



Scoring Methodology 2026

Framework and Design Principles



Thomson Reuters
Foundation

Version Control

#	Description of the Revision	Sections revised	Date revised	Edited by	Approval Date	Approved by
1	New Document	All	N/A	Shruti Karkhedkar	July 2026	Joy Zhang

DRAFT

Contents

Introduction..... 4

Scope..... 4

Scoring Architecture..... 4

The 3A Model..... 4

Scale Convention and Output Levels..... 5

Topic Score 8

Section Score 10

Company-Level Score 11

Section Weight Matrix..... 12

Illustrative Complete Company-Level Examples..... 14

Appendix..... 15

Introduction

The Workforce Disclosure Initiative (WDI) has introduced a new scoring methodology in response to growing demand from both companies and investors for a more meaningful assessment of workforce management practices. While disclosure remains a critical foundation, stakeholders have increasingly sought greater insight into the quality, maturity, and effectiveness of the policies, processes, and practices described. The new methodology is designed to provide a more nuanced evaluation of company disclosures against WDI's scoring framework and guidance, enabling more robust benchmarking and clearer identification of strengths and areas for improvement. For investors, it offers deeper topic-level insights that support stewardship, engagement, and risk assessment. This document outlines the principles, structure, and application of the new scoring approach.

Scope

This document sets out the WDI 2026 Scoring Methodology Framework, which explains how company responses to the Workforce Disclosure Initiative survey are assessed and translated into comparable scores. The framework provides a consistent approach to evaluating disclosures across all 13 survey sections.

Each company receives four scores: an **Overall Composite Score** and **three-dimension scores measuring Awareness, Approach, and Action**, all on a scale of 0–100. Scores are calculated through a three-level structure—**Topic, Section, and Overall Company level**—with results aggregated from individual topics, through sections, to produce the overall company scores. This approach aims to enable meaningful benchmarking across companies, sectors and regions while providing greater insight into specific areas of workforce management performance to investors and other stakeholders in the responsible business community.

Scoring Architecture

The 3A Model

Every topic in the WDI survey is evaluated across three dimensions: Awareness, Approach, and Action. These are the locked definitions used across all 31 WDI topics:

AWARENESS	APPROACH	ACTION
The company recognises, identifies, or acknowledges a workforce issue, risk, or topic — covering risk identification, issue mapping, and understanding of obligations. <i>Does the company know what its workforce risks are?</i>	The governance structures, monitoring systems, processes, methodologies, and safeguards the company has put in place to address identified risks. <i>Does the company have a framework to manage those risks?</i>	The implemented practices, programmes, and operational measures that demonstrate the approach is in operation, including monitoring outcomes, and evidence in practice. <i>Does the company effectively implement and demonstrate that framework in practice?</i>

The three dimensions reflect different dimension of companies' workforce management journey. While they are interconnected and collectively contribute to a robust workforce management system, companies may demonstrate varying levels of maturity across each dimension. Using the WDI survey framework, we capture information across all three dimensions to assess workforce management holistically and develop a comprehensive understanding of a company's workforce management practices and performance. A single survey question can contribute evidence to more than one dimension. The scoring criteria for each topic specify exactly which questions contribute to which dimensions and how.

Not every topic uses all three dimensions. Whether a dimension is scored for a given topic depends entirely on whether the survey questions under that topic provide evidence for it. For example: *a topic asking only for quantitative data disclosures may have no Approach dimension; for topics built around a Yes/No question, Awareness is often inherent and may not need to be treated as a separate dimension.* Where a topic has only two applicable dimensions, the composite formula divides by two instead of three. Each topic's scoring criteria document states which dimensions apply and why.

