**Company Name**: Sysco  
**Industry**: Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)  
**Overall Score (**): 15.6 out of 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Score</th>
<th>Out of</th>
<th>For Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. Governance and Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F. Transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.1          | Commitment to respect human rights | 1               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
• Met: General HRs commitment: The company indicates that 'The respect and protection of fundamental human rights is critically important to us. We operate globally in a manner that supports the basic human rights. [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com]  
• Not met: UNGPs  
• Not met: OECD: The company indicates in the Suppliers Code of Conduct that additionally to the commitments they must make, other resources to follow are the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Labour Organization Conventions and Recommendations and the International Labour Organization Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. However no evidence has been found that Sysco commits to these initiatives. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com] |

| A.1.2          | Commitment to respect the human rights of workers | 0.5             | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
• Not met: ILO Core: The company indicates that 'We operate globally in a manner that supports the basic human rights, including the rights of associates to have fair wages and benefits in accordance with local laws, a safe and healthy working environment, a right to freedom of association, a workplace free of harassment and discrimination and one that prohibits child labor, forced labor and human |
| A.1.3.a AG | Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Respect land ownership and resources  
• Not met: Respecting the right to water  
• Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights  
Score 2  
• Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure  
• Not met: IFC Performance Standards  
• Not met: FPIC for all  
• Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs  
• Not met: Respecting the right to water  
• Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights |
|---|---|---|---|
| A.1.3.b AG | Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - people's rights (AG) | 0.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Women's rights  
• Not met: Children's rights  
• Not met: Migrant worker's rights  
• Met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights: The company indicates in the supplier code of conduct that “If foreign or migrant workers are working for you, you must follow the labor and immigration laws of the host country. Before hiring, the basic terms of the employment must be provided to the workers in a language they understand. Workers will be able to keep their own passports and other forms of personal identification, which are never to be withheld by you or any third party.” However no evidence has been found of Women or Children’s Rights commitment. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com]  
Score 2  
• 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 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The company indicates in the Modern Slavery Act that “Sysco is committed to playing a constructive role in addressing this serious issue [ensure that its seafood supply chain is free from any human rights concerns] and will engage with interested stakeholders to develop and implement meaningful, practical and effective solutions”. In addition the Proxy Statement indicates that “Communicating with stakeholders, whether customers, suppliers, employees or stockholders, has always been an important part of how Sysco does business.” However no formal document has been found committing it to engage with it potentially and actually affected stakeholders. [Modern slavery act transparency statement, 2015 & Proxy Statement, 2017]  
Score 2  
• Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement  
• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design  
• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.5          | Commitment to remedy                               | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Commits to remedy  
      Score 2 • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies  
      • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives  
      • Not met: Work with AG suppliers to remedy impacts  
      |
| 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 • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs): The Global Supplier Code of Conduct states "We strive to create an environment where associates feel comfortable to raise concerns and are confident that those concerns will be addressed. Sysco prohibits retaliation against anyone who reports a concern in good faith or who participates in an internal or external investigation. This means that an associate who has raised a concern that is honest, sincere and complete to the best of their knowledge, cannot and must not be the target for any type of retaliation. Retaliation could include, but is not limited to, termination, job demotion, intimidation, humiliation, exclusion and threats. Retaliation will not be tolerated." However, this does not cover human rights defenders more broadly, or extend beyond complainants.  
      [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com]  
      Score 2 • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments  
      |
| A.2.1          | Commitment from the top                            | 1                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: CEO or Board approves policy: The company’s Code of Conduct has been signed by the CEO.  
      [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com]  
      • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The company indicates that "The Corporate Sustainability Committee reviews and assesses Sysco’s corporate responsibility and sustainability activities against the company’s policies and its commitment to operate as a socially responsible business. The Committee ensures that stakeholder concerns about environmental, social and governance issues are considered with identified priorities’. [Ethics and Governance - Governance: sustainability.sysco.com]  
      Score 2 • 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 • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs  
      • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion  
      Score 2 • 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 • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member: The company indicates that “The Compensation Committee establishes the policies and criteria informing executive compensation, with an interest in attracting, developing and retaining business leaders to drive financial and strategic growth and build long-term stockholder value. The Committee’s activities include assessing executive compensation against company performance and individual objectives; establishing competitive structures to attract, retain and develop executive talent; and managing risk through appropriate compensation policies.” However no evidence has been found of incentives or performance management schemes linked to and aspect of the company HR policies. [Ethics and Governance - Governance: sustainability.sysco.com]  
      Score 2 • Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S  
      • 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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  
• Not met: Senior responsibility fo HR (inc ILO): In order to get any Score under this indicator, the human rights policy commitment must include the ILO core labour standards at a minimum and the company policies do not include a commitment to respect collective bargaining.  
Score 2  
• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility  
• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility in supply chain |
| B.1.2 | Incentives and performance management | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights: The company indicates that “The Compensation Committee establishes the policies and criteria informing executive compensation, with an interest in attracting, developing and retaining business leaders to drive financial and strategic growth and build long-term stockholder value. The Committee’s activities include assessing executive compensation against company performance and individual objectives; establishing competitive structures to attract, retain and develop executive talent; and managing risk through appropriate compensation policies.” However no evidence has been found of incentives or performance management schemes linked to and aspect of the company HR policies for senior managers. [Ethics and Governance - Governance: sustainability.sysco.com]  
• Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S  
Score 2  
• Not met: Performance criteria made public |
| B.1.3 | Integration with enterprise risk management | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: HR part of enterprise risk system  
Score 2  
• Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment |
| B.1.4.a | Communication/dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company’s own operations | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: In order to get any Score under this indicator, the human rights policy commitment must include the ILO core labour standards at a minimum and the company policies do not include a commitment to respect collective bargaining.  
Score 2  
• 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  
• Not met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs  
• Not met: Including to AG suppliers  
Score 2  
• Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual  
• Not met: Including on AG suppliers |
| B.1.5 | Training on Human Rights | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments  
• Not met: Trains relevant managers including procurement  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met |
| B.1.6 | Monitoring and corrective actions | 0.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments  
• Met: Monitoring AG suppliers: The Company indicates that ‘all Sysco suppliers must operate in full compliance with the Code and with all applicable U.S., International, Country and local laws and regulations. Suppliers in all markets must complete an initial self-assessment against the Code as part of the Sysco Brand approval process. We conduct third-party assessments for suppliers in high-risk Latin American and Asian countries to identify potential risks relating to wages, working hours, discrimination, worker safety, living conditions, and child and forced labor’. [Social compliance on website: sustainability.sysco.com] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.1.7          | Engaging business relationships                           | 1.5              | Score 1  
- Not met: Example of corrective action  
- Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored  

