



BRIDGEWATER

Modern Slavery Statement

2021

Table of Contents

1. A Message from Our Executives.....	3
2. Our Commitment and Purpose of Statement	4
3. Overview of Bridgewater	6
4. Identifying Risks of Modern Slavery	10
5. Actions Taken to Address Modern Slavery Risks	21
6. Assessment of Effectiveness of Our Actions	26
7. Consultation with Our Owned and/or Controlled Entities	28
8. Approval	29
9. Disclaimers	30

Criteria	Section	Page
Identify the reporting entity	Overview of Bridgewater	6
Describe the entity’s structure, operations, and supply chains	Overview of Bridgewater	6
Describe the risks of modern slavery practices in the operations and supply chains of the reporting entity and any entities it owns or controls	Identifying Risks of Modern Slavery	10
Describe the actions taken by the reporting entity and entities it owns or controls to assess and address these risks, including due diligence and remediation processes	Actions Taken to Address Modern Slavery Risks	21
Describe how the reporting entity assesses the effectiveness of these actions	Assessment of Effectiveness of our Actions	26
Describe the process of consultation with any entities the reporting entity owns or controls	Consultation with Our Owned and/or Controlled Entities	28
Provide any other relevant information	N/A	

1. A Message from Our Executives

Our mission at Bridgewater¹ is to deeply understand markets and economies and translate that understanding into investment solutions and impactful relationships with our clients. Core to delivering on our mission is operating with a commitment to the highest standards of ethics and business conduct.

We recognize that modern slavery is an issue that affects millions of people around the world. We support the goals of the Australian Modern Slavery Act to bring about concrete action in the private sector to combat these practices.

The following statement describes our actions to identify and address the risk of modern slavery in our operations, supply chains, and investment portfolios. While this is our second iteration of the statement and we have another year of experience in this work, we continue to acknowledge the difficulty of this exercise: modern slavery is often deeply buried in supply chains and frequently occurs where oversight and accountability are limited, making these practices difficult to detect and prevent. Over the past year we have deepened our understanding of this topic, and at the same time remain humble about the depth of our current understanding. We are committed to continuously improving our processes for addressing modern slavery risk in our business over time. In this statement, we describe our key priorities for evolving our approach to risk identification, mitigation, and remediation. We look forward to the opportunity to continue reporting on our progress in future reporting periods.

Nir Bar Dea

Co-Chief Executive Officer

Mark Bertolini

Co-Chief Executive Officer

Karen Karniol-Tambour

Co-CIO for Sustainability

Carsten Stendevad

Co-CIO for Sustainability

¹ This statement is made on behalf of Bridgewater Associates, LP, the reporting entity, which we refer to as "Bridgewater," "we," "us," or "our."

2. Our Commitment and Purpose of Statement

The Australian *Modern Slavery Act 2018* (Cth) (the “Act”) defines modern slavery as including eight types of serious exploitation of people: trafficking in persons, slavery, servitude, forced marriage, forced labor, debt bondage, deceptive recruiting for labor or services, and the worst forms of child labor. An estimated 40.3 million people were victims of modern slavery in 2016,² and as of 2018, more than \$350 billion of at-risk products were imported into G20 countries annually.³ Modern slavery is a challenging and pervasive issue that requires partnership between investors, policy makers, and businesses globally to root out these practices.

This is the second statement that Bridgewater Associates, LP has prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Act. This statement covers the actions taken during the year ending December 31, 2021 and up to the date of this statement to assess and address the risk that we cause, contribute to, or are directly linked to modern slavery through our operations, supply chains, or investment portfolios. When we refer to modern slavery risks in this statement, we are referring to the risks to *people*.

2021 Priorities: Building our risk identification capabilities

During the 2021 reporting period, we assessed modern slavery risk using the same three lenses: high-risk geographies, sectors, and business practices. We also continued to prioritize the mapping of modern slavery risk in our investment portfolios, as this is the most significant area of our business in terms of both size and potential impact.

To this end, we focused significant attention on improving our risk identification capabilities for our investment portfolios, including through participation in “17 Rooms”—an initiative convened by the Center for Sustainable Development (CSD) at The Brookings Institution and The Rockefeller Foundation. As co-Chair of “Room 17,” a working group dedicated to modern slavery risk assessment, our co-CIO for Sustainability, Carsten Stendevad, worked with a group of institutional investors, modern slavery experts, NGO representatives, and ESG data providers to identify actionable priorities that could help stakeholders identify and mitigate modern slavery risks.⁴

Through our discussions, we found that even as institutional investors increasingly focus on the issue of modern slavery, the lack of reliable and comparable data remains a fundamental barrier to effective investor engagement. We therefore launched a major collaborative partnership with leading global modern slavery experts aimed at developing quality data on potential modern slavery risk hidden in company supply chains. We designed this project to transform institutional investors’ access to and use of reliable forced labor risk data. Access to such data is crucial for two reasons: (1) to allow markets to better factor forced labor risks into capital allocation and management decisions and (2) to allow regulators and standards setters to calibrate expectations on market behavior to incorporate consideration of such risks.

While some early movers are incorporating such data into decision making, the lack of systematic access to reliable, comparable information has impeded system-level gains. Following on from the 17 Rooms initiative, we have established a working group of institutional investors, industry practitioners, and forced-labor experts to build and promote a differentiated forced-labor risk estimation tool to be made available as a financial utility. Although we are still in the early stages of this work, we expect this tool to help investors—as well as other stakeholders such as companies and regulators—to better understand some of the risk factors that contribute to

² International Labour Office (ILO) and Walk Free (2017), *Global Estimates of Modern Slavery*.

³ Walk Free (2018), *Global Slavery Index 2018*.

⁴ The full concept note from “Room 17’s” modern slavery project is available on the Brookings Institution’s [website](#), as well as a [podcast](#) with our co-CIO for Sustainability, Carsten Stendevad, discussing the project.

modern slavery across context (e.g., location of a company's operations), business (e.g., purchasing practices) and people (e.g., reliance on temporary workers). This is a project that we anticipate will span many future reporting periods.

We are committed to improving our efforts to address modern slavery risk across our business in future reporting periods. In section 5 of this statement, we lay out our key priorities with respect to our operations, supply chains, and investment portfolios, as well as longer-term steps.

3. Overview of Bridgewater

Who we are and what we do

Founded in 1975, Bridgewater is a US-based, privately held asset management firm focused on delivering unique insight and partnership to the most sophisticated global institutional investors.

As of December 31, 2021, Bridgewater managed approximately \$151 billion⁵ for institutional clients globally, including public and corporate pension funds, university endowments, charitable foundations, foreign governments, central banks, family offices, fund of funds and similar third-party entities, and Union/Taft Hartley plans. Bridgewater provides discretionary investment management services to pooled investment vehicles, single investor funds, and managed account clients. Beyond managing portfolios for our clients, Bridgewater offers research insights to our clients on their most important strategic initiatives and questions. We also publish *The Bridgewater Daily Observations*, our flagship research publication.