Scale Convention and Output Levels

Each dimension is scored on an integer scale from 0 to 5. The scale is designed to reflect genuine maturity differences — not just the volume of disclosure, but the quality, specificity, and consistency of what the company shows. While all dimensions ultimately use a **maximum score of 5**, the number of scoring levels may vary depending on the extent to which meaningful differentiation can be made. Intermediate levels — 2, 3 and 4 — are only included for a specific dimension within a topic when the question's guidance and evidence genuinely support an additional level of differentiation.

Standard Differentiation Scale (0, 1, 3, and 5)

The standard scale uses four anchor points: **0, 1, 3, and 5**, allowing assessments to distinguish between absence of evidence, basic practice, developing practice, and leading practice without introducing unnecessary complexity. For example, the Human Rights Policy Commitment Criteria on Awareness simply evaluates the public disclosure of such a commitment, its alignment with globally recognised standards, scope of the commitment and disclosure of commitment to remedial measures in case of adverse human rights impacts.

Granular Differentiation Scale (0, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5)

In some topics where the scope of differentiation is high it can add further granularity to the scale whereby the scale adopted may be **0, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5**. For instance under the Governance Structure and Management topic Awareness and Approach is tested through a number of parameters such as presence of oversight body, workforce topics covered thereunder, remit and responsibilities and the monitoring mechanism of such oversight. As these parameters have a wide scope of differentiation a detailed scale like the one used is warranted.

Limited Differentiation Scale (0, 1, and 5)

Where a dimension has only two or three meaningfully distinct states (for example, a simple Yes/No gate), the scale may shorten (e.g. **0, 1, 5**). This ensures scores reflect real differences in practice, not just more boxes to fill.

The six levels and their names — fixed across all WDI topics — are:

Score	Level	What It Means
0	No [Dimension]	No relevant evidence provided. The company has not addressed this topic in any disclosure, policy, or reporting.
1	Minimal	The topic is acknowledged in passing only. No specifics, no context about the company's own situation, and no evidence of genuine understanding.
2	Basic	Some evidence exists but is limited in scope or depth. The response is partial — early-stage engagement rather than a systematic approach.
3	Adequate	Clear, substantive evidence addressing the core of what is asked. Some gaps remain, but the company demonstrates meaningful and consistent engagement.
4	Strong	Comprehensive and specific evidence. The company demonstrates structured, well-governed, and consistently applied practice across relevant operations.
5	Leading	Best-in-class disclosure. Systematic, regularly reviewed, externally verifiable practice covering both direct operations and the value chain (where relevant)

Scores reflect the evidence present in the company's survey response and public disclosures. Analysts do not infer intent or assume action from policy statements alone.

Raw and Reported Scales

The framework uses two scales, applied consistently at every level:

Scale	Range	Usage
Raw (0–5)	0 to 5 (integer)	Raw criteria value reflecting the depth of response [0 – No Response to 5 – Leading Practice]
Reported (0–100)	0 to 100	All published scores. Any 0–5 value × 20. Used at topic, section, and company level.

Conversion: any raw score × 20 = reported score. Example: if raw score is 3 then the reported score will be 60

Topic-Specific Criteria

For each WDI 2026 topic, specific assessment criteria have been developed for the applicable Awareness, Approach, and Action (3A) dimensions. Each criterion is mapped to a defined scoring scale to ensure consistent and transparent evaluation.

Scores are assigned based on the quality, completeness, and specificity of a company's disclosures. In general, higher scores reflect more comprehensive disclosures, stronger evidence of formal processes and governance, and clearer demonstration of implementation and outcomes. This approach enables companies to be assessed consistently against the same topic-specific expectations.

Three Output Levels

- **Topic:** Each topic is assigned a single **Composite Topic Score**. This score is calculated by taking the three-underlying **Raw 3A scores**—Awareness, Approach, and Action—and weighting them equally. However, as mentioned earlier in this document, not every topic uses all three dimensions. Whether a dimension is scored for a given topic depends entirely on whether the survey questions under that topic provide evidence for it.
- **Section:** For each section, four scores are generated:
 - Average Awareness Score
 - Average Approach Score
 - Average Action Score
 - Composite Section Score

Each of these scores is calculated as the simple average of the corresponding topic-level scores within that section. All topics contribute equally to the section score.