Score 2  
- Met: Both requirement under score 1 met: See above  
- Not met: Working with suppliers to improve performance: The company reports supply chain monitoring and implementation of corrective actions. However, no evidence found of general work carried out with business relationships to improve human rights performance. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com]  

B.1.8          | Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders | 0                | Score 1  
- Not met: Stakeholder process or systems  
- Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement  
- Not met: Workers in SC engaged  
- Not met: Communities in the SC engaged  

Score 2  
- Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.2.1          | Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts | 0                | Score 1  
- Not met: Identifying risks in own operations  
- Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers  

Score 2  
- 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)  

B.2.2          | Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks) | 1                | Score 1  
- Met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The company indicates that 'All Sysco Brand approved suppliers in high-risk Latin American and Asian countries must undergo third party assessments to identify potential risks relating to wages, working hours, discrimination, worker safety, living conditions, and child and forced labor'. [Human Rights: sustainability.sysco.com]  
- Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks  

Score 2  
- Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  

- Not met: Explains use of HRIAs or ESIA (inc HR)  

- Not met: Triggered by new circumstances  
- Not met: In consultation with stakeholders  
- Not met: In consultation with HR experts  
- Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The company indicates that 'All Sysco Brand approved suppliers in high-risk Latin American and Asian countries must undergo third party assessments to identify potential risks relating to wages, working hours, discrimination, worker safety, living conditions, and child and forced labor'. [Human Rights: sustainability.sysco.com]  

- Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks  

- Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.2.3          | Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action | 1                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks  
• Met: Example of Actions decided: The Company provides an example of an action decided regarding labour rights issues in their seafood supply chain. The Company discloses "As a result of specific concerns about labor violations in the seafood supply chain that have recently been chronicled in the media, Sysco has increased its efforts on several fronts, both independently as well as in cooperation with other companies, associations and NGOs.  