Bridgewater as an investment manager

Bridgewater's investment strategies are designed to be highly diversified, multi-asset strategies that invest based on fundamental macro-economic considerations and only trade the largest, liquid, public financial markets. Our investment approach is driven by a tireless pursuit to understand how the world's markets and economies work. This has led us to a distinctive philosophy for managing money in all of our strategies—a fundamental, systematic and diversified investment process—described below.

- **Fundamental:** The views we take are the result of a deep, fundamental understanding of the timeless and universal cause and effect linkages that drive global economies and financial markets.
- **Systematic:** We translate our fundamental understanding into a set of explicit rules for trading markets, which allows us to stress-test our logic, form explicit expectations for the performance of our ideas and evolve and compound on our understanding through time.
- **Diversified:** We spread our risk such that no one position, group of positions, or type of risk dominates our portfolios' performance.

Our fundamental understanding has led to what we believe is a core truth about investing: there are only two sources of return: "beta" and "alpha." One can hold risky assets and earn a risk premium (beta), or one can trade markets and generate alpha, either positive or negative. Many investments are an unclear mixture of those two things, but we believe that great gains can be made in portfolio design if alpha and beta are considered and designed separately before being brought together into a total portfolio.

This belief is the foundation for our three flagship strategies:

1. Pure Alpha, our optimal alpha strategy (launched in 1991)
2. All Weather, our optimal beta strategy (launched in 1996)
3. Optimal Portfolio, which applies our best understanding of how to combine beta and alpha into a total portfolio (launched in 2015)

⁵ AUM figures are estimated as of December 31, 2021, are in US\$, and are inclusive of additions and/or withdrawals made as of the first business day of the following month.

ESG integration in our investment process

Environmental, social, and governance (“ESG”) integration into our investment process is a strategic priority for Bridgewater. Our approach to integrating modern slavery considerations into our investment portfolios is informed by our overall sustainable investing approach and is overseen by our Sustainable Investment Committee.⁶

Our approach to sustainability

Our approach to ESG issues is shaped both by who we are as an investment manager—a global macro, multi-asset investor with a fundamental, systematic, and diversified approach—and by how we partner with clients.


Our first investment goal is to build a deep understanding of how economies and markets work. Because ESG issues are important drivers of global economies and markets, we have explicitly made it a strategic priority to deeply research these issues and to integrate that research into our systematic investment process in a manner that is consistent with our systematic way of managing money. We believe our research approach is well-suited to explore the fundamental ESG-related linkages at play in the same way we study other cause-and-effect linkages in the global economy and markets.

Our second goal is to convert the understanding we have developed into high-quality solutions for our clients’ most important investment objectives. The framework we use for integrating ESG considerations into our investment portfolios depends on the portfolios’ objectives, which we describe as being either “two dimensional” or “three dimensional.”

For portfolios with traditional “two dimensional” return and risk objectives, we research ESG issues that we believe may have a material impact on financial performance and integrate that research into our broader investment research process. Alongside return and risk considerations, an increasing number of clients have added a third dimension to their investment objectives, namely impact. For these portfolios, we are partnering with clients to consider not only how ESG-related issues might affect return and risk, but also how aligned these portfolios are with environmental and social outcomes. The All Weather Sustainability strategy, launched in 2021, is our first strategy that explicitly seeks to achieve return, risk, and impact, by including only assets we assess to be aligned to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs). The UN SDGs are a broad-based set of global social and environmental goals. One of such goals (Goal 8.7) specifically pertains to modern slavery: “Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms.”

⁶ For more information on our sustainable investing governance, please see section 6.

Our Approach	ESG Integration	Sustainable Investing
Investment Goals	FINANCIAL 2-Dimensional Focus: Risk-Return	FINANCIAL + IMPACT 3-Dimensional Focus: Risk-Return-Impact



Overview of our operations and supply chains

The core input for what we do and how we generate revenue—investment management—is the people we hire. As of December 31, 2021, we had approximately 1,250 full-time employees,⁷ whom we refer to as our “direct workforce.” 98 percent of those employees are based in our US headquarters. Given the nature of our industry, a significant proportion of our employees are highly skilled professionals. The employees who make up our direct workforce generally have responsibilities that are core to providing investment management services and are complemented by our “external workforce,” which is primarily responsible for non-core support services.

We define “external workforce” to include (i) contingent workers engaged through staffing agencies to provide on- or off- site services in a staff augmentation capacity (such as administrative assistants), (ii) contingent workers engaged through vendors to provide on- or off- site services that are supervised by Bridgewater employees (such as software engineers and workers carrying out operational functions), (iii) consultants engaged through external consulting firms for a specific project or initiative (such as management consultants), and (iv) vendors that deliver people-based services, where the vendor is responsible for oversight and execution (such as food service and facilities management). We consider the last category of our external workforce to be most akin to what is commonly referred to as “outsourced labor.”

To support our investment management business, we purchased goods and services from nearly 800 direct vendors during the year ending December 31, 2021. In addition to the vendors through which we engaged our external workforce described above, we contracted with vendors to purchase a range of goods, including office equipment, supplies, IT hardware and software, and analytical products. The vast majority—94 percent—of our direct vendors were located in the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, or Australia and accounted for approximately 99 percent of our total vendor spend in 2021.⁸

⁷ This figure is inclusive of employees of Bridgewater Associates, LP and its wholly owned operating subsidiaries.

⁸ See Section 4 of this statement for details of the risk assessment of the direct vendors of Bridgewater Associates, LP and its domestic, wholly owned operating subsidiaries.

Our structure

Bridgewater is a limited partnership formed under the laws of Delaware in the United States, with a registered office located at One Glendinning Place in Westport, Connecticut. Bridgewater is registered as an investment adviser with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and as a registered commodity trading advisor and commodity pool operator with the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission. In addition, Bridgewater is registered with various foreign authorities, including the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ARBN 143 483 416).⁹

While our only line of business is institutional investment management, Bridgewater has parent entities for governance and other corporate structuring purposes. Our ultimate parent company is Bridgewater Associates Holdings, Inc., a Delaware corporation. Bridgewater also owns and/or controls certain entities, including wholly owned subsidiaries, most of which were formed to (i) hold title to various assets (primarily real estate) that are independent of our investment management business, (ii) provide services or support for our operations, or (iii) expand our investment business geographically (including through Bridgewater (China) Investment Management Co., Ltd. (BCIM), our subsidiary located in Shanghai, China).

⁹ Bridgewater Associates, LP's predecessor entity was licensed in Australia with the ASIC as an Investment Adviser and as a Futures Adviser in 1997. Bridgewater was granted exempt status by ASIC in 2004, and as of the date of this statement Bridgewater continues to be exempt from the requirement to hold an Australian financial services license.