- **Company:** At the company level, four overall scores are produced:
 - Overall Awareness Score
 - Overall Approach Score
 - Overall Action Score
 - Overall Composite Score

These scores are calculated by taking the corresponding section-level scores and applying the predefined sector weightings (more information on sector weights is available in the **Section Weight Matrix** section of this document). This ensures that sections with greater relevance to the sector have a proportionately larger impact on the final company score.

To summarize, Topic scores are derived from the 3A dimensions, section scores are averages of topic scores, and company scores are weighted averages of section scores.

Topic Score

The topic score is the first level of aggregation. It combines the three-dimension sub-scores into a single composite, then converts to the 0–100 scale.

Formula:

$$\text{Composite (0–5)} = (\text{Awareness} + \text{Approach} + \text{Action}) \div 3$$

$$\text{Topic Score (0–100)} = \text{Composite (0–5)} \times 20$$

The composite will frequently be a decimal, which is expected. Where a topic has only two applicable dimensions, the formula divides by two (as explained in the previous section).

The three examples below show how the same formula applies to different situations — one with a straightforward Yes-path response, and one involving a more complex Not Yet gate and always-applicable questions.

Example:

Three questions assess whether a company conducts Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD). Responses are either Yes/Not Yet or a short text explanation.

Q. No.	Question	Tagged 3A Dimension	Answer Format
2.1	Does the company conduct regular HRDD to identify, prevent, mitigate and address human rights risks and impacts?	Awareness	Yes/Not yet gateway
2.1a	If yes, describe the HRDD process, standards used (e.g. UNGPs, OECD, ILO), operational scope, frequency, communication of findings, risk management, stakeholder engagement, severity assessment, effectiveness, improvements made, and provide a public reference.	Approach Action	Description to be provided in 150 words
2.1b	If not yet, outline future plans for HRDD, expected implementation timeline, and any interim measures such as policies, supplier assessments, grievance mechanisms or audits.	Awareness Approach	Response to be provided in 150 words

Company A

This company has a robust HRDD mechanism with detailed evidence of process and improvement in implementation.

Awareness =5 because HRDD is fully implemented across direct operations and Tier I supply chain and the process is aligned with the UNGP on Business and Human Rights and OECD Guidelines

Approach = 5 because a comprehensive process covering governance, scope, standards and methodology has been detailed. The process includes desk-based risk mapping along with on-site HR impact assessments at high-risk sites. The process has board level oversight with corrective action plans and, grievance mechanism and escalation matrix. The company also discloses how effectiveness of actions is assessed and what metrics are used.

Action = 5 because provided example demonstrate evidence of completed improvements and public disclosure of the HRDD process. Improvements are monitored using the HRDD KPI dashboard and previously identified risks have undergone corrective action.

Step	Calculation	Result
Dimension scores	Awareness (5) + Approach (5) + Action (5)	(raw inputs)
Composite (0–5)	$(5 + 5 + 5) \div 3 = 15 \div 3$	5.00
Topic Score (0–100)	5.00×20	100 / 100

Robust mechanism in place with strong evidence of implementation and continuous improvement

Company B

A company has an active HRDD process with a published methodology.

Awareness = 5 because the company has an HRDD process

Approach = 3 because the company has a documented process with defined scope, accountability and board oversight. The process aligns with recognised standards such as UNGPs, OECD Guidelines, and ILO Core Labour Standards, but KPI tracking is absent.

Action = 1 because implementation is present but limited to a single assessment with no reported outcomes.

Step	Calculation	Result
Dimension scores	Awareness (5) + Approach (3) + Action (1)	(raw inputs)
Composite (0–5)	$(5 + 3 + 1) \div 3 = 9 \div 3$	3.00
Topic Score (0–100)	3.00×20	60 / 100

Strong recognition and a documented approach, but not yet translated into systematic, evidenced practice.

