

Company Name McCormick & Company
Industry Agricultural Products (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score (*) 6.7 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.2	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.9	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.8	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.0	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.3	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.5	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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: General HRs commitment 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 Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 Not met: Explicitly list All four ILO for AG suppliers: The Company states that "McCormick utilizes a supplier scorecard process, that includes the number of suppliers targeted by region and risk level, determined by an assessment and audit score, as a key performance indicator to measure the Company's effectiveness in ensuring that slavery and human trafficking is not taking place in the Company's business or supply chains. This process uses formal assessments and audits to verify that high risk suppliers in the supply chain are in compliance with ILO regulations and McCormick's requirements regarding slavery and human trafficking". However, no evidence found of the Company requiring explicit commitment to each ILO core including forced and child labour, discrimination, freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Slavery and human trafficking

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>statement for the UK Modern Slavery act of 2015, 2015: mccormickcorporation.com</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core • Not met: Respect H&S of workers: In its purpose-led report, the Company indicates that "We host an annual Safety & Wellness Day where McCormick employees learn how to develop and maintain healthy lifestyles in and outside of work, while also practicing the highest safety standards in our manufacturing and distribution facilities.". However, this is not a statement of policy indicating a commitment. [Purpose-ledPerformanceReport, 2017: p.widencdn.net] • Met: H&S applies to AG suppliers: The Company states in its Global Supplier Code that "Vendor will conduct its business in a manner compatible with the environment and in accordance with applicable law. Reasonable standards of care shall be taken to protect the environment and to provide for the health and safety of employees and the communities in which facilities are operated." [Global Supplier Code, 24/01/2018: mccormickcorporation.com]
A.1.3.AG.a	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry - land and natural resources (AG)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Respect land ownership and natural resources • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure Rights • 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.AG.b	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – people’s rights (AG)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's rights: Although the Company has a Gender Pay Gap Report, no evidence was found that the Company is committed to respect women's rights. [2018 UK Gender Pay Gap Report, 2018: p.widencdn.net] • Not met: Children's rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights: Although the Company states that is "part of our commitment to empower women across our supply chain by 2025" there is no reference to the women’s empowerment principles. [Purpose-ledPerformanceReport, 2017: p.widencdn.net]
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 "At McCormick, we seek to engage with key stakeholders to better inform our efforts, maximize our impact and create value for society". However, there is no further evidence regarding dialogue with potentially and actually affected stakeholders. [Purpose-ledPerformanceReport, 2017: p.widencdn.net] • 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 AG suppliers 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 AG suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

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

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AG 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key AG HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: Regarding the communication of policy commitment, the Company states that "The Board is committed to, and expects all of the Company's employees involved in the disclosure process to strive for, full, fair, accurate, timely, and understandable disclosure in the Company's periodic reports and other public statements". However, there is no further information, including local languages and how the policy commitments are communicated to employees. [Purpose-ledPerformanceReport, 2017: p.widencdn.net] Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers • Not met: Communicating policy down the whole AG supply chain • Not met: Requiring AG suppliers to communicate policy down the chain Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on AG suppliers