4. Identifying Risks of Modern Slavery

We have assessed modern slavery risk in our business, including across our investment strategies.¹⁰ This risk assessment aims to identify the potential for Bridgewater to cause, contribute to, or be directly linked to modern slavery practices through our operations, supply chains, and investment portfolios. In accordance with guidance provided by the Australian Border Force, we define these terms as follows:

Cause	Risk that our operations directly result in modern slavery practices
Contribute	Risk that our operations and/or actions in our supply chains may contribute to modern slavery, including acts or omissions that facilitate or incentivize modern slavery
Directly Linked	Risk that our operations, financial products, or services may be connected to modern slavery through the activities of another entity with which we have a business relationship

First, we acknowledge the difficulty of this exercise. Modern slavery practices are often deliberately hidden, making oversight and accountability challenging. Accordingly, the availability and quality of data required for such analysis is imperfect, there is no one optimal way to assess risk and no single viewpoint can provide a complete picture of an entity's risk. Again, we are humble about the depth of our current understanding of this topic, and the findings below represent a first step in assessing our modern slavery risk rather than a definitive answer.

Drawing on guidance from a range of external sources, we used three lenses to assess risk: (1) high-risk geographies, (2) high-risk sectors, and (3) companies with high-risk business practices. Because no single indicator will paint a holistic picture, we triangulated our assessment across multiple indicators using data from different external providers.

Lenses to Identify Modern Slavery Risk¹¹

High-Risk Geographies	Countries reported to have weak rule of law, which may be due to corruption, conflict, or political instability, a poor track record on human rights protections, or inadequate protections for workers
High-Risk Sectors	Sectors in which the primary players compete on price, the workforce predominantly comprises vulnerable populations such as migrants, there is reliance on unskilled, temporary, or seasonal workers, or use of short-term contracts and outsourcing
High-Risk Business Practices	Companies that rely on outsourcing significant labor needs or have complex supply chains, indicators of substandard working conditions, or unclear public commitments to human rights

¹⁰ Our assessment includes those investments managed by Bridgewater (China) Investment Management Co., Ltd. (BCIM), a Bridgewater subsidiary located in Shanghai, China that conducts its investment management operations on a largely independent basis.

¹¹ The descriptions of these high-risk criteria were based on the RIAA Investor Toolkit, the ACSI Modern Slavery Risks, Rights and Responsibilities Guide for Companies and Investors, and the Responsible Sourcing Tool.

Our investments

We continue to focus our efforts on identifying modern slavery risk in our investment portfolios, as we believe that developing a rich understanding of our risks will help us better manage and mitigate them. Below, we describe our research approach and initial findings across each of the major asset classes we trade: equities, sovereign bonds, and commodities.

Our approach

We acknowledge that assessing modern slavery risk in investments is a challenging exercise. Further, for highly diversified portfolios like ours, with tens of thousands of individual holdings across multiple asset classes and geographies, the analytical and data challenges of assessing each entity (and its supply chains) are significant. In light of these challenges, we have applied the same principles we use to assess markets and financial risk to assess modern slavery risk. Our approach starts with deep fundamental research, which we triangulate across multiple perspectives and then rigorously systemize.

Our starting point for understanding modern slavery risk was to construct a framework to analyze the relationship between investing in assets and modern slavery outcomes for each asset class, which we triangulated with external research. We then systemized our logic so we could apply it across the individual holdings within each asset class. Since no single method of assessment can be comprehensive, we triangulated across multiple data sources and methods to arrive at an aggregate modern slavery risk assessment for each asset class.

While we have focused on building a robust approach, we acknowledge that we are still in the early stages of understanding our risk and expect that our assessment process will evolve as both our understanding and data availability improve.

Findings

Our findings are that Bridgewater's investments are not concentrated in high-risk geographies, sectors, or individual entities with high-risk business practices. However, modern slavery risk is present in our portfolios, just as it is present in other globally diversified public market investments.

Equities

The majority of our equity investments are in highly diversified equity indices that represent the largest, liquid, public markets. As a result, we may hold thousands of public companies at any point in time across many geographies and sectors. As an equity investor, investing in companies with modern slavery risk may support businesses with suboptimal practices that cause harm to people.


As described above, our current starting point for identifying modern slavery risks in companies is looking across high-risk geographies, high-risk sectors, and high-risk business practices. Practically, however, conducting a comprehensive assessment across these three dimensions is very challenging, as modern slavery risks frequently occur where oversight, accountability, and company reporting are low. For example, data on company exposures to high-risk geographies is limited, as most companies do not publish detailed breakdowns of their operations or supply chains. Likewise, documentation of high-risk business practices is often poor, especially in emerging markets where standards for sustainability disclosures are more nascent.

To address some of these challenges, as detailed in section 2 of this statement, we have launched a collaboration with leading global modern slavery experts that emerged from “Room 17” in the 2021 “17 Rooms” initiative— an initiative convened by the Center for Sustainable Development (CSD) at The Brookings Institution and The Rockefeller Foundation. In 2021, Carsten Stendevad co-chaired a group with Kristen Abrams, Senior Director of Combatting Human Trafficking at the McCain Institute, aimed at developing quality data on estimating modern slavery risks in company operations and supply chains.

Acknowledging the inadequacy of the currently available data, we have started to build out a model of modern slavery risk in our equity investments. We started with individual company business practices, assessing our equity holdings using relevant indicators from Moody’s ESG Solutions, which analyzes companies based on the extent to which they commit to respecting and promoting fundamental human rights as well as monitoring the social standards of their suppliers. Within our equity holdings, approximately 15% of our exposure was rated as having “weak” business practices.¹² A weak rating does not necessarily indicate modern slavery incidence, as companies can be given a weak rating based on limited public disclosure. However, a lack of transparency may make a company more susceptible to modern slavery risk.

We then overlaid a second level of analysis based on high-risk sectors and geographies. When we filtered our equity holdings for companies that were also in a high-risk sector—as classified by the Responsible Investment Association of Australasia (RIAA), Australian Council of Superannuation Investors (ACSI), or the Responsible Sourcing Tool—our exposure dropped to approximately 12%. Adding in companies domiciled in high-risk countries (as classified by the Walk Free initiative or the US Department of State), **we found that approximately 5% of our equity holdings were classified as high risk across all three dimensions: having “weak” business practices, being in a high-risk sector, and domiciled in a high-risk country.** These numbers are reflective of the diversification of Bridgewater’s overall equity exposures among major global equity indices, but there are differences across our investment strategies—most notably higher risk percentages in our China-focused strategies.

Below we show our overall results.



13

¹² The risk assessment figures in this statement are estimated for the 2021 reporting period based on positions we believe are representative of our portfolios overall, as well as our risk assessment data and methodology for that period, which may differ in future reporting periods.