Company C

The company does not have an active HRDD process however has an implementation plan

Awareness = 3 because it has a clear implementation plan with timeline and scope of HRDD framework although it currently lacks a formal HRDD process.

Approach = 3 because meaningful interim measures have been established such as a policy on Human Rights which aligns with the ILO Core Labour Standards has been published and the company has also made a whistleblower hotline available to direct employees and contractual workforce.

Action = 0 because formal HRDD is currently absent

Step	Calculation	Result
Dimension scores	Awareness (3) + Approach (3) + Action (0)	(raw inputs)
Composite (0–5)	$(3 + 3 + 0) \div 3 = 6 \div 3$	3.00
Topic Score (0–100)	2.00×20	40 / 100

Clear implementation plan and interim measures have been established, albeit in the absence of current HRDD

Section Score

Each of the 13 WDI sections generates four scores on a 0–100 scale: Awareness, Approach, Action, and Composite. These scores are calculated by taking the average of the relevant topic scores within the section, with all topics weighted equally. This provides a consolidated view of company performance across all topics covered by that section.

Formula:

Score	Formula	Description
Avg. Awareness (0–100)	AVG [Topic Awareness] *20	Average of Awareness sub-scores across all topics in the section.
Avg. Approach (0–100)	AVG [Topic Approach] *20	Average of Approach sub-scores across all topics in the section.
Avg. Action (0–100)	AVG [Topic Action] *20	Average of Action sub-scores across all topics in the section.
Composite (0–100)	AVG [Topic Composite] *20	Primary section score. Average of all topic composite scores, used in the company-level weighting calculation.

All topics within a section carry equal weight. Differential weighting is applied only at the section level, via the sector weight matrix (discussed later in this document).

Example: Risk Assessment & HRDD (Health Care sector)

Section 2 of the survey contains three topics, namely i) Human Rights Due Diligence; ii) Risks and Opportunities; iii) Responding to Human Rights Risks.

Topic	Awareness	Approach	Action	Topic Score
i) Human Rights Due Diligence	5	3	1	60
ii) Risks & Opportunities	3	3	3	60
iii) Responding to HR Risks	3	1	0	27

Section Score	Calculation
Avg. Awareness	$(5+3+3) \div 3 \times 20 = 73 / 100$
Avg. Approach	$(3+3+1) \div 3 \times 20 = 47 / 100$
Avg. Action	$(1+3+0) \div 3 \times 20 = 27 / 100$
Composite	$(60+60+27) \div 3 = 49 / 100$ (primary section score)

The Awareness–Approach–Action breakdown shows the shape of the gap: strong recognition, weaker governance, limited implementation evidence.

Company-Level Score

Four company-level scores are generated on a 0–100 scale: Awareness, Approach, Action, and Composite. Each score is calculated by averaging the corresponding scores from all 13 sections using the relevant sector weightings. The same sector weighting approach is applied consistently across all four company-level scores.

Formulas

Overall Composite (0–100) = Σ [Section Composite $\times$ Section Weight%] $\div$ 100

Overall Awareness (0–100) = Σ [Section Avg. Awareness $\times$ Section Weight%] $\div$ 100

Overall Approach (0–100) = Σ [Section Avg. Approach $\times$ Section Weight%] $\div$ 100

Overall Action (0–100) = Σ [Section Avg. Action $\times$ Section Weight%] $\div$ 100

What the Four Scores Reveal:

Section Score	Calculation
Overall Awareness	Does the company recognise its workforce obligations across all 13 sections? A low score signals fundamental gaps in understanding or disclosure.
Overall Approach	Does the company have governance and policy frameworks in place? A gap between Awareness and Approach signals policy development lags behind stated understanding.
Overall Action	Is the company implementing and improving in practice? A gap between Approach and Action signals policies exist but are not yet operationalised.
Overall Composite	Sector-weighted composite across all three dimensions. The primary metric for cross-company comparison and benchmarking.

