

Policy on conflicts of interest relating to the scoring of responses

Revised August, 2016

Maintaining CDP's reputation as an independent and unbiased provider of high quality information is of paramount importance. Accordingly, CDP has adopted this policy to minimize the risk of conflicts of interest that might affect the accuracy of the scores we award to companies that respond to our questionnaires.

Development of scoring methodologies

1. CDP's Scoring Team is responsible for developing CDP's scoring methodologies in a way which furthers CDP's mission, takes into account scientific knowledge on environmental issues, and treats responding companies fairly. The Scoring Team must balance these factors and make an independent decision on them, and to minimize the potential for conflicts of interest none of the team is responsible for CDP's relationship with any responding company.

Scoring process

2. CDP's Scoring Team oversees implementation of the scoring process, training Scoring partners (as defined in paragraph 4 below) and validating scores before their release. The Scoring Team may request input from other CDP staff (e.g. to translate an attachment to check whether it meets specific criteria) but such staff are not granted access to unpublished responses or scores and all staff remain subject to the prohibition in paragraph 7 below at all times.
3. Questionnaire responses submitted by respondents may only be amended by them, or to their instruction by CDP staff.
4. Organizations scoring responses on behalf of CDP ("**Scoring partners**") must be approved by CDP, and must successfully complete CDP's training programme, put in place an internal quality assurance process to ensure CDP's scoring methodology is applied consistently, and submit scores to CDP for final quality assurance before publication.
5. Scoring partners must treat all responders equally, irrespective of whether a responder is their funder, client or competitor. Accordingly:
 - a. Before commencing scoring, Scoring partners must disclose to CDP if any clients, funders or competitors are included within the sample of companies they have been asked to score and if they have provided any companies in the sample with response preparation or 'response check' services.
 - b. Where a Scoring partner has assisted a responding company in preparing its response or has provided it a 'response check' service, such company will be scored by a different Scoring partner.
 - c. Where a Scoring partner is working with responding companies in any other capacity that could influence its objectivity, CDP will quality assure all or a proportion of such responses.

- d. If there is any concern about a Scoring partner's impartiality, CDP will either apply additional quality assurance checks to such Scoring partner's scores, or arrange for any affected companies to be scored by a different Scoring partner.
- e. If CDP discovers that a Scoring partner is not being even-handed in its approach to scoring, CDP will immediately terminate its relationship with that Scoring partner and check and correct any affected scores.

Restrictions on funding and attempts to influence scores

- 6. Neither CDP nor its Scoring partners will accept funding where an objective of such funding is to influence any scoring decisions. This applies equally to grants, sponsorship, sales of services or any other income.
- 7. Any attempt by any member of CDP's staff or board of Trustees to amend responses or influence scoring methodologies or scoring results, or assist any other party in doing so for personal gain, will be regarded as gross misconduct and will result in instant dismissal without compensation.