¹³ Equity exposure represents consolidated long exposures across all Bridgewater strategies as of December 31, 2021. For short exposures, figures from left to right on chart would be: 15%, 11%, and 5%. Data on business practices is sourced from Moody’s ESG Solutions, with ~80% coverage across major global equities. Data on high-risk sectors is sourced from the RIAA, ACSI, and Responsible Sourcing Tool. Data on high-risk geographies is sourced from the Walk Free initiative and US Department of State. Please see the disclaimers in section 9 of this statement.

In line with the data limitations described above, the 5% figure above reflects only the “known risks,” or the percent of equities exposure where our data positively flags a risk, leaving (at present) “unknown risks” where we have gaps in our data.¹⁴ Through our work with the Brookings Institution, we hope to improve our understanding of both the “known risks” (e.g., by breaking down company operations by geography, rather than relying on country of domicile) and the “unknown risks” (e.g., by estimating modern slavery risk for companies who do not directly report on their business practices).

Sovereign bonds

We trade sovereign bonds in the largest liquid markets across both developed and emerging countries and implement our trades both directly and through diversified indices with multiple constituent countries. As a result, at any point in time we may hold the bonds of many sovereign nations either directly or indirectly through our index holdings.

Modern slavery is often reported in regions with ongoing conflict, political instability, poverty, corruption, or weak political institutions. Investing in the sovereign bonds of a country with reported incidents of modern slavery could mean funding a government that implicitly or explicitly allows modern slavery, but it could also mean providing funding to a government to help build the institutions for eliminating modern slavery.


To try to differentiate between cases where investing in sovereign bonds is more likely to contribute to modern slavery and cases where such investments are more likely to assist in combatting modern slavery, we assessed sovereign bonds based on each issuer’s outcomes, commitments, and actions. Outcomes provide a current perspective on risk, and actions and commitments provide a forward-looking perspective on a government’s progress toward eliminating modern slavery.

We found that the majority of our sovereign bond exposure is in countries that have a lower indication of modern slavery risk. Within the subset of countries indicated as higher risk, the majority have made commitments to eliminate modern slavery (e.g., by signing international treaties) but have taken more limited action to do so (e.g., through domestic legislation and law enforcement).

Outcomes

We used data from the Walk Free initiative’s 2018 Global Slavery Index to indicate the likelihood of modern slavery occurring within a country’s borders. The majority of our exposure is in countries with low modern slavery prevalence, consistent with other globally diversified benchmarks. We do not directly trade sovereign debt in 46 of the 50 countries indicated as having the highest prevalence in the Global Slavery Index. The four we do trade—Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, and Turkey—represented less than 2% of our total sovereign bond holdings.




¹⁴ While our data coverage is significant (~80% of our equity exposure), this coverage varies widely by geography, including larger gaps in our business practice data in emerging markets that can have higher risks of modern slavery.



Commitments

We assessed governments’ commitments to join landmark conventions and treaties on modern slavery, which signal governments’ intentions to actively reduce modern slavery risks within their borders. As shown below, the majority of our sovereign exposure is in countries that have signed and ratified several of these conventions:

- 1957 ILO Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor: signatories commit to not make use of any form of forced labor and to take effective measures to secure the immediate and complete abolition of forced labor.
- 1999 ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labor: signatories commit to take immediate and effective measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labor.
- 2000 UN Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (Slavery and Prostitution): signatories recognize the right of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the child’s development, and agree to prohibit the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.




¹⁵ Sovereign exposure represents consolidated long exposure across all Bridgewater strategies as of December 31, 2021. The figure for Bridgewater sovereign short positions is 1.8. Data on prevalence of modern slavery is sourced from the Walk Free Global Slavery Index 2018. Please see the disclaimers in section 9 of this statement.

¹⁶ The countries that have not signed one or more of these conventions are China, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, and Singapore. Sovereign exposure represents consolidated long exposure across all Bridgewater strategies as of December 31, 2021. For short exposures, percentages from left to right would be 100%, 95%, and 100%. Data on human rights conventions signatory status is sourced from Moody’s ESG Solutions. Please see the disclaimers in section 9 of this statement.

Actions:

The US Department of State's 2021 Trafficking in Persons Report classifies governments into tiers based on their perceived efforts to acknowledge and combat human trafficking. The majority of our sovereign exposure is in countries categorized as Tier 1 or Tier 2, representing countries that either have fully met the standards for combating trafficking in persons or are making "significant efforts" to do so. Within the remaining exposure to countries categorized as Tier 3 or Tier 2 Watch List, almost all was exposure to China.



Commodities

We trade a diversified mix of commodities, including precious and industrial metals, agriculture, and energy, and implement our trades primarily using futures contracts.

The production of many commodities involves vulnerable populations, and modern slavery is prevalent in certain regions where commodities are sourced. Futures exchanges still have room for improvement in their mechanisms for governing human rights standards in production. Accordingly, some of the physical commodities underlying futures contracts could be from producers or regions with higher modern slavery risk.


As an institutional investor, we do not take delivery of physical commodities. We trade financial futures, which are not tied to an individual lot of production, but rather support the function of the commodity market overall. Knowing some of the physical commodities traded on futures exchanges comes from producers or regions with modern slavery risk means we have indirect exposure to these risks through financial futures trading.

To try to understand probabilistically which commodities are most likely to be associated with modern slavery, we looked at data from Verisk Maplecroft, which aggregates evidence of modern slavery in commodity production. Because the financial futures we trade are not tied to specific producers or regions, we assessed risk based on the average evidence of modern slavery for all regions of production for each commodity. We found that modern slavery risk was mixed for the commodities we trade; some commodities had on average low evidence of modern slavery, while others had higher evidence.

Looking across commodities, we found that, on average, agricultural products tended to have a higher incidence of modern slavery, consistent with the reliance in some geographies on vulnerable populations to harvest crops, while industrial metals on average had a lower incidence.

¹⁷ Sovereign exposure represents consolidated long exposure across all Bridgewater strategies as of December 31, 2021. For short exposures, percentages from left to right would be 72%, 28%, 0%, and 0%. Data is sourced from the US Department of State. Please see the disclaimers in section 9 of this statement.

Forced Labor Alignment Score by Commodity Group



18


For each commodity however, there were geographies where production was more or less likely to be associated with modern slavery practices. For example, copper production in the United States and Australia is indicated as having limited modern slavery risk, whereas production in the Democratic Republic of Congo is associated with clear evidence of human rights violations.

In the charts below, we show an example of measuring the evidence of forced labor in the production of three commodities in which we invest (gold, copper, and wheat).

¹⁸ As of December 31, 2021. Data on forced labor alignment is sourced from Verisk Maplecroft. Please see the disclaimers in section 9 of this statement.

