press release - 02/05/2016 • Allegation: On April 29, 2016, 13 people were killed after a helicopter crashed in route to Bergen, Norway. Among the victims was one employee of Equinor (at that time Statoil) and employees of Aker Solutions, Schlumberger, Karsten Moholt, Halliburton and CHC Helicopter Service. The helicopter, a Eurocopter Super Puma EC225LP, manufactured by Airbus, and operated by CHC Helicopter Service, crashed after having departed from Statoil's Gullfaks B platform in the North Sea. Three days before the incident, the same helicopter was reportedly forced to abort an offshore trip after a warning indicator lamp flashed on the cockpit display. Despite a component replacement, the warning light reappeared and other components were subsequently changed until the issue was considered to be resolved. An investigation by Norway's Accident Investigation Board has reportedly been launched as a result of the accident.
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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 response available <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Response goes into detail: The Company communicated about the accident through several press releases. It reported that the Accident Investigation Board in Norway would investigate the accident, and said that Statoil would contribute. Statoil would also reportedly start its own investigation in cooperation with the employee representatives and the safety delegates. This investigation was to be coordinated with the work of the Accident Investigation Board. Statoil's emergency response organisation was mobilised. Statoil's vice-president stated that the company had suspended oil production at the Gullfaks B platform to "take care of the staff in the best way possible". Operations were reportedly resumed at the platform after two days.
E(1).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: The Company states in The Statoil Book that it is committed to 'Providing safe, healthy and secure working conditions'. The Company also states that the policy 'sets out the principles for how we relate to our employees, contractors, suppliers, partners and communities affected by our business activities'. In addition it indicates that it requires 'hired contractors to comply with this policy and will offer capacity building to this end' and 'we expect our suppliers and business partners to follow the spirit and intent of this policy when working for or together with us'.
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 • 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

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	2.21 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Equinor made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 21 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 2.21 out of 4 points.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
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 Company third party assurance states 'in our opinion, the safety and environmental performance indicators, as defined above, are, in all material respects, prepare and presented in accordance with the G4 Guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiative including the Oil and Gas Sector Supplement' . The Company states 'Our annual sustainability report is externally verified and prepared in accordance with recognised frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) G4 Guidelines and the UN Global Compact Communication on Progress requirements.' The Company also publishes a GRI Index. [Sustainability Report 2017, 31/12/2017 & GRI G4 Content Index, 2017: equinor.com]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Equinor 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.3.1 : Living wage (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs) Not met: Score 2 for D.3.4 : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own extractive operations, which includes JVs)

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.