



## "Devoir de Vigilance: Reforming Corporate Risk Engagement"

Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Contents**

		Cromology SAS	34
Accor SA		Danone SA	
Air France-KLM SA		Dassault Aviation SA	36
Airbus Group SE	3	Dassault Systemes SE	37
Alstom SA		Decathlon SA	38
Alten SA		Derichebourg Propreté SA	39
Altice France SA	6	EGIS SA	40
Altran Technologies SA		Eiffage Infrastructures SAS	41
ArcelorMittal Atlantique et Lorraine SAS		Electricite de France SA	42
Arkema SA	9	Elior Group SA	43
Atos SE	10	Elis SA	44
Auchan Holding SA	11	Enedis SA	45
Axa SA		Engie SA	46
Banque Fédérative du Crédit Mutuel SA	13	Eramet SA	47
bioMérieux SA		Essilor International SA	48
BNP Paribas SA	15	Europcar Group SA	49
Bolloré SA	16	Faurecia Automotive Holdings SE	50
Bonduelle SA	17	Financière de l'Odet SA	51
Bouygues SA	18	FNAC Darty SA	52
Bureau Veritas SA	19	Galeries Lafayette Haussmann SA	53
Burelle Participations SA	20	GFI Informatique SA	54
Caisse D'epargne et de Prevoyance Ile-de-France SA	21	GRDF SA	55
Capgemini SA	22	Group Crit SA	56
Carrefour SA	23	Groupama Assurances Mutuelles SA	57
Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA	24	Groupe ADP SA	58
Catering International & Services SA	25	Groupe BPCE SA	59
Christian Dior SA	26	Groupe LDC SA	60
Club Med SAS	27	Groupe SNEF SA	61
Compagnie de Saint-Gobain SA	28	Hermès International SA	62
Compagnie Générale des Établissements Michelin SCA		HSBC France SA	63
Constantia Flexibles Group GmbH	30	ID Logistics Group SA	64
Credit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank SA	31	Iliad SA	65
Credit Industriel Et Commercial SA - CIC	32	Imervs SA	66





### Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

IPSOS Group SA	67	Safran SA	-
JCDecaux SA	68	Sanofi SA	
Keolis SA	69	Savencia SA	
Kering SA	70	Schneider Electric SE	105
Kiabi Europe SAS	71	SEB SA	106
Korian SA	72	Société Bic SA	107
L'air Liquide SA	73	Société Générale SA	108
L'Oréal SA		Sodexo SA	109
La Banque Postale SA	75	SOMDIAA SA (Société d'Organisation de Management et de Développement	
La Poste SA		des Industries Alimentaires et Agricoles)	110
Lagardere SCA	77	Sopra Steria Group SA	111
Legrand SA		Spie Batignolles SA	112
Les Mousquetaires SA		ST microelectronics SA	113
Lisi Aerospace SAS		Stahl GmbH	114
LVMH Moët Hennessy - Louis Vuitton SE		STEF SA	115
Maisons du Monde SA		Suez Water Technologies and Solutions SA	116
Mobivia Groupe SA		Tarkett SA	117
Natixis SA		Technicolor SA	118
Naval Group SA		Teleperformance SE	119
Nexans SA		Thales SA	120
Nexity SA		Total SA	121
Onet SA		Transdev Group SA	122
Orange SA		Tsebo Solutions Group Proprietary Limited	123
Orano SA		Ubisoft Entertainment SA	124
Orpea SA		Unibel SA	125
Pernod Ricard SA		Valeo SA	126
Pierre & Vacances SA		Vallourec SA	127
Plastic Omnium SA		Veolia Environnement SA	128
PSA Automobiles SA		Vinci SA	129
Publicis Groupe SA		Vivarte SAS	130
Rallye SA		Vivendi SA	131
Régie Autonome des Transports Parisiens SA		Wendel SA	132
Renault SA		Worldline SA	133
Rexel Electrical Supply & Services Holding Limited		XPO Logistics Europe SADIR	
RTE Reseau de Transport d'electricite SA	101		





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Accor SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 12,854 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,149 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	6/11 (55%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Air France-KLM SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 29,057 Total Assets (million EUR): 26,515 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	12/18 (67%)  2/13 (15%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)
	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 16/42 (38%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Airbus Group SE

Total Revenue (million EUR): 115,198 Total Assets (million EUR): 63,707 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	8/18 (44%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	2/11 (18%)
	2/13 (15%)		
o. Local community input in risk map			