As a member of the National Fisheries Institute (NFI), which has conducted a comprehensive analysis of the leading global social responsibility standards to help participating companies find the most thorough and credible labor systems, Sysco is committed to conducting business with entities that follow international laws to ensure an appropriate, safe, ethical and sustainable food supply chain. Through its membership in NFI, Sysco actively participates with other stakeholders to support actions needed to end human rights violations, including a call for governments in Southeast Asia and throughout the world to be more vigilant in enforcing fair, moral and ethical labor practices.  

Sysco has also recently joined the Shrimp Sustainable Supply Chain Task Force, a membership organization that includes retail, foodservice and NGO participation. The task force aims to strengthen worker well-being and compliance with laws governing the seafood supply chain through implementation of a track and trace system of international verification from vessel to feed mill; development of a standard code of conduct model for ports, brokers and vessels; and support for fishery improvement projects to mitigate the effects of overfishing, which can contribute to human rights abuses in the shrimp supply chain.  

Earlier this year, Sysco reinforced its commitment to improving the sustainability of seafood procurement practices and standards by extending its longstanding alliance with World Wildlife Fund (WWF) through 2020. Among other things, Sysco is working with WWF to enhance seafood traceability within its supply chain and globally by participating in the Global Dialogue for Seafood Traceability.” [Modern Slavery Act Transparency Statement, 2018: sysco.com]  
Score 2  
• 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  
• Not met: System to check if Actions are effective  
• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness  
Score 2  
• 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  
• 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  
• Not met: Including AG suppliers  
Score 2  
• Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns  
• Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The company indicates that ‘you have many resources available to help you. You can speak with your immediate manager, next-level manager, Human Resources, the Legal Department or the Ethics and Compliance Office (ECO). You also have an additional resource, The Ethics Line, Sysco’s global, multi-lingual hotline that you can contact via phone or web. It is available to all – associates, vendors, consultants, temporary associates, contractors, subcontractors or suppliers – to voice concerns’. The Global Code of Conduct containing these instructions includes human rights commitment. [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com] Score 2 • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The company indicates about the Ethics Line that it is operated ‘worldwide, with country-based toll free numbers and interpreters when needed’. You can also voice a concern through the online tool, which is available in more than 40 languages. [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com] • Met: Opens own system to AG supplier workers: The company indicates that ‘The Ethics Line, Sysco’s global, multi-lingual hotline that you can contact via phone or web. It is available to all – associates, vendors, consultants, temporary associates, contractors, subcontractors or suppliers – to voice concerns’. [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The company indicates that ‘The Ethics Line, Sysco’s global, multi-lingual hotline that you can contact via phone or web. It is available to all – associates, vendors, consultants, temporary associates, contractors, subcontractors or suppliers – to voice concerns’. The Company has clarified to the CHRB that the Ethics Line is available to anyone to report a concern at ethicsline.sysco.com. [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com] Score 2 • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The company indicates that ‘The Ethics Line, is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, worldwide, with country-based toll free numbers and interpreters when needed’. In addition to there is an online tool available in more than 40 languages. The Company has also clarified that it is a ‘multi-lingual hotline’. [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com &amp; Ethics line website: ethicsline.sysco.com] • Not met: Expects AG supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: AG supplier communities use global system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this Score 2 • 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed Score 2 • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C.5            | Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made | 1.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: ‘We strive to create an environment where associates feel comfortable to raise concerns and are confident that those concerns will be addressed. Sysco prohibits retaliation against anyone who reports a concern in good faith or who participates in an internal or external investigation’. [Sysco Global code of conduct, June 12, 2017: sysco.com] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company indicates that ‘If you think that you or someone you know has experienced retaliation, contact any of the resources in the “Voice Concerns” section of the Code’. In addition, it is
## D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (20% of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1.1.b</td>
<td>Living wage (in the supply chain)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.2</td>
<td>Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices) • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights (purchasing practices): No evidence found in relation to positive incentives via purchasing practices to encourage respect for human rights in the supply chain. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1.3</td>