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments • Not met: Trains relevant AG managers including procurement Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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 AG suppliers Score 2 <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 AG supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects AG selection of suppliers • Met: HR affects on-going AG supplier relationships: The Global Supplier Code of Conduct (Code) clarifies the global expectations in the areas of business integrity, human rights, health and safety and environmental management, it states that " McCormick also reserves the right to terminate the relationship with any Supplier and/or Facility that does not comply with this Code of Conduct." [Global Supplier Code, 24/01/2018: mccormickcorporation.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with AG suppliers to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Workers in AG SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the AG SC engaged Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: Identifying risks in AG suppliers Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks 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	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 • Not met: Including in AG supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	appropriate action		
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 • Not met: Including AG suppliers 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	1	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 states that possesses a hotline for grievance as it is indicated in " All supervisory and management employees, including all officers and directors of the company, have a special responsibility to lead according to the standards in this policy, in both words and action. Our supervisory and management employees are also expected to adhere to and promote our "open door" policy. This means that they are available to anyone with ethical or other concerns, questions or complaints. We also maintain a confidential "hotline" that we can call in those circumstances, the details of which are set out at the end of this policy. All concerns, questions and complaints will be taken seriously and handled promptly, confidentially and professionally" [Business ethics policy, Not mentioned: mccormickcorporation.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect AG supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to AG supplier 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 AG supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: AG supplier 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: AG suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly	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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	available and explained		Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level: According to the Business ethics policy the Company states that they can "share the report with the following individuals: The Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Accounting Officer, and Chief Corporate Human Relations Officer of McCormick - The Chief Executive responsible for McCormick's European operations, the Chief Financial Officer for Europe, the Chief Human Relations Officer for Europe, and The Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Human Relation Officer and in-house counsel of the appropriate McCormick affiliate or subsidiary." However, no further information was found regarding escalating to reach a final decision. [Business ethics policy, Not mentioned: mccormickcorporation.com]
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: The Company states that "We also maintain a confidential "hotline" that we can call in those circumstances, the details of which are set out at the end of this policy. All concerns, questions and complaints will be taken seriously and handled promptly, confidentially and professionally. No retaliation will be taken against any employee for raising any concern, question or complaint in good faith." However, no evidence found of the commitment being made extensive to other stakeholders. [Business ethics policy, Not mentioned: mccormickcorporation.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Not met: Has not retaliated in practice Not met: Expects AG suppliers to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts: In its Supplier Code, the Company states that " Employees will be fairly compensated and provided with wages and benefits that comply with applicable laws, including appropriate compensation for overtime work and other premium pay situations required by applicable law." No further information regarding living wage is mentioned. [Global Supplier Code, 24/01/2018: mccormickcorporation.com] Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices) Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights (purchasing practices) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.1.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Identifies suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Discloses significant parts of SP and why

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.1.4.b	Prohibition on 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code, the Company states that "Child labor is strictly prohibited. Suppliers shall adhere to the minimum employment legal age limit defined by national law or regulation, and comply with relevant International Labor Organization (ILO) standards. In no instance shall a supplier permit children to perform work that exposes them to undue physical risks than can cause physical, mental or emotional harm or improperly interfere with their schooling (except as may be permitted under apprenticeship or similar programs in which the minor is lawfully participating)." However, the Company does not indicate that it verifies the age of job applicants. [Global Supplier Code, 24/01/2018: mccormickcorporation.com] Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.b	Prohibition on 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.1.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code, the Company states that " Supplier confirms that, in providing goods and services to McCormick, it has not used involuntary or forced labor, whether indentured, bonded, prison or otherwise, and that the Supplier has not confiscated or withheld worker identity documents or other valuable items, including passports, work permits and travel documentation. Supplier certifies that it has not been, and is not, keeping workers' personal documents as a means to bind them to employment or to restrict their freedom of movement". [Global Supplier Code, 24/01/2018: mccormickcorporation.com] Not met: How working with suppliers on free movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: In its Global Supplier Code, the Company states that "Vendor shall provide employees with safe and healthy working conditions. At a minimum, potable drinking water, clean restrooms, adequate ventilation, fire exits and essential safety equipment, an emergency aid kit, access to emergency medical care and appropriately lit work stations are provided. The Vendor's facilities are to be constructed and maintained in accordance with applicable law." [Global Supplier Code, 24/01/2018: mccormickcorporation.com] Not met: Injury Rate disclosures [Purpose-ledPerformanceReport, 2017: p.widencdn.net] Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures Not met: Fatalities disclosure [Purpose-ledPerformanceReport, 2017: p.widencdn.net] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on land & owners in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on land issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.9.b	Water and sanitation (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Rules on water stewardship in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on water stewardship issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.1.10.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress

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 5.38 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.34 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	0.48 out of 4	Out of a total of 42 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, McCormick & Company made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 5 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.48 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company reports on GRI: The Purpose-Led report was produced in reference to the GRI Standards. [Purpose-ledPerformanceReport, 2017: p.widencdn.net] • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	McCormick & Company 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 <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

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.