Combined score: 12/42 (29%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Alstom SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 13,410 Total Assets (million EUR): 8,072 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	14/18 (78%)  7/13 (54%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. Alert system outcomes published 36. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	6/11 (55%)
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	7/13 (54%) • • • •	<ul><li>31. Alert system outcomes published</li><li>38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li><li>41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li></ul>	

Combined score: 27/42 (64%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Alten SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,662 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,270 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	11/18 (61%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	0/13 (0%) • • • •		

Combined score: 14/42 (33%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Altice France SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 11,479 Total Assets (million EUR): 10,187 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	0/18 (0%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	0/11 (0%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	0/13 (0%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 0/42 (0%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Altran Technologies SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 4,662 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,916 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	4/18 (22%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 6/42 (14%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### ArcelorMittal Atlantique et Lorraine SAS

Total Revenue (million EUR): 100,374 Total Assets (million EUR): 83,636 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	10/18 (56%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	, , ,		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			

Combined score: 14/42 (33%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Arkema SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 10,111 Total Assets (million EUR): 8,816 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	16/18 (89%)  4/13 (31%)	<ul> <li>15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>26. Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>42. Human rights violations published</li> <li>Transparency</li> <li>2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>20. Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>24. Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>31. Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ul>	7/11 (64%)
	, , ,	<ul><li>38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li><li>41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li></ul>	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •	·	

Combined score: 27/42 (64%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Atos SE

Total Revenue (million EUR): 21,576 Total Assets (million EUR): 12,258 Vigilance plan statement

<ol> <li>Vigilance plan established</li> <li>Stakeholder input in vigilance plan</li> <li>Risk mapping and analysis undertaken</li> <li>Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims</li> <li>Risk prioritization within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping</li> <li>Environmental rights or harms at issue specified</li> <li>Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure</li> <li>Affirmative steps to address negative impacts</li> <li>Structure for an alert mechanism included</li> <li>Specify of what the alert system entails</li> <li>Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy</li> <li>Vigilance plan within the management report</li> <li>Compte rendu or discussion of findings published</li> </ol> Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles <ol> <li>Local community input in vigilance plan</li> <li>Stakeholder input in risk map</li> </ol>	7/13 (54%)	26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	•

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Auchan Holding SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 35,935 Total Assets (million EUR): 50,986 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	11/18 (61%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	6/11 (55%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>		38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Axa SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 930,695 Total Assets (million EUR): 102,874 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	15/18 (83%)  6/13 (46%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•	

Combined score: 25/42 (60%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Banque Fédérative du Crédit Mutuel SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 535,112 Total Assets (million EUR): 12,083 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	12/18 (67%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>		38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
o. Local community input in risk map	•		

Combined score: 16/42 (38%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### bioMérieux SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 3,390 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,421 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	0/18 (0%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	0/11 (0%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	0/13 (0%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 0/42 (0%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **BNP Paribas SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,040,836 Total Assets (million EUR): 33,333 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	15/18 (83%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 23/42 (55%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Bolloré SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 55,429 Total Assets (million EUR): 23,024 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	16/18 (89%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	7/11 (64%)
	6/13 (46%)  • •	31. Alert system outcomes published	

Combined score: 29/42 (69%)

Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Bonduelle SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,027 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,777 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 19/42 (45%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Bouygues SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 36,303 Total Assets (million EUR): 35,555 Vigilance plan statement

28. Structure for an alert mechanism included 29. Specify of what the alert system entails 32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy 39. Vigilance plan within the management report 40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map  16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 32. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 33. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 44. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail  45. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 46. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 47. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 40. Specific location of risks provided 42. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 43. Alert system outcomes published 44. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	29. Specify of what the alert system entails 32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy 39. Vigilance plan within the management report 40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
--	---	--	---

Combined score: 24/42 (57%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Bureau Veritas SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 6,096 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,796 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	16/18 (89%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	6/11 (55%)
•	2/13 (15%)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Combined score: 24/42 (57%)

Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Burelle Participations SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,022 Total Assets (million EUR): 9,000 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established 4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan 6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken 9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims 10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping 11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping 12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping 13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping 14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping 18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping 19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified 21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure 24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts 28. Structure for an alert mechanism included 29. Specify of what the alert system entails 32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy 39. Vigilance plan within the management report 40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	3/18 (17%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. Alert system outcomes published	2/11 (18%)
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 5/42 (12%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Caisse D'epargne et de Prevoyance Ile-de-France SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 66,651 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,107 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map  8. Local community input in risk map	12/18 (67%)  3/13 (23%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ol>	5/11 (45%)
--	-------------------------	---	------------