Section Weight Matrix

Not all workforce issues are equally important for every industry. To reflect this, each of the 13 WDI sections is assigned a specific weight for each of the 11 GLCS-aligned sectors. These weights determine how much each section contributes to the company's overall Awareness, Approach, Action, and Composite scores, ensuring the final results reflect the workforce issues most material to the company's sector.

Fixed Sections

Two sections carry a fixed weight across all 11 sectors, reflecting their universal materiality:

Section	Fixed Weight	Rationale
Section 1 Governance	10%	Board-level accountability for human capital is a universal material issue under UNGP Pillar I.
Section 10 Grievance Mechanisms	5%	Access to remedy is a universal obligation under UNGP Pillar III.

To ensure company scores reflect the workforce issues most relevant to each industry, 15% of the total weighting is allocated to fixed sections that are considered important across all sectors. The remaining 85% is distributed across the 11 sector-variable sections using a materiality-based weighting formula.

Variable Sections

Each variable section is assigned a materiality tier for each sector based on its relative importance. This approach ensures that the scoring methodology reflects the workforce issues most relevant to each sector.

These weightings are informed by recognised frameworks and standards (details provided in the Appendix), including SASB materiality maps, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs), ILO Core Labour Conventions, the KnowTheChain benchmark, and the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD). This approach ensures that topics of greater relevance to a sector have a larger influence on the final company scores.

Section Weight Matrix

The table below shows the weight of each section per sector (%). Fixed sections are highlighted. Each column sums to 100%.

#	Section	Health Care	Financials	Info Tech	Real Estate	Cons. Staples	Energy	Industrials	Materials	Cons. Discr.	Utilities	Comm. Svcs
1	Governance	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%
2	Risk Assessment & HRDD	9.8%	12.1%	9.4%	10.0%	8.8%	9.4%	8.5%	8.8%	8.8%	7.7%	8.5%
3	Workforce Composition	9.8%	8.1%	6.3%	10.0%	8.8%	9.4%	8.5%	8.8%	8.8%	7.7%	8.5%
4	Diversity & Inclusion	9.8%	12.1%	9.4%	10.0%	5.9%	6.3%	5.7%	5.9%	5.9%	7.7%	12.8%
5	Wage Levels & Pay Gaps	6.5%	12.1%	9.4%	10.0%	8.8%	6.3%	5.7%	5.9%	8.8%	7.7%	8.5%
6	Stability	9.8%	8.1%	9.4%	10.0%	5.9%	6.3%	5.7%	5.9%	8.8%	7.7%	8.5%
7	Training & Development	6.5%	12.1%	9.4%	10.0%	5.9%	9.4%	8.5%	5.9%	5.9%	11.6%	8.5%
8	Health, Safety & Wellbeing	9.8%	4.0%	6.3%	5.0%	5.9%	9.4%	8.5%	8.8%	5.9%	11.6%	4.3%
9	Worker Voice & Representation	6.5%	4.0%	6.3%	5.0%	8.8%	6.3%	8.5%	8.8%	5.9%	11.6%	4.3%
10	Grievance Mechanisms	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
11	Supply Chain Transparency	6.5%	4.0%	6.3%	5.0%	8.8%	6.3%	8.5%	8.8%	8.8%	3.9%	8.5%
12	Responsible Sourcing	3.3%	4.0%	6.3%	5.0%	8.8%	9.4%	8.5%	8.8%	8.8%	3.9%	4.3%
13	Supply Chain Working Conditions	6.5%	4.0%	6.3%	5.0%	8.8%	6.3%	8.5%	8.8%	8.8%	3.9%	8.5%
	TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Illustrative Complete Company-Level Examples

The example below show a complete company-level score, with all 13 sections and an overall result. Health Care sector weights are used.