Evidence of Forced Labor


Breakdown by Geography for Selected Commodities



Risk Areas

PER Migrant workers recruited to work in informal gold mines are vulnerable to debt bondage, while women and girls are trafficked to gold mining towns and forced to work in brothels frequented by mine workers.

SAF There are reports of people from countries such as Zimbabwe, Malawi, and Mozambique being trafficked to South Africa to work under forced labor in informal, illegal gold excavation in abandoned mines.




Risk Areas

PER There is no direct evidence linking copper production in Peru with forced labor. However, there is substantial evidence that forced labor is involved in the production of similar commodities (e.g., gold).

CHN While no direct evidence has been identified linking copper mining in China to forced labor, there are risk factors related to the industry (e.g., low transparency) that make this an issue of high concern.

DRC The US State Department's 2020 Trafficking in Persons Report links artisanal copper mining to forced child labor in DR Congo.



Risk Areas

IND There is no direct evidence linking wheat production in India with forced labor. However, there is substantial evidence that forced labor is involved in the production of similar commodities (e.g., rice).

RUS The 2015 US Department of State Trafficking in Persons Report indicated that migrants working in Russian agriculture experienced exploitative conditions such as "withholding of identity documents, nonpayment for services rendered, physical abuse, or extremely poor living conditions."

¹⁹ As of December 31, 2021. Data on forced labor alignment is sourced from Verisk Maplecroft. Please see the disclaimers in section 9 of this statement.

Looking ahead

In 2022, we plan to continue to stay apprised of new data providers that have developed innovative approaches to mapping and measuring modern slavery risks, as well as continuing to monitor companies that have recently faced allegations of labor rights and forced labor violations.

In addition, we plan to improve our risk identification capabilities for our investment portfolios, including through participation in “17 Rooms” —an initiative convened by the Center for Sustainable Development (CSD) at The Brookings Institution and The Rockefeller Foundation, as described in section 2 of this statement. Through our discussions, we found that even as institutional investors increasingly focus on the issue of modern slavery, the lack of reliable and comparable data remains a fundamental barrier to effective investor engagement. We therefore launched a collaboration with leading global modern slavery experts aimed at developing quality data on potential modern slavery risk hidden in company supply chains. We designed this project to transform institutional investors’ access to and use of reliable forced-labor risk data.

While some early movers are incorporating such data into decision making, the lack of systematic access to reliable, comparable information has impeded system-level gains. Following on from the 17 Rooms initiative, we have established a working group of institutional investors, industry practitioners, and forced-labor experts to build and promote a differentiated forced-labor risk estimation tool to be made available as a financial utility. Although we are still in the early stages of this work, we expect this tool to help investors—as well as other stakeholders such as companies and regulators—to better understand some of the risk factors that contribute to modern slavery across context (e.g., location of a company’s operations), business (e.g., purchasing practices) and people (e.g., reliance on temporary workers). We will continue to provide updates on the progress of our work in subsequent statements.

Operations and supply chains

Our operations

As described above, our only line of business—institutional investment management—is driven by highly skilled employees who are predominantly located in the United States. Our employees are hired on an at-will basis, meaning that they are free to resign at any time, and they sign written employment agreements that clearly set out the terms of their employment.

The composition of our direct workforce, the at-will nature of their employment, the industry in which we operate, and the location of our headquarters in a low-risk jurisdiction all factor into our assessment that our direct operations have a low risk of modern slavery.

As detailed in section 3, in addition to our direct workforce, which is primarily made up of highly skilled workers with responsibilities that are core to our investment management business, our “external workforce”²⁰ provides non-core support services, which include outsourced food service and facilities management. Given that we engage these workers through our vendors, we have assessed the modern slavery risks associated with our external workforce as part of the assessment of our supply chains.

²⁰ As described above, we define “external workforce” to include (i) contingent workers engaged through staffing agencies to provide on- or off- site services in a staff augmentation capacity (such as administrative assistants), (ii) contingent workers engaged through vendors to provide on- or off- site services that are supervised by Bridgewater employees (such as software engineers and workers carrying out operational functions), (iii) consultants engaged through external consulting firms for a specific project or initiative (such as management consultants), and (iv) vendors that deliver people-based services, where the vendor is responsible for oversight and execution (such as food service and facilities management vendors). We consider the last category of our external workforce to be most akin to what is commonly referred to as “outsourced labor.”

Our supply chains

For our assessment of modern slavery risk in our supply chains in this reporting period, we evaluated the nearly 800 direct vendors from which we purchased goods and services in 2021.²¹

We began our risk assessment by identifying the subset of our direct vendors that fell into each of the high-risk categories: high-risk geographies, sectors, and business practices.²² We assessed the highest-risk vendors to be where those risks overlapped.

We acknowledge that assessing modern slavery risk is a complex exercise and remain humble about our findings. As described below, during this reporting period we focused our resources on the implementation of a Procure-to-Pay tool that facilitates the systematization of our modern slavery screening for vendors. Moving forward, we plan to leverage this tool to improve our processes for collecting, storing, and reporting on vendor data, including the results of our modern slavery diligence questions, as well as opening an additional channel for vendor communication. We consider our risk assessment findings most useful for identifying the group of direct vendors with the greatest potential risk of modern slavery. We therefore plan to focus our efforts on improving processes to identify and engage with those vendors.

Findings

None of our direct vendors were in the highest risk group (i.e., classified as high risk across all three risk categories identified above).

Our direct vendors with the greatest potential risk of modern slavery are those that fell into two high-risk categories: vendors with high-risk business practices (i.e., the vendors through which we engage our external workforce) that also operate in a high-risk sector. This group of vendors represented approximately nine percent of our total 2021 vendor spend.

We found no other meaningful overlap between the high-risk categories of our direct vendors; for example, of the vendors operating in a high-risk sector, approximately 92 percent were located in the United States or the United Kingdom, accounting for more than 99 percent of total 2021 spend on that group of vendors.

We recognize the limitations of the findings from our risk assessment. For example, the classification of our direct vendors by geography includes a mixture of data reflecting the location of vendors' operations and corporate headquarters, which may not provide a complete picture of geographical risk. This is because a subset of those vendors may employ individuals or otherwise operate in other parts of the world, which may include high-risk geographies. We also acknowledge that our risk assessment is limited to direct vendors; modern slavery risks may also exist in our vendors' supply chains, such as raw materials sourced in high-risk geographies to manufacture goods that we ultimately purchase.

We describe below our methodology and findings with respect to each high-risk category.

²¹ The findings in this section are based on our assessment of the direct vendors of Bridgewater Associates, LP and its domestic, wholly owned operating subsidiaries. As described in section 7 of this statement, we separately carried out a high-level assessment of the modern slavery risks of the operating entities that are owned and/or controlled by Bridgewater but operate on a largely independent basis and found that the risk profile of those entities is by and large consistent with the risk profile of the group as a whole. We plan to carry out a more comprehensive assessment of modern slavery risk in those entities' operations and supply chains in future reporting periods as we further develop our modern slavery risk mitigation framework.