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Capgemini SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 16,498 Total Assets (million EUR): 13,197 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Carrefour SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 47,378 Total Assets (million EUR): 77,917 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	17/18 (94%)  6/13 (46%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published	8/11 (73%)  8/10 (73%)
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	6/13 (46%) • •		

Combined score: 31/42 (74%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Casino Guichard-Perrachon SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 37,440 Total Assets (million EUR): 37,136 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)  5/13 (38%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
	• •		• •

Combined score: 24/42 (57%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Catering International & Services SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 129 Total Assets (million EUR): 224 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	10/18 (56%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ol>	4/11 (36%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 14/42 (33%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Christian Dior SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 77,300 Total Assets (million EUR): 46,826 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	13/18 (72%)  5/13 (38%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	·	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 21/42 (50%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Club Med SAS

Total Revenue (million EUR): 955 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,600 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Compagnie de Saint-Gobain SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 44,042 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,471 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	12/18 (67%)  4/13 (31%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	, , ,	·	

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

# Compagnie Générale des Établissements Michelin SCA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 29,448 Total Assets (million EUR): 22,028 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. Alert system outcomes published 36. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	11/11 (100%)
5. Local community input in vigilance plan		38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 33/42 (79%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Constantia Flexibles Group GmbH

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,280 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,538 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Credit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,624,400 Total Assets (million EUR): 18,634 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	15/18 (83%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	7/11 (64%)
8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	

Combined score: 30/42 (71%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Credit Industriel Et Commercial SA - CIC

Total Revenue (million EUR): 294,704 Total Assets (million EUR): 5,021 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	15/18 (83%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	13/10 (03/0)	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan		26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	•
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping		34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	
	• •	•	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	2/11 (18%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	1/13 (8%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		
		·	

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Credit Mutuel Arkea SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 134,920 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,164 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 21/42 (50%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Cromology SAS**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 811 Total Assets (million EUR): 668 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 21/42 (50%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Danone SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 44,177 Total Assets (million EUR): 24,651 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. Alert system outcomes published 36. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 37. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 39. Alert system outcomes published	4/11 (36%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •	•	• •

Combined score: 19/42 (45%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Dassault Aviation SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 17,053 Total Assets (million EUR): 5,119 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	8/18 (44%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	0 •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •	12 Trainan Tigita Trainana pasiisira	
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	2/11 (18%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	0/13 (0%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	0 0		
		I	

Combined score: 10/42 (24%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Dassault Systemes SE**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,974 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,477 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	7/18 (39%)  2/13 (15%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
	, , ,		
• • •		ı	

Combined score: 12/42 (29%)

Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Decathlon SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): NA Total Assets (million EUR): 12,800 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	13/18 (72%)  4/13 (31%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	7/11 (64%)
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 24/42 (57%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Derichebourg Propreté SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,413 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,920 Vigilance plan statement

18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping • •	<ol> <li>Environmental rights or harms at issue specified</li> <li>Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure</li> <li>Affirmative steps to address negative impacts</li> <li>Structure for an alert mechanism included</li> <li>Specify of what the alert system entails</li> <li>Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy</li> <li>Vigilance plan within the management report</li> <li>Compte rendu or discussion of findings published</li> </ol> Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles <ol> <li>Local community input in vigilance plan</li> <li>Stakeholder input in risk map</li> </ol>	3/13 (23%)	<ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> </ol>	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
--	--	------------	--	---------------------------------------

Combined score: 17/42 (40%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **EGIS SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,573 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,074 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	2/18 (11%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	0/11 (0%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	0/13 (0%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 2/42 (5%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Eiffage Infrastructures SAS**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 18,571 Total Assets (million EUR): 16,557 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	13/18 (72%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	2/11 (18%)
	4/13 (31%)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Combined score: 19/42 (45%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Electricite de France SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 283,169 Total Assets (million EUR): 44,874 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	16/18 (89%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. Alert system outcomes published 36. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	7/11 (64%)
	6/13 (46%)  • •	31. Alert system outcomes published	