Example: Strong Performer (Health Care sector)

Section	Weight	Avg. Awareness	Avg. Approach	Avg. Action	Composite
1. Governance	10.00%	80	78	72	77
2. Risk Assessment & HRDD	9.80%	73	47	27	49
3. Workforce Composition	9.80%	80	73	67	73
4. Diversity & Inclusion	9.80%	87	80	73	80
5. Wage Levels & Pay Gaps	6.50%	80	73	67	73
6. Stability	9.80%	87	80	73	80
7. Training & Development	6.50%	73	67	60	67
8. Health, Safety & Wellbeing	9.80%	93	87	80	87
9. Worker Voice & Representation	6.50%	80	73	67	73
10. Grievance Mechanisms	5.00%	87	80	73	80
11. Supply Chain Transparency	6.50%	67	60	47	58
12. Responsible Sourcing	3.30%	60	53	40	51
13. Supply Chain Working Conditions	6.50%	60	53	40	51
OVERALL	100%	79	72	64	72

Composite 72/100. Strong across direct operations (Section 1–10), with value chain sections (11–13) slightly lower.

The Awareness–Approach–Action spread (79 / 72 / 64) is typical: recognition is ahead of implementation.

Appendix

References for Materiality Tier Assignments for all sectors

Section	Source
S1: Governance (FIXED — 10%)	SASB Conceptual Framework (IFRS Foundation)
	UNGP Pillar I — State Duty to Protect (UN OHCHR)
S2: Risk Assessment & HRDD	SASB Standards Navigator — Materiality Finder
	EU CSDDD — Directive (EU) 2024/1760
S3: Workforce Composition	UNGP Pillar II — Corporate Responsibility to Respect
	SASB Standards Navigator — Human Capital Disclosure Topics
	ILO — Statistics on sectoral employment (ILOSTAT)
S4: Diversity & Inclusion	CHRB — Corporate Human Rights Benchmark (WBA)
	SASB Standards Navigator — Employee Engagement, Diversity & Inclusion
	Equileap — Gender Equality Global Report & Ranking 2024
S5: Workforce Wage Levels & Pay Gaps	WEF — Global Gender Gap Report 2024
	SASB Standards — Labour Practices general issue category
	Living Wage Foundation — Low Pay by Sector Analysis 2024
S6: Stability (Employee Turnover)	ILO — Global Wage Report 2024–25
	SASB Standards — Employee Engagement & Retention disclosure topic
S7: Training & Development	ILO — World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2024
	SASB Standards Navigator — Training & Development disclosure topic
	ILO — Guidelines for a Just Transition towards Environmentally Sustainable Economies and Societies for All
S8: Health, Safety & Wellbeing	WEF — Future of Jobs Report 2025
	SASB Standards — Occupational Health & Safety general issue category
	ILO — Safety and Health at Work
S9: Worker Voice & Representation	ISO 45001:2018 — Occupational Health and Safety Management Systems
	SASB Standards — Labour Relations general issue category
	ILO — Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining (Conventions 87 & 98)
S10: Grievance Mechanisms (FIXED — 5%)	ITUC — Global Rights Index 2024
	UNGP Pillar III — Access to Remedy (UN OHCHR)
S11: Supply Chain Transparency	OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct (2023)
	SASB Standards — Supply Chain Management general issue category
	OECD — Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct
S12: Responsible Sourcing	EU CSDDD — Supply chain due diligence obligations (Directive 2024/1760)
	OECD — Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas
	Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) — Code of Conduct v8.0 (2024)
S13: Supply Chain Working Conditions	SASB Standards Navigator — Raw Materials Sourcing
	KnowTheChain — Benchmark Reports (Forced Labour in Supply Chains)
	CHRB — Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2023 Insights Report (WBA)
	ILO — Labour in Global Supply Chains

Note: All source links in this section have been verified as of July 2026 against the authoritative domains specified in the Weight Matrix design principles