

Company Name Anhui Conch Cement Company
Industry Extractive
Overall Score (*) 3.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.8	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.0	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.9	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
0.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
0.4	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 2019 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

Detailed assessment

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: The Company states that it fully respects human rights and maintains international Covenants on Human Rights and labour standards. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 Not met: UDHR Not met: International Bill of Rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs Not met: OECD
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: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: ILO Core: The Company states that it fully respects employees' freedom of employment, resolutely prohibiting forced labour. It also expressly prohibits any form of child labour and gender discrimination. Although the Company implements the employee congress system, which improved the collective bargaining and collective contract system, it is not sufficient as evidence for this indicator. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO apply to EX BPs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states that it constantly improves the regulations for safety management and continuously promotes standard and scientific safety management. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] • Not met: H&S applies to EX BPs: The Company drives the suppliers' voluntary fulfilment of social responsibility by setting relevant terms in the contracts and agreement. One of the terms urges suppliers to operate safely and fulfil their respective safety responsibility. However, the policy does not apply to its extractive business partners. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn]
A.1.3.EX	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (EX)	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: Based on UN Instruments • Not met: Voluntary Principles (VPs) participant • Not met: Uses only ICoCA members • Not met: Respecting indigenous rights • Not met: ILO 169 • Not met: UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) • Not met: Expects BPs to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FPIC commitment • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights • Not met: IFC performance standards • Not met: Zero tolerance for land grabs • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expects BPs to commit to all these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that it has consulted, cooperated and shared with local stakeholders in overseas markets so as to achieve a win-win outcome. However it is not sufficient as evidence for this indicator. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement <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	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with 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	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: CEO or Board approves policy • Not 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 • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key EX RH risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company states that the Safety committee office – the department of production safety and environmental protection – has been set up at its headquarters with the general manager serving as the director of the Safety committee who is generally responsible for its production safety management. However, no evidence found of senior management responsibility for human rights issues in wider context. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key EX HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions • 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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers • Not met: Communicating policy to EX contractors and joint ventures • Not met: Including to EX BPs (removed) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on EX BPs
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments • Not met: Trains relevant EX managers including security personnel <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Not met: Monitoring EX BP's <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of EX supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects selection EXs business partners: The Company states that it has set up and updated a strict supplier entry mechanism to conduct comprehensive review and full life-cycle management of suppliers. However it does

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>not explicitly states whether human rights are reflected in the process. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects on-going EX business partner relationships: The Company states that it prohibits suppliers with material failure to fulfil their social responsibilities from participating in tendering again. However it is not clear that social responsibilities cover human rights. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with EX business partners to improve performance: The Company states that it guided all subsidiaries to improve the overall level of occupational disease prevention and control and actively carried out technological improvement for safety such as noise reduction and dust control within the plant area. All subsidiaries have set up the production safety alert system developed independently by the Company. However it is not clear whether the extractive business partners are covered by the system. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn]
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 • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners workers • Not met: Engagement includes EX business partners communities <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	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: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: identifying risks in EX business partners <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)
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including amongst EX BPs • Not met: Example of Actions decided <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • Not met: Including EX business partners Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states that it standardised the reporting and whistle-blowing procedures and enhanced the accountability system in supervision and disciplinary enforcement. However, it is not clear if the company has a grievance channel in place and who can access such channels. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports that in 2018, it processed 37 reporting and whistle-blowing cases, and 100% of these cases were settled within required period. However, it is not clear how many of the reports are related to human right issues. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect EX BPs to have equivalent grievance system: The Company states that it guides the subsidiaries to carry out collective bargaining in accordance with the standard procedures, which required subsidiaries to focus on solving prominent problems that employees were most concerned about and accurately understand the wishes, demands and expectations of employees in order to build a harmonious labour relationship. However it is not clear whether the extractive business partners are covered by the procedure. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] • Not met: Opens own system to EX BPs workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects EX BPs to have community grievance systems • Not met: EX BPs communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this Score 2 <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 consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects EX BPs to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • 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 or achieved: The Company states that the employee congress collectively reviewed and approved by voting "Conch Cement guidelines for the management of total wage of subsidiaries". It also states that the monthly salary of college graduates is much higher than the minimum wage at the place where headquarters of the Company is located. However, it does not explicitly state about paying all workers a living wage. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how living wage determined • 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)	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: Member of EITI • Not met: Reports of taxes and revenues beyond legal minimums <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Reports taxes and revenue by country • Not met: Steps taken re non EITI countries • Not met: Disclosures contract terms where not a requirement
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: In 2018, the coverage of the Company's collective bargaining and collective contract was 100%. Percentage of employee joining the labour union in subsidiaries meeting the conditions for establishing a labour union was 100%. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] <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)	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: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company reports that during the reporting period 2018, the number of new cases of occupational diseases was 0; and no production safety accident of the major level or above occurred. 44 subordinate entities of the Company did not experience any safety accidents, while 6 subsidiaries has not suffered accidents of minor injury or above for more than 3 consecutive years. During the reporting period, its safety accidents decreased by 39.6% year-on-year. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosures

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Set targets for H&S performance: The Company states that in 2019, it set the goal of preventing work-related death and minimizing minor injuries, committing to ensure that all subordinate entities have zero work related death and minor injuries be reduced by more than 20%. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.3.5	Indigenous peoples rights and free prior and informed consent (FPIC) (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: Process to identify indigenous rights holders 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) 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	<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: How implements security (inc VPs or ICOC) Not met: Example of respecting HRs in security Not met: Ensures Business Partners follow security approach <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: The Company states that it controls pollutant emissions in accordance with national and local environmental protection standards on water pollution as well as environmental protection laws and regulations. However it is not sufficient as evidence for this indicator. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn] <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		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 3.08 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 0.77 out of 20 points for theme E.

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	0.42 out of 4	Out of a total of 38 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Anhui Conch Cement Company made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 4 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.42 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Company reports on GRI: The Company reports that the report is prepared in accordance with Appendix 27 Environmental, Social and Governance Reporting Guide to the Rules Governing the Listing of Securities on The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited and the Guidelines for preparation of Social Responsibility Reports issued by the Shanghai Stock Exchange, with reference to standards including Guidelines for Preparation of China Enterprise Social Responsibility Report by Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. [Social Responsibility Report, 31/12/2018: conch.cn]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	<p>Anhui Conch Cement Company 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</p> <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) <p>Discussing challenges openly</p> <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 <p>Demonstrating a forward focus</p> <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 2019 Key Findings report and technical annex 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.