Combined score: 29/42 (69%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Elior Group SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 5,366 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,886 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 10/42 (24%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Elis SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,795 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,133 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	, ,	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 23/42 (55%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Enedis SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 283,000 Total Assets (million EUR): 14,000 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	2/18 (11%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessens learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li></ul>	• •		
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 7/42 (17%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Engie SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 153,702 Total Assets (million EUR): 60,596 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	15/18 (83%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	5/11 (45%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	5/13 (38%) • •	•	

Combined score: 25/42 (60%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Eramet SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 5,995 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,725 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	16/18 (89%)  4/13 (31%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
	, , ,	·	
o. Local confindinty input in risk map	•		

Combined score: 25/42 (60%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Essilor International SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 46,269 Total Assets (million EUR): 10,799 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	15/18 (83%)  7/13 (54%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	7/13 (54%) • • • •		• •

Combined score: 25/42 (60%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Europcar Group SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 6,495 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,929 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	5/18 (28%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	3/11 (27%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
•		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	2/13 (15%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		
·		1	

Combined score: 10/42 (24%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Faurecia Automotive Holdings SE

Total Revenue (million EUR): 13,395 Total Assets (million EUR): 17,525 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	13/18 (72%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>		38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 24/42 (57%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Financière de l'Odet SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 53,539 Total Assets (million EUR): 23,024 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	16/18 (89%)  6/13 (46%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	7/11 (64%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 29/42 (69%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **FNAC Darty SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 5,511 Total Assets (million EUR): 7,500 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	8/18 (44%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
	, , ,		
		I .	

Combined score: 11/42 (26%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Galeries Lafayette Haussmann SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): NA Total Assets (million EUR): 77,069 Vigilance plan statement

<ol> <li>Vigilance plan established</li> <li>Stakeholder input in vigilance plan</li> <li>Risk mapping and analysis undertaken</li> <li>Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims</li> <li>Risk prioritization within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping</li> <li>Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure</li> <li>Affirmative steps to address negative impacts</li> <li>Structure for an alert mechanism included</li> <li>Specify of what the alert system entails</li> <li>Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy</li> <li>Vigilance plan within the management report</li> <li>Compte rendu or discussion of findings published</li> </ol>	25. 26. 27. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 42.  Tra 2. 3. 16. 17. 20. 22. 23. 30. /13 (15%) 31. 38.	Office tasked with implementing mitigating action Office requires upper management sign off Follow up process to embed mitigation steps Monitoring scheme by independent third party Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law KPIs for all four subject matters of the law Human rights violations published  Insparency Vigilance plan readily accessible within website Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping Specific location of risks provided Frequency of risk mapping update stated Frequency of vigilance plan update stated Alert system managed by a third party Alert system outcomes published KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
---	--	---	---

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **GFI Informatique SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,258 Total Assets (million EUR): 743 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law 1. Vigilance plan established 4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan 6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken 9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims 10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping 11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	10/18 (56%)	<ul> <li>15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>26. Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> </ul>	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	2/11 (18%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	3/13 (23%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 15/42 (36%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **GRDF SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): NA Total Assets (million EUR): 2,298 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	10/18 (56%)  4/13 (31%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Group Crit SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,275 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,498 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	7/18 (39%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	4/11 (36%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li></ul>	0 0	The state of the s	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 14/42 (33%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Groupama Assurances Mutuelles SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 88,506 Total Assets (million EUR): 10,649 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	3/18 (17%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	2/11 (18%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	0/13 (0%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 5/42 (12%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Groupe ADP SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 16,067 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,478 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 19/42 (45%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Groupe BPCE SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,273,926 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,819 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	13/18 (72%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 19/42 (45%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Groupe LDC SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,191 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,124 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	8/18 (44%)  2/13 (15%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
	, , ,	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 14/42 (33%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **Groupe SNEF SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 984 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,241 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	5/18 (28%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 9/42 (21%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Hermès International SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,468 Total Assets (million EUR): 5,966 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### **HSBC France SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 180,946 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,736 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	6/18 (33%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
, , , <del>,</del> , ,	• •	·	• •

Combined score: 12/42 (29%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **ID Logistics Group SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 755 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,410 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 21/42 (50%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Iliad SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 11,252 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,891 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 9/42 (21%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Imerys SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,594 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,590 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	14/18 (78%)  6/13 (46%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. MPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	7/11 (64%)
	, ,	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •

Combined score: 27/42 (64%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **IPSOS Group SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,375 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,749 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	9/18 (50%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 15/42 (36%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### JCDecaux SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 5,762 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,619 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law 1. Vigilance plan established	16/18 (89%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	6/11 (55%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	5/13 (38%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 27/42 (64%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

