

**Company Name** ANTA Sports Products  
**Industry** Apparel (Supply Chain and Own Operations)  
**UNGP Core Score (\*)** 2.5 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
<b>Governance and Policy Commitments</b>		
0	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
0.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
1	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
<b>Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</b>		
Embedding respect		
0	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
0	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
<b>Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</b>		
1	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
0	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
0	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
<b>2.5</b>	<b>26</b>	

(\*) Instead of the full list of indicators in the 2020 CHRB Methodology, this year's assessment uses the CHRB Core UNGP Indicators. These are 13 non-industry specific indicators that focus on three key areas of the UNGPs: high level commitments, human rights due diligence and access to remedy.

The 13 indicators selected from the full CHRB Methodology are scored on a simple unweighted basis, with a maximum of 2 points for each indicator for a maximum total of 26 points.

In addition, allegations of severe human rights impacts (Measurement Theme E) were also assessed but do not impact overall final scores

Please note that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2020 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

## Detailed assessment

### Governance and Policies

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: General HRs commitment: The Company describes that human rights is the most relevant key issue for its stakeholders. However, the Company does not explicitly disclose about a commitment related to human rights. Also, the Company discloses in its ESG Report 2019 that 'In terms of compliance, we ensure the business operation are aligned with the regulatory requirements, including the "Labor Law of the People's Republic of China" and "Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China" and so on. We respect human rights and prohibit child labor or forced labor in our companies' and partners' operation. We follow the principle of meritocracy, voluntariness, equality, honesty and credibility'. However, no formal statement of policy commitment to respect human rights found. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: <a href="#">files.services</a> &amp; Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: UNGC principles 1 &amp; 2: The Company has statement about Sustainable Development Goals but we were not able to find evidence as to whether the company has a commitment to UN Global Compact. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: <a href="#">files.services</a> &amp; Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: UDHR</li> <li>• Not met: International Bill of Rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: UNGPs</li> <li>• Not met: OECD</li> </ul>
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: ILO Core: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company states: 'we ensure the business operation are aligned with the regulatory requirements, including the "Labor Law of the People's Republic of China" and "Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China" and so on. We respect human rights and prohibit child labor or forced labor in our companies' and partners' operation.' However, there is no reference to ILO Conventions. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a> &amp; Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: UNGC principles 3-6</li> <li>• Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for AP suppliers: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company states: 'we have established strict codes and requirements for the suppliers in terms of environment, society and work'. In which the Company established 10 basic principles.' These principles include: Child Labor, Forced Labor, Non discrimination, Health and Safety and Working hours; however it does not comply all requirement to met this indicator: 1. There is no commitment to respect human rights according to ILO Conventions; 2. Child Labor Principle refers only to local minimum working age; 3. There is no mention to freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a> &amp; Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: See above</li> <li>• Met: Respect H&amp;S of workers: The Company discloses that 'value the health and safety of our staff and we strive for a safe and comfortable working environment'. In addition, 'formulated a series of policies based on actual operation condition, to protect our staff from different departments and ensure their occupational health and safety'. Also, 'Provide health and safety training and assessment for staff to ensure that they fully understand how to operate the machines and handle the</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>materials properly, so as to avoid injury due to improper operation'. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: H&amp;S applies to AP suppliers: Although the Company states that provides mechanisms to respect the health and safety of its workers, there is no evidence that these methods also applies to its suppliers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: working hours for workers: The Company mentions that 'we value the physical and mental health of our staff and we incline not to have our staff to remain in an anxious working state for a long time, so we do not encourage working overtime. In order to maintain the stability of manufacturing, we hire temporary staff. At the same time, we also introduce automation technology to reduce the reliance of human resources and simplify the manufacturing process for the requirement of handicraft, enabling us to cope with the increasing orders.'. However, there is no description about what are the maximum working hours for workers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Working hours for AP suppliers: See above. In addition, Working hour principles refer to 'Salary and working records must be provided' and 'establish working hours and payroll management system'. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company discloses that 'We believe stakeholders' views can help improve our policies and serve as a reference for the Group's sustainable development strategies. In order to ensure quality communication, we continued to invite professional third party as consulting company to collect stakeholders' opinions and gain a better understanding and evaluation on the potential risks. As usual, we continue to maintain two-way communication with both internal and external stakeholders. We collected their views to improve our current measures and provide some basis for the management to formulate cooperating policies'. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design</li> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement</li> </ul>
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to remedy</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies</li> <li>• Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives</li> <li>• Not met: Work with AP suppliers to remedy impacts</li> </ul>

## Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2</li> <li>• Not met: Senior responsibility for HR</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility</li> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AP in supply chain</li> </ul>
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in own operations</li> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in AP suppliers</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Ongoing global risk identification</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with HR experts</li> <li>• Not met: Triggered by new circumstances</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context)</li> <li>• Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks</li> <li>• Not met: Including in AP supply chain</li> <li>• Not met: Example of Actions decided</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: System to check if Actions are effective</li> <li>• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans</li> <li>• Not met: Including AP suppliers</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns</li> <li>• Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications</li> </ul>

## Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Channel accessible to all workers: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In terms of reporting channels, we have established multiple channels for communication as usual. Employees can make an anonymous report to the audit department'. The Company provide its hotline number in which workers can make complaints. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company discloses number of complaints made by consumers. However, there is no description about human rights complaints received through its hotline mechanism. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages</li> <li>• Not met: Expect AP supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates that 'have developed a more comprehensive audit requirement based on social enterprise responsibilities of the supplier'. Their responsibilities are stated in ten principles. One of these principles is: 'Complaint mechanism and communication channels'. Which describes that suppliers must 'Establish an effective complaint mechanism and communication channels' and 'Protect the whistleblower and ensure staff who made complaints would not be retaliated'. No evidence found, however, if suppliers are required to convey the same expectations to their suppliers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Opens own system to AP supplier workers</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Grievance mechanism for community</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages</li> <li>Not met: Expects AP supplier to have community grievance systems: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates that 'have developed a more comprehensive audit requirement based on social enterprise responsibilities of the supplier'. Their responsibilities are stated in ten principles. One of these principles is: 'Complaint mechanism and communication channels'. Which describes that suppliers must 'Establish an effective complaint mechanism and communication channels' and 'Protect the whistleblower and ensure staff who made complaints would not be retaliated'. However, there is no further information about this complaint mechanism, including whether channel is open to communities or other external stakeholders. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report 2019, 2020: <a href="#">files.services</a>]</li> <li>Not met: AP supplier communities use global system</li> </ul>
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided</li> <li>Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition</li> <li>Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts</li> <li>Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</li> </ul>

## Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (Not included in the overall score)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found.

### Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2020 Key Findings report and the 2019 technical annex for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice.

The CHRB is part of the World Benchmarking Alliance ('WBA'). The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of WBA, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and

construed in accordance with Dutch law and shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of Amsterdam.

As WBA, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

#### COPYRIGHT

Our publications and benchmarks are the product of the World Benchmarking Alliance. Our work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit [creativecommons.org](https://creativecommons.org)