

Company Name BAIC Motor
Industry Automobiles
Overall Score (*) 4.5 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.2	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.0	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.1	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
0.9	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.3	10	F. Transparency

(*) While other sectors are being measured against a reduced set of CHRB Core UNGP Indicators this year the Automotive Manufacturing sector is being measured against the full CHRB Methodology as it is the first year that the sector has been analysed.

Please note that any small differences between the Overall Score and the added total of Measurement Theme scores are due to rounding the numbers at different stages of the score calculation process.

Please note also 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

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: General HRs commitment: The Company indicates: '(The Company) has safeguarded the legitimate rights and interests of employees, and built harmonious labor relations' and 'The Group adheres to the people-oriented philosophy and firmly protects the legitimate rights and interests of employees. [...] We strive to build an equal workplace environment to ensure that employees' rights and interests are not infringed'. However, no evidence found of a publicly available statement of policy committing it to explicitly respect human rights. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 Not met: UDHR Not met: International Bill of Rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: ILO Core: The Company indicates: 'The Group has strictly complied with the Labor Law of the People's Republic of China, the Labor Contract Law of the

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	human rights of workers		<p>People’s Republic of China, the Provisions on the Prohibition of Using Child Labor’ and ‘It has prevented child and forced labour, in strict compliance with the requirements of labour standards’. It also states: ‘It has adhered to the principle of equal employment, eradicating any discrimination, and strived to create an atmosphere of diversified employment’. However, no evidence of formal commitment to the ILO Declaration found, or all ILO core areas including respecting freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for MO suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states that 'we continue to optimize our talent structure and attach great importance to cultivation and ability advancement of employees, to care about their safety and health, and to commit itself to building a fairly treated, positive and harmonious team of employees.' Furthermore, in its "Creating a safe and healthy environment", BAIC indicates that 'BAIC Motor adheres to the guidelines of “Safety First, Prevention Primary and Comprehensive Governance”, enhances the construction of safety system continuously, and develops safety training in all aspects through complying with requirements of laws and regulations including PRC Production Safety Law and Prevention and Control of Occupational Diseases Law, in order to ensure the sustainable and efficient operation of safety management system with characteristics of BAIC Motor and avoid the occurrence of various accidents.' Following that statement, the Company demonstrates the actions taken to achieve a safe work environment, dividing those actions in three macro areas, which are: 'Completing safety system and safety management system certification, Organizing safety training and Paying attention to physical and mental health of employees'. [2017 ESG Report, 24/07/2018: baicmotor.com] • Not met: H&S applies to MO suppliers • Not met: Working hours for workers: The Company states that ' Meanwhile, the Group protects recruitment, promotion, removal, working hours, holiday and other interests of employees specified by laws and company policies and continuously improves the remuneration and welfare system.' Furthermore, 'While safeguarding the remuneration welfare, working hours, democratic communication and other basic rights of employees, the Group organizes and develops activities out of the actual needs of employees, solves living concerns for employees, offers soil for strugglers and keeps on enhancing the enterprise’s attraction and cohesion and the employees’ happiness and sense of belonging.' However, no evidence of a formal commitment regarding working hours as established on the ILO conventions was found. • Not met: Working hours for MO suppliers
A.1.3.MO.a	Commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals	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"> • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing in conflict areas • Not met: Based on OECD Guidance • Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers • Not met: Requires suppliers to follow the OECD Guidance <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals • Not met: Suppliers expected to make similar requirements of their suppliers
A.1.3.MO.b	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (ICT)	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"> • Not met: Women's Rights • Not met: Children's Rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	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"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company indicates that 'The Group has actively undertaken its social responsibility, continuously strengthened