#### Keolis SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 3,337 Total Assets (million EUR): 5,624 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	15/18 (83%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	• •		• •

Combined score: 28/42 (67%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Kering SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 21,368 Total Assets (million EUR): 13,665 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	17/18 (94%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 27/42 (64%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Kiabi Europe SAS

Total Revenue (million EUR): NA Total Assets (million EUR): 1,174 Vigilance plan statement

Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5/13 (38%) 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map  5/13 (38%)  • • 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail  • • 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
--	---	-----	---	-----

Combined score: 19/42 (45%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Korian SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 4,559 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,336 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •		• •

Combined score: 28/42 (67%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### L'air Liquide SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 41,027 Total Assets (million EUR): 21,011 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	13/18 (72%)  5/13 (38%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
	, ,	·	• •
o. Local community input in risk map	•		

Combined score: 21/42 (50%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### L'Oréal SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 38,458 Total Assets (million EUR): 26,937 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	16/18 (89%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	9/11 (82%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
		<b>'</b>	

Combined score: 32/42 (76%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### La Banque Postale SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 245,201 Total Assets (million EUR): 6,910 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 8/42 (19%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### La Poste SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 261,509 Total Assets (million EUR): 24,700 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	11/18 (61%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
•	3/13 (23%)	1	
o. Local community input in riok map			

Combined score: 17/42 (40%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Lagardere SCA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 8,219 Total Assets (million EUR): 7,258 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	7/18 (39%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ol>	2/11 (18%)
the state of the s			
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 9/42 (21%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Legrand SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 10,306 Total Assets (million EUR): 5,997 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	16/18 (89%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	7/11 (64%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li></ul>	, ,	·	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 27/42 (64%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Les Mousquetaires SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 5,650 Total Assets (million EUR): 34,800 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	5/18 (28%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>		41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	

Combined score: 8/42 (19%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Lisi Aerospace SAS

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,866 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,694 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	5/18 (28%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	1/11 (9%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	0/13 (0%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 6/42 (14%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### LVMH Moët Hennessy - Louis Vuitton SE

Total Revenue (million EUR): 74,300 Total Assets (million EUR): 46,826 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	8/18 (44%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 13/42 (31%)

Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Maisons du Monde SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,211 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,143 Vigilance plan statement

4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan 6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken 9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims 10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping 11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping 12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping 13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping 14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping 18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping 19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified 21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure 24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts 28. Structure for an alert mechanism included 29. Specify of what the alert system entails 32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy 39. Vigilance plan within the management report 40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan	3/13 (23%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ol>	3/11 (27%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	·	• •

Combined score: 16/42 (38%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Mobivia Groupe SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): NA Total Assets (million EUR): 2,700 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	8/18 (44%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons leaved in first year sported in detail	3/11 (27%)
	, , ,		
o. Local community input in risk map	•		

Combined score: 13/42 (31%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Natixis SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 495,500 Total Assets (million EUR): 9,616 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	11/18 (61%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	2/11 (18%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	2/13 (15%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 15/42 (36%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Naval Group SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 15,693 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,608 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
	, , ,	·	
o. 2002. Community input in risk map			

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Nexans SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 5,119 Total Assets (million EUR): 65,000 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	3/11 (27%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	2/13 (15%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		
		<b>'</b>	

Combined score: 19/42 (45%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Nexity SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,616 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,135 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)	<ul> <li>15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>26. Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>42. Human rights violations published</li> <li>Transparency</li> <li>2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>20. Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>30. Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>31. Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ul>	3/11 (27%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Onet SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): NA Total Assets (million EUR): 3,200 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 7/42 (17%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Orange SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 96,592 Total Assets (million EUR): 41,381 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Orano SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 22,540 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,623 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	14/18 (78%)  4/13 (31%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
	, , ,	·	
o. 2002. Community input in risk map			

Combined score: 23/42 (55%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Orpea SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 11,145 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,420 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	13/18 (72%)  4/13 (31%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 34. Alert system managed by a third party 35. Alert system outcomes published 36. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 37. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Pernod Ricard SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 29,558 Total Assets (million EUR): 9,182 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	10/18 (56%)  2/13 (15%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
	0 0		
o. Local community input in risk map	•		