<td>Mapping and disclosing the supply chain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields): However, the company indicates that 'As part of our membership in the Task Force, Sysco is working to map its Sysco Brand seafood supply chain'. [Human Rights: sustainability.sysco.com] Score 2 • Not met: Discloses significant parts of SP and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Code</td>
<td>Indicator name</td>
<td>Score (out of 2)</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D.1.4.b        | Child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: The Supplier code of conduct indicates that 'All of your employees will be of legal age established by local law. If the local law does not set a minimum age, your employees must be at least fourteen (14) years old. You must maintain official and verifiable documentation of each of your employee’s date of birth, or if documentation is not available, have a legally recognizable means of confirming your employees’ age. An exception to this is legitimate workplace apprenticeship programs, which comply with all laws and regulations. Except where local law allows, workers under the age of eighteen (18) should not perform hazardous work and may be restricted from night work with consideration given to educational requirements. More details can be found in ILO Convention No. 138’. However, no evidence found in relation to remediation programmes. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made |
| D.1.5.b        | Forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: The Supplier code of conduct indicates that 'You shall not require workers to pay recruitment and/or hiring-related fees to employers, agents or labor broker outside legally allowed fees. All fees charged to workers must be disclosed in advance and documented in a language that the workers understand'. However no evidence has been found of guidelines that include refraining from imposing any financial burden. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made |
| 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  
• Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The Global Supplier Code of Conduct states ‘Foreign or Migrant Workers – If foreign or migrant workers are working for you, you must follow the labor and immigration laws of the host country. Before hiring, the basic terms of the employment must be provided to the workers in a language they understand. Workers will be able to keep their own passports and other forms of personal identification, which are never to be withheld by you or any third party.” [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made |
| 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  
• Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: The Supplier code of conduct indicates that 'You will give your employees the right to freely associate and organize and to legally bargain collectively. More information can be found in ILO Conventions Nos. 87 and 98’. However, no explicit guidelines found against intimidation or harassment against union members or representatives. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made |
| 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  
• Not met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Supplier code of conduct indicates that 'Sysco requires that all facilities that are used to produce goods for Sysco have a safe and healthy work environment for all the employees'. However no evidence has been found of specific clear health and safety requirements. [Sysco corporation supplier code of conduct: sysco.com]  
• Not met: Injury Rate disclosures  
• Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures  
• Not met: Fatalities disclosure |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D.1.8.b        | Land rights: Land acquisition (in the supply chain)                            | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on land issues  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provides analysis of 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  
• Not met: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts: The company indicates that “Although we are not a significant water user, we do use water for refrigeration systems, washing vehicles and landscaping. We have identified water-saving opportunities including recycling water from vehicle washing stations and refrigeration units and using rainwater for landscaping at our offices.” However no evidence has been found of water guidelines in the contractual arrangements.  
[Warehouse & Distribution Centers: sustainability.sysco.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made  

| 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  
• Not met: Women’s rights in codes or contracts  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on women’s rights  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provides analysis of trends in progress made  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E(1).0         | Serious allegation No 1           |                  | No allegations meeting the CHRB severity thresholds were found, and so the score of 12.50 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 3.13 out of 20 points for theme E.  

**F. Transparency (10% of Total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| F.1            | Company willingness to publish information | 1.14 out of 4   | Out of a total of 42 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Sysco made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 12 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 1.14 out of 4 points.  

| F.2            | Recognised Reporting Initiatives      | 0 out of 2      | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2  
• Not met: Company reports on GRI  
• Not met: Company reports on SASB  
• Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF  

| F.3            | Key, High Quality Disclosures         | 0 out of 4      | Sysco met 0 of the 8 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples  
• 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  
• 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 : Remediating adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned  
Demonstrating a forward focus  
• Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management  
• Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management  


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.