²² Given the risks associated with third-party labor arrangements, the "high-risk business practices" lens focused on direct vendors that provide our external workforce.

Geography. To identify vendors in high-risk geographies, we mapped the locations of our direct vendors against the countries designated as (i) “Tier 2 watchlist” or “Tier 3” in the U.S. Department of State’s Trafficking in Persons Report and/or (ii) a top 50 country in the Global Slavery Index prepared by the Walk Free initiative.

Of the direct vendors from which we purchased goods and services during the year ended December 31, 2021, the vast majority—approximately 94 percent—were located in the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, or Australia (each a Tier 1 country), accounting for approximately 99 percent of our total vendor spend in 2021. **As these jurisdictions are low risk for modern slavery, we consider that a relatively low risk of modern slavery is associated with the geographical location of our direct vendors.** As we continue to expand the scope of data from vendors through our modern slavery specific diligence, including with respect to the locations of their operations and services, we expect to have greater confidence in the results of our high-risk geography analysis.

Sectors. To identify vendors in high-risk sectors, we drew on guidance from a range of external sources, including the RIAA Investor Toolkit, the ACSI Modern Slavery Risks, Rights and Responsibilities Guide for Companies and Investors, and the Responsible Sourcing Tool, to define a list of sectors associated with a higher risk of modern slavery.

We found that we have relationships with direct vendors in sectors associated with a higher risk of modern slavery, including IT manufacturing, recycling and hardware, food and other hospitality services, and facilities management. **Our exposure to high-risk sectors was concentrated in the IT manufacturing, recycling, and hardware sector, which is in line with the fact that a significant amount of technology is utilized in our systematic investment approach.** Overall, our IT manufacturing, recycling, and hardware vendors represented a small proportion of our total 2021 vendor spend—less than four percent.

Vendors in high-risk sectors will be subject to our enhanced due diligence measures in future reporting periods, the results of which will help to inform the risk profile of individual vendors in this category.

Business practices. Given the risks associated with third-party labor arrangements, the “high-risk business practices” lens focused on direct vendors that provide our external workforce.

We found that half of our 2021 vendor spend was with vendors through which we engage our external workforce. The four largest external workforce vendors (based on 2021 spend) were NYSE-listed companies based in the United States that have made their anti-slavery policies public. This data point suggests, but does not confirm, that the level of modern slavery risk associated with these vendors is relatively low. We nevertheless recognize the inherent risks of third-party labor arrangements and plan to focus our comprehensive modern slavery diligence efforts on vendors through which we engage our external workforce.

Within that subset of vendors, particular attention will be paid to those that intersect with either high-risk sectors, such as food and other hospitality services, or with high-risk geographies through the location of their workers (regardless of the location of their company headquarters).

Looking ahead

Moving forward, we plan to improve our risk identification capabilities for our operations and supply chains by:

- Partnering with third-party experts to triangulate changes to our analytical methodology;
- Expanding the scope of engagement through our modern slavery questionnaire to include existing vendors that have not yet been through the screening process; and
- Aggregating the modern-slavery specific data we have begun collecting through a new vendor platform to improve the accuracy of our risk assessment in future reporting periods.

5. Actions Taken to Address Modern Slavery Risks

We recognize that assessing our risk is only the first step in addressing the issue of modern slavery; this must be followed by action. Accordingly, we describe below the actions that we have taken thus far to address modern slavery risks in our investment portfolios, operations, and supply chains, as well as the key priorities and next steps that we have identified for future reporting periods.

Investments

Modern slavery is a complex issue and eliminating these practices will require coordinated action between many stakeholders, including policy makers, companies, investors, and consumers. As an institutional investor, our approach to engagement is to identify and take action in the forums where we believe we have the greatest potential and likelihood to shape change.

Through our risk assessment, we identified risks in each of the major asset classes in our portfolios:

1. **Equities:** the subset of companies at the intersection of all three risk lenses: high-risk sector, geography, and business practices.
2. **Sovereign bonds:** the subset of countries issuing sovereign bonds that either have a higher prevalence of modern slavery or have taken limited action to mitigate modern slavery.
3. **Commodities:** the commodities associated with a higher incidence of forced labor violations.

To help address some of these risks, we have begun to engage with individual companies we identified as higher risk and to pursue collaborative engagements aimed at shaping industry dialogue (see section 4 for a description of our work with the Brookings Institution). We are still at the beginning of our journey and expect our approach to engagement will evolve in the coming years as we build a deeper understanding of the risks in our portfolios and learn from our initial engagements, which began in 2021.

Company engagements

We believe in the value of constructive engagements between companies and investors to drive both financial and sustainability objectives, including progress on modern slavery. We have spent the last several years developing a systematic process to assess the sustainability of securities, both in terms of the sustainability of the companies' products and services and their business behavior. This capability underpins our impact-oriented strategies like All Weather Sustainability and is foundational for our ability to credibly and constructively engage with companies.

Because we generally have highly diversified equity portfolios with small ownership stakes, we have chosen to engage thematically and partner with other investors to push forward positive change across key industries. In addition, we engage in targeted discussions with companies that have recent controversies related to modern slavery and support their remediation efforts by sharing learnings from our thematic engagements. This is in line with our overall approach to stewardship and engagement, which emphasizes collaboration across multiple stakeholders. By approaching these engagements thematically, we aim to think broadly and deeply about the challenges that companies are facing, play a role in helping to shape industry standards and best practices, and be more targeted in specific conversations. **Since we initiated our corporate engagements in May 2021, our focus has been on three core themes, one of which is modern slavery.**²³

²³ Another one of our core themes focuses on ensuring that the products and services needed for a net zero emissions world are produced responsibly across both environmental and social dimensions, including modern slavery.

To help supplement and facilitate our engagements, we work with an engagement services provider—Sustainalytics—to effectively scale our engagement operations (company outreach, meeting coordination, and documentation) and align our focus areas with other investors to strengthen our collective messaging. Our work with Sustainalytics is centered on a rigorous and constructive approach to engagement, which is aimed at “encouraging companies to improve their approach to themes identified and agreed to by the parties, resulting in reduced reputational and operational risks and raising standards at the sector level.”

We take a hands-on approach to working with Sustainalytics. At the strategy level, we have shared our Sustainable Investing and ESG Policy with their leadership team and hold regular executive-level conversations regarding our philosophy, approach, and priorities. At the operational level, we also hold direct, active discussions with Sustainalytics’ engagement managers, in which we share our list of target companies (based on our systematic analysis of ESG behavior), discuss appropriate KPIs, assess the progress of existing engagements, and discuss potential areas for improvement. We have found it valuable to engage with a broad range of companies from industry leaders to laggards, both because all companies have potential to improve on an absolute basis and because it gives us valuable insights into relative strengths and weaknesses. All members of our Sustainable Investing team (including our co-CIOs for Sustainability and Head of Sustainability Research) actively participate in the dialogues with companies. We have met with a range of company representatives from board members, CEOs, company secretaries, and C-suite executives to investor-relations and sustainability executives.