Combined score: 16/42 (38%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Pierre & Vacances SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,489 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,595 Vigilance plan statement

<ol> <li>Vigilance plan established</li> <li>Stakeholder input in vigilance plan</li> <li>Risk mapping and analysis undertaken</li> <li>Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims</li> <li>Risk prioritization within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping</li> <li>Environmental rights or harms at issue specified</li> <li>Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure</li> <li>Affirmative steps to address negative impacts</li> <li>Structure for an alert mechanism included</li> <li>Specify of what the alert system entails</li> <li>Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy</li> <li>Vigilance plan within the management report</li> <li>Compte rendu or discussion of findings published</li> </ol> Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles <ol> <li>Local community input in vigilance plan</li> <li>Stakeholder input in risk map</li> </ol>	2/13 (15%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 26. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 46. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 47. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 48. Specific location of risks provided 49. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 49. Alert system managed by a third party 49. Alert system outcomes published 49. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
---	------------	---	------------

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Plastic Omnium SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 6,779 Total Assets (million EUR): 8,244 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 21/42 (50%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **PSA Automobiles SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 58,565 Total Assets (million EUR): 74,027 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 23/42 (55%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Publicis Groupe SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 27,080 Total Assets (million EUR): 9,951 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	7/18 (39%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	3/11 (27%)
	, , ,	·	
o. Local community input in risk map			

Combined score: 13/42 (31%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Rallye SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 39,169 Total Assets (million EUR): 38,029 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	6/18 (33%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	2/11 (18%) • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 8/42 (19%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Régie Autonome des Transports Parisiens SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 15,166 Total Assets (million EUR): 5,994 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	5/18 (28%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 10/42 (24%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Renault SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 114,996 Total Assets (million EUR): 57,419 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	6/11 (55%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 24/42 (57%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Rexel Electrical Supply & Services Holding Limited

Total Revenue (million EUR): 10,205 Total Assets (million EUR): 13,366 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	15/18 (83%)  7/13 (54%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	6/11 (55%)
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	7/13 (54%) • •		

Combined score: 28/42 (67%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### RTE Reseau de Transport d'electricite SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 20,560 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,817 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	12/18 (67%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Safran SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 24,959 Total Assets (million EUR): 21,025 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	10/18 (56%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessens learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
	, ,		
o. 2002. Community input in riok map			

Combined score: 17/42 (40%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Sanofi SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 111,408 Total Assets (million EUR): 34,463 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	15/18 (83%)  6/13 (46%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	7/11 (64%)
	, ,		
, ,		I	

Combined score: 28/42 (67%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Savencia SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 3,659 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,863 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Schneider Electric SE

Total Revenue (million EUR): 42,259 Total Assets (million EUR): 25,720 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	12/18 (67%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **SEB SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,077 Total Assets (million EUR): 6,812 Vigilance plan statement

29. Specify of what the alert system entails 32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy 39. Vigilance plan within the management report 40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map  17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 52. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	<ul> <li>32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy</li> <li>39. Vigilance plan within the management report</li> <li>40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published</li> <li>Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles</li> <li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li> <li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li> </ul>	22 22 33 33 34 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map  8. Local community input in risk map  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	·		1. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 28/42 (67%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Société Bic SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,407 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,950 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	13/18 (72%)  4/13 (31%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ol>	3/11 (27%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Société Générale SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 1,275,128 Total Assets (million EUR): 23,954 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	11/18 (61%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•	

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Sodexo SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 15,280 Total Assets (million EUR): 20,407 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
The state of the s			

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### SOMDIAA SA (Société d'Organisation de Management et de Développement des Industries Alimentaires et Agricoles)

Total Revenue (million EUR): 400 Total Assets (million EUR): 457 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	0/18 (0%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	0/11 (0%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	0/13 (0%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		
5			

Combined score: 0/42 (0%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

## Sopra Steria Group SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 3,988 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,095 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	7/18 (39%)  5/13 (38%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)
<ul><li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li></ul>	, ,	·	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 14/42 (33%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Spie Batignolles SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 7,790 Total Assets (million EUR): 14,194 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map  8. Local community input in risk map	12/18 (67%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ol>	4/11 (36%)
--	-------------	---	------------

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **ST** microelectronics **SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 10,867 Total Assets (million EUR): 10,512 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	15/18 (83%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> </ol>	7/11 (64%)
	, ,	·	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Combined score: 29/42 (69%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Stahl GmbH

Total Revenue (million EUR): 984 Total Assets (million EUR): 867 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	13/18 (72%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Alert system managed by a third party	5/11 (45%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report		<ul><li>22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li><li>23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li></ul>	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	4/13 (31%) • • • •	31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **STEF SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,324 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,255 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Suez Water Technologies and Solutions SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 33,553 Total Assets (million EUR): 17,331 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Tarkett SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,390 Total Assets (million EUR): 2,836 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	12/18 (67%)  6/13 (46%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
o. Local community input in risk map	•		

Combined score: 23/42 (55%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Technicolor SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 3,759 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,988 Vigilance plan statement

<ol> <li>Vigilance plan established</li> <li>Stakeholder input in vigilance plan</li> <li>Risk mapping and analysis undertaken</li> <li>Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims</li> <li>Risk prioritization within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping</li> <li>Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping</li> <li>Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure</li> <li>Affirmative steps to address negative impacts</li> <li>Structure for an alert mechanism included</li> <li>Specify of what the alert system entails</li> <li>Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy</li> <li>Vigilance plan within the management report</li> <li>Compte rendu or discussion of findings published</li> </ol>	25. (26. (27. F) 33. N) 34. I 35. N 36. N 37. N 42. N 43. N 13 (23%) 31. N 13 (23%) 31. N 13 (23%) 33. N 13 (23%) 33. N 13 (23%)	Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map Office tasked with implementing mitigating action Office requires upper management sign off Follow up process to embed mitigation steps Monitoring scheme by independent third party Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit In KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law It will four subject matters of the law It will four subject matter of the law It will four subje	4/11 (36%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
---	--	--	---

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Teleperformance SE**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 5,888 Total Assets (million EUR): 4,441 Vigilance plan statement

6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken 9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims 10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping 11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping 12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping 13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping 14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping 18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping 19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified 21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure 24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts 28. Structure for an alert mechanism included 29. Specify of what the alert system entails 32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy 39. Vigilance plan within the management report 40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 21. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 33. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Combined score: 20/42 (48%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Thales SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 25,506 Total Assets (million EUR): 15,855 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 23/42 (55%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Total SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 233,653 Total Assets (million EUR): 167,536 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	15/18 (83%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	6/11 (55%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 29/42 (69%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Transdev Group SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 4,372 Total Assets (million EUR): 6,892 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Tsebo Solutions Group Proprietary Limited**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 426 Total Assets (million EUR): 618 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	14/18 (78%)  3/13 (23%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	4/11 (36%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 21/42 (50%)

Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Ubisoft Entertainment SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 2,805 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,732 Vigilance plan statement

39. Vigilance plan within the management report 40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles 5. Local community input in vigilance plan 7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map  20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	<ul> <li>40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published</li> <li>Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles</li> <li>5. Local community input in vigilance plan</li> <li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li> </ul>	3/13 (23%) • •	<ul><li>23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li><li>30. Alert system managed by a third party</li><li>31. Alert system outcomes published</li><li>38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li></ul>	• •
---	--	----------------	---	-----

Combined score: 18/42 (43%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Unibel SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 3,928 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,312 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	10/18 (56%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
	, , ,	·	
o. Local community input in risk map			

Combined score: 15/42 (36%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Valeo SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 18,472 Total Assets (million EUR): 19,100 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan	14/18 (78%)  5/13 (38%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes	6/11 (55%)
	, ,	·	
o. 200a. commune, mpar in tiok map			

Combined score: 25/42 (60%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Vallourec SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 6,413 Total Assets (million EUR): 3,921 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	15/18 (83%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	5/11 (45%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 22/42 (52%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **Veolia Environnement SA**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 37,593 Total Assets (million EUR): 25,911 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 12/42 (29%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Vinci SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 75,357 Total Assets (million EUR): 43,500 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	16/18 (89%)	<ol> <li>Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map</li> <li>Office tasked with implementing mitigating action</li> <li>Office requires upper management sign off</li> <li>Follow up process to embed mitigation steps</li> <li>Monitoring scheme by independent third party</li> <li>Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners</li> <li>Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit</li> <li>KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law</li> <li>KPIs for all four subject matters of the law</li> <li>Human rights violations published</li> </ol> Transparency <ol> <li>Vigilance plan readily accessible within website</li> <li>Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law</li> <li>Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping</li> <li>Specific location of risks provided</li> <li>Frequency of risk mapping update stated</li> <li>Frequency of vigilance plan update stated</li> <li>Alert system managed by a third party</li> <li>Alert system outcomes published</li> <li>KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes</li> <li>Lessons learned in first year reported in detail</li> </ol>	7/11 (64%)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •	•	
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		