On the modern slavery theme, we have worked closely with Sustainalytics both in terms of the identification of relevant sectors, geographies, and companies to target, and in terms of scoping the key objectives of these engagements. Our engagements to date have focused on apparel and construction, which are sectors with a demonstrated risk of forced labor. Our objectives in these engagements have aimed to, among other aspects:

- Strengthen strategic human rights integration at the senior leadership level
- Ensure focus is afforded to responsible purchasing practices, including throughout the supply chain
- Seek progress on payment of a living wage for all workers
- Improve the robustness of relevant grievance mechanisms and remediation

For example, we participated in the first global investor call focused exclusively on ESG for a solar energy company in a high-risk geography. During the call, we probed the company on the sustainability of its operations and supply chain. Although the company still had nascent ESG practices and audit capabilities, they were receptive to engagement and investor input. The engagement added valuable data points for our assessment of their operational practices, and we will continue to monitor their progress in subsequent investor calls.

Looking ahead, we expect many such conversations to shift from learning about companies’ existing modern slavery governance mechanisms—which has been the focus of most of our engagements to date—to sharing our takeaways on industry best practices and supporting targeted action to identify and mitigate modern slavery risks. On this front, we have been encouraging Sustainalytics (via bilateral sessions with their engagement managers) to think more about leading indicators of modern slavery risk, which we believe would help companies better understand the risks “hidden” in their supply chains that do not show up in their internal audits. We also expect to incorporate some of these learnings into our own risk assessment process, as we improve our understanding of risky sectors and business practices.

Additionally, our co-CIO for Sustainability, Carsten Stendevad, has played an important role in helping to shape the development of a new thematic engagement focusing on human rights risks across the ICT manufacturing supply chain, which covers modern slavery as well as related risks such as living wages and fair remuneration. Carsten participated in a kick-off panel with Sustainalytics to help garner collective support and has been closely involved with shaping the objectives of this theme, developing KPIs, and providing input on the target companies to engage. With the launch of the theme in 2022, we expect to broaden our engagement efforts across new companies and issues relating to modern slavery.

Operations and Supply Chains

Our operations

Bridgewater has a robust framework of internal policies and processes that were designed to ensure that any ethical concerns are reported, investigated, and appropriately addressed.

Bridgewater employees are encouraged to be deeply compliance conscious. Our unique culture is built upon the principles of transparency, problem identification, and constant improvement. Employees do not simply have the “right” to speak up, they have a responsibility to do so. We encourage employees to report discrimination, harassment, or retaliation immediately and prohibit retaliation against any individual who, in good faith, reports discrimination or harassment or participates in an investigation. More broadly, our policies prohibit behavior that would violate the law, including laws related to unfair labor practices, and require employees to report, among other things, actual or perceived violations of law or Bridgewater policies and procedures by employees, consultants, or service providers. Importantly, Bridgewater enables people to raise issues through a variety of channels—including an employee’s management chain, our Employee Relations group, our Legal and Regulatory group, or Bridgewater’s anonymous reporting hotline. In our view, the most important thing is not *how* someone raises an issue, but that the process is clear and enables people to speak up.

We review our policies throughout the year to make any changes that may be necessary to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal law, and to ensure that the policies align with our principles and values. We also conduct a formal annual review of certain policies, including our code of ethics and employee handbook.

Bridgewater employees are required to review our corporate policies, including policies concerning the fair treatment of employees on at least an annual basis and to certify their compliance. In this reporting period, Bridgewater engaged experts and provided our first annual modern slavery awareness training to employees working directly on modern slavery initiatives, as well as a broader group of employees across the firm, including from our human resources, technology, operations, corporate engagement, legal and sustainable investing teams. As part of their assessment of Bridgewater’s modern slavery risk mitigation framework, those teams consider, on an ongoing basis, whether changes or additions to our existing set of company policies and processes are appropriate.

Our supply chains

Our standards for excellence apply to our vendors as well as our employees; we expect our vendors to operate ethically and in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, as provided in our master service agreements. Our agreements with vendors require compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and orders of any governmental, judicial, or administrative authority, including anti-bribery and anti-corruption laws, export control laws, and all laws regarding anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and equal employment opportunity in hiring and employment practice. In 2021, our master service agreement for vendors also began specifically requiring compliance with anti-slavery and human trafficking laws. Since February 2021, all new vendors that have been presented with the revised agreement have agreed to its expanded scope.

Bridgewater has long maintained a due diligence program designed to identify risks associated with our third-party vendors. This review process is carried out by a dedicated team of security, legal, and procurement professionals who use systematized processes to understand and address the risks posed by vendors. Depending on the nature of the engagement, review components may include questionnaires, open-source information searches, independent company assessments, and litigation and sanctions screening, among others.

In 2020, we began explicitly screening for risks of modern slavery and human trafficking. Our aim was twofold: minimize the risk of engaging vendors that cause, contribute to, or are directly linked to modern slavery practices, and communicate, at the outset of our vendor relationships, that combating modern slavery is important to Bridgewater. Specifically, we modified the questionnaire used to screen potential new vendors to identify (i) if the company has any policies, procedures, or statements regarding anti-modern slavery practices and (ii) if there have been any concerns, reports, or investigations of modern slavery risks or incidents relating to the business or its suppliers. At the end of 2020, we expanded from screening a subset of potential new vendors to screening all potential new vendors for modern slavery risks and have found a willingness among vendors to comply with this additional screening process.

In April 2022, we implemented a Procure-to-Pay tool that facilitates the systematization of our modern slavery screening for vendors. This tool is designed to seamlessly enable the collection, storage, and reporting on vendor data, including the results of our modern slavery diligence questions. Any potential new vendor is required to respond to our modern slavery diligence questions in order to complete the onboarding process; the automation of this process eliminates the possibility of a vendor being onboarded without having completed the modern slavery screening.

Remediation

With respect to our operations, all reports of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation are promptly and thoroughly investigated. If appropriate, immediate corrective action is taken. In the event that our supplier onboarding process and/or due diligence process identifies a potential or existing vendor suspected of engaging in modern slavery practices, our dedicated team of security, legal, and procurement professionals would investigate, engage with the vendor as needed, notify key stakeholders, and determine the appropriate remedial measures. Such measures may include deciding against entering into an agreement with the vendor, working with the vendor to address the identified risks, or terminating an existing agreement. In the event that an actual or potential incident of modern slavery in our operations or supply chains is reported through Bridgewater's anonymous tips program, the Chief Compliance Officer would be notified, triggering an investigation of the incident. In either case, remedial measures may be triangulated with outside counsel and other third-party advisors prior to implementation. As of the date of this report, Bridgewater has begun working with external counsel to design a formal remediation policy for modern slavery incidents as a part of a broader project to develop a comprehensive Vendor Code of Conduct.