Combined score: 31/42 (74%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Vivarte SAS

Total Revenue (million EUR): NA Total Assets (million EUR): 1,400 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	11/18 (61%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 33. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
<ul><li>7. Stakeholder input in risk map</li><li>8. Local community input in risk map</li></ul>	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 16/42 (38%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Vivendi SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 34,403 Total Assets (million EUR): 13,932 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law	8/18 (44%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map	• •
1. Vigilance plan established	• •	25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action	• •
4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan	• •	26. Office requires upper management sign off	• •
6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken	• •	27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps	• •
9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims	• •	33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party	• •
10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping	• •	34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners	• •
11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping	• •	35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit	• •
12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping	• •	36. KPIs for at least one subject matter of the law	• •
13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping	• •	37. KPIs for all four subject matters of the law	• •
14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping	• •	42. Human rights violations published	• •
18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping	• •		
19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified	• •	Transparency	3/11 (27%)
21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure	• •	2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website	• •
24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts	• •	3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law	• •
28. Structure for an alert mechanism included	• •	16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping	• •
29. Specify of what the alert system entails	• •	17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping	• •
32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy	• •	20. Specific location of risks provided	• •
39. Vigilance plan within the management report	• •	22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated	• •
40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published	• •	23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated	• •
		30. Alert system managed by a third party	• •
Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles	1/13 (8%)	31. Alert system outcomes published	• •
5. Local community input in vigilance plan	• •	38. KPIs used to report on due diligence outcomes	• •
7. Stakeholder input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •
8. Local community input in risk map	• •		
		'	

Combined score: 12/42 (29%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Wendel SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 14,317 Total Assets (million EUR): 984 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	4/18 (22%)  • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	2/11 (18%)
8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 8/42 (19%)





Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### Worldline SA

Total Revenue (million EUR): 6,358 Total Assets (million EUR): 1,720 Vigilance plan statement

Combined score: 17/42 (40%)



Corporate Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance Law, UNGP Conformance and Transparency in Vigilance Plans published in 2019

### **XPO Logistics Europe SADIR**

Total Revenue (million EUR): 10,986 Total Assets (million EUR): 15,471 Vigilance plan statement

Compliance with the Devoir de Vigilance law  1. Vigilance plan established  4. Stakeholder input in vigilance plan  6. Risk mapping and analysis undertaken  9. Risk mapping in the perspective of potential victims  10. Risk prioritization within risk mapping  11. Discussion of suppliers within risk mapping  12. Discussion of subcontractors within risk mapping  13. Discussion of subsidiaries within risk mapping  14. Discussion of labor rights within risk mapping  18. Discussion of environmental harm in risk mapping  19. Environmental rights or harms at issue specified  21. Partner / subsidiary risk assessment procedure  24. Affirmative steps to address negative impacts  28. Structure for an alert mechanism included  29. Specify of what the alert system entails  32. Monitoring scheme to review action efficacy  39. Vigilance plan within the management report  40. Compte rendu or discussion of findings published  Conformance with the UN Guiding Principles  5. Local community input in vigilance plan  7. Stakeholder input in risk map	10/18 (56%)	15. Discussion of nondiscrimination within risk map 25. Office tasked with implementing mitigating action 26. Office requires upper management sign off 27. Follow up process to embed mitigation steps 33. Monitoring scheme by independent third party 34. Independent audit of subsidiaries and partners 35. Monitoring scheme includes alert system audit 36. KPls for at least one subject matter of the law 37. KPls for all four subject matters of the law 42. Human rights violations published  Transparency 2. Vigilance plan readily accessible within website 3. Vigilance plan mentions the Devoir de Vigilance law 16. Forms of discrimination specified in risk mapping 17. Discriminated groups specified in risk mapping 20. Specific location of risks provided 22. Frequency of risk mapping update stated 23. Frequency of vigilance plan update stated 30. Alert system managed by a third party 31. Alert system outcomes published 38. KPls used to report on due diligence outcomes 41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	3/11 (27%)
7. Stakeholder input in risk map 8. Local community input in risk map	• •	41. Lessons learned in first year reported in detail	• •

Combined score: 16/42 (38%)