Looking ahead

A cross-disciplinary group of professionals from our security, legal, procurement, technology, and finance departments has evaluated the progress made against our initial goals for improving the ways in which we systematically identify, mitigate, and address modern slavery risk in our supply chains. This group has identified the following next steps for future reporting periods:

Expanded Scope		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Expanding the modern slavery specific screening process to include existing vendors that have not yet been through the screening process, beginning with vendors that meet high-risk criteria and have contracts that are subject to renewal or extension
Vendor Code of Conduct		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Developing a comprehensive Vendor Code of Conduct to outline the standards that we expect our vendors to adhere to, including on modern slavery issues▪ Targeting engagement, particularly with high-risk vendors, by clearly communicating expectations for our vendors' anti-slavery measures▪ Establishing, as part of the Vendor Code of Conduct, a formal remediation policy for modern slavery incidents
Training		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Increasing the number of employees who have completed training on modern slavery

6. Assessment of Effectiveness of Our Actions

In line with the requirements of the Act, on an annual basis, our modern slavery working groups covering our operations, supply chains, and investment portfolios will provide reporting and transparency to the senior leaders who comprise our principal governing body. This reporting will include the progress of our modern slavery initiatives, an assessment of the effectiveness of measures to date, and suggested actions moving forward.

To provide this reporting, our modern slavery working groups will collaborate to track our commitments described above in section 5 and evaluate our effectiveness in assessing and addressing modern slavery risks in our operations, supply chains, and investment portfolios.

Investment portfolios

As with our broader ESG integration approach, our Sustainable Investing Committee is responsible for ensuring processes are in place for assessing the effectiveness of our actions to assess and address modern slavery risks in our investment portfolios. This committee includes our Co-CIOs for Sustainability, Karen Karniol-Tambour and Carsten Stendevad, and our Head of Sustainability Research, Daniel Hochman, and is supported by a full-time, dedicated research staff. More broadly, Bridgewater's Investment Committee is responsible for all aspects of the firm's investment research process, and Karniol-Tambour is also a member of Bridgewater's Investment Committee, ensuring visibility at the top of the firm.

We assess the effectiveness of our approach across both risk identification and mitigation.

For risk identification, we will continue to triangulate our methodology and capabilities with industry best practices both by working with experts in the field and by canvassing the internal and external data landscapes for potential risk indicators that we may be missing.

For risk mitigation via engagement, we set objectives at the outset of each engagement and monitor our progress relative to those expectations. Our assessment of the effectiveness of our engagements takes into account quantitative measures, such as the number of entities we have engaged with, and qualitative measures, such as the extent to which entities evolve their practices. In particular, after each engagement, we integrate learnings from the dialogue into our systematic assessment—seeking to answer three questions in particular: 1) Has the company made quantifiable progress, 2) Did we learn anything from the dialogue that would change our internal assessment of the company (for better or worse), and 3) Did the company respond constructively to our engagement.

Operations and supply chains

Responsibility for non-investment risk at Bridgewater, such as modern slavery risks in our operations and supply chains, sits with our co-Chief Executive Officers (Nir Bar Dea and Mark Bertolini), with support from our corporate social responsibility function, Chief Administrative Officer (Richard Falkenrath), and the principal governing body, which includes a broader group of key senior leaders.

Our assessment of the effectiveness of our modern slavery initiatives takes into account quantitative measures, such as the number of employees who have participated in modern slavery awareness training, as well as qualitative measures, such as the quality of engagement with our vendors on issues of modern slavery and feedback from third-party experts. As our approach to modern slavery matures and we further develop the data collection capabilities of our new Procure-to-Pay tool, we plan to define additional performance measures to better monitor and evaluate the impact and effectiveness of our initiatives.

In line with our principles of transparency, problem identification, and constant improvement, our modern slavery working group covering our operations and supply chains is empowered to modify the design of our modern slavery risk framework and risk assessment methodology in order maximize impact and effectiveness. In addition, the group may reassess its membership—which currently consists of professionals from our security, legal, procurement, technology, and finance departments—as additional stakeholders and representatives from across Bridgewater and its owned and controlled entities are engaged.

7. Consultation with Our Owned and/or Controlled Entities

Our owned and/or controlled entities fall into three categories: (i) entities that are subject to our key company policies and procedures, including those relevant to modern slavery, (ii) entities that have no employees or operations to assess for modern slavery risk (such as our wholly owned subsidiaries formed to hold title to various assets (primarily real estate) independent of our investment management business), and (iii) entities that operate their business on a largely independent basis. The vast majority of our owned and/or controlled entities fall into categories (i) and (ii).

We have consulted with each operating entity that is owned and/or controlled by Bridgewater and engaged with these entities on the preparation of this statement. With respect to the entities that operate on a largely independent basis, including our subsidiary located in Shanghai, China (Bridgewater (China) Investment Management Co., Ltd. (BCIM))²⁴, we carried out a high-level modern slavery risk assessment and found that the risks were broadly in line with the corporate group as a whole, as reported in this statement.

We have also continued collaborating with stakeholders from those entities to develop appropriate policies and procedures for those entities as part of our broader modern slavery risk mitigation framework.

²⁴ As described in section 4 of this statement, our findings with respect to each of the major asset classes we trade (equities, sovereign bonds, and commodities) were based on the consolidated long exposure across all Bridgewater strategies, including those managed by BCIM, as of December 31, 2021.

8. Approval

As a Delaware limited partnership, the reporting entity, Bridgewater Associates, LP, is not required to have a board of directors. The body properly considered the principal governing body of the reporting entity comprises a group of key senior leaders, which includes our Co-Chief Executive Officers, Chief Legal Officer, two Co-Chief Investment Officers and one of our Co-CIOs for Sustainability. This body is responsible for setting the overall strategic direction of the reporting entity, as well as overseeing the implementation of its modern slavery risk mitigation framework.

This statement has been approved by the principal governing body of Bridgewater Associates, LP on behalf of Bridgewater and all entities it owns and/or controls.

Signed:

Nir Bar Dea

Name: Nir Bar Dea

Title: Co-Chief Executive Officer, Member of Principal Governing Body

Date: June 29, 2022

9. Disclaimers

The purpose of this statement is to provide general information only. Information included in this statement is current only as of the date of this statement, unless otherwise indicated. This statement has been prepared solely for informational purposes and is not a recommendation to enter into any trading strategy or an offer to buy or sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy or sell any security or to participate in any trading strategy.