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			communication with stakeholders, actively responded to the stakeholders' appeals, and continuously enhanced its sustainable development capability.' However, no specific commitment regarding stakeholder engagement was found. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with MO suppliers to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects MO suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEO or Board approves policy: The Company states that the Board of Directors is responsible for formulating the basic management system of the Company; implementing, reviewing and improving the corporate governance system and condition of the Company and formulating, reviewing and supervising the code of conduct and relevant compliance manual of employees and directors. However, it is not clear if the Company's code of conduct defines human rights policies. [Articles of Association, 28/04/2019: baicmotor.com] • Not met: Board level oversight for HRs: The Company states that one of the Strategy Committee's duties is to 'review and make suggestions for the medium-to-long-term development strategies (including overall-strategies, human resources strategies and operation strategies) and development plans and proposals of the Company, and to evaluate and monitor the implementation of such plans'. However, it is not clear if those strategies englobe human rights. [Terms of Reference of Strategy Committee of the Board, 22/12/2015: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key MO HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence (25% of Total)

B.1 Embedding Respect for Human Rights in Company Culture and Management Systems (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for MO in supply chain

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key MO HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The Company discloses its analysis of material issues. In the table presented, BAIC includes Protection of rights and interests of employees; Care for employees and Employee health and safety. However, no evidence found that general human rights issues are considered part of the enterprise risk system. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: BAIC states that 'The Company conducts business activities in conformity with the laws and regulations including the Company Law of the People's Republic of China, the Law of Countering Unfair Competition of the People's Republic of China and the Interim Provisions Forbidding Commercial Briberies, as well as the basic code of ethics. We guided the Group's compliance behaviors by formulating and improving the internal systems and regulations including the Compliance Management Measures, the Compliance Whistle-Blowing Management Measures and the corporate code of commercial conducts.' However, it is not clear whether the code of ethics or the code of commercial conducts approach human rights aspects, nor how these policies are communicated to all employees. No evidence found on latest reports. [2017 ESG Report, 24/07/2018: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers • Not met: Communicating policy down the whole MO supply chain • Not met: Requiring MO suppliers to communicate policy down the chain Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on MO suppliers
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company indicates hours of employee training and includes diverse training in its Stakeholder Communication table. Moreover, it states that 'All subsidiaries carried out training in basic safety knowledge in consideration of labor protection, occupational health and safety, first aid, traffic safety, and safety accident prevention, with 100% of employees trained'. However, no evidence found on specific human rights training for all its employees beyond safety. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant MO managers including procurement
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Not met: Monitoring MO suppliers: The Company indicates: 'The Group has improved the Detailed Rules of BAIC Motor on Performance Evaluation of Suppliers and the Measures of BAIC Motor for Management of Supplier Assessment, to strengthen the application of evaluation results and form a closed loop for the entire supplier management' and 'The Group has comprehensively promoted the construction of a responsible supply chain and incorporated environmental and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			social risks into its supplier management system'. However, it is not clear how it actually monitors suppliers, including human rights. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of MO supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects MO selection of suppliers: On its Life-cycle Management of Suppliers, under the Admission part, the Company indicates: 'The Group has further optimized the Measures of BAIC Motor for Management of Supplier Admission, further strengthening supplier risk assessment prior to admission, and adding detailed rules on the assessment of suppliers of "embedded software" components to make the supplier admission mechanism more objective and comprehensive'. However, no evidence found of human rights aspects impacts being considered in supplier selection. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR affects on-going MO supplier relationships • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with MO suppliers to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems: In its 'Stakeholder Communication' section, the Company discloses all its stakeholders, the Communication Mechanism, Stakeholders' Appeals and Response of the Group . However, no explanation was found regarding the process of how stakeholders are identified and selected to engage on human rights during the last two years. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Workers in MO SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the MO SC engaged Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

B.2 Human Rights Due Diligence (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying 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"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company states that the Audit Committee is responsible for discussing 'the design, implementation and monitoring of the risk management and internal control system with the management as to financial, operational and compliance monitoring and other material matters so as to ensure the management has performed its duty to establish effective systems.' However, no evidence regarding the description of the process of identifying human rights risks was found. [Terms of Reference of Audit Committee of the Board, 22/12/2015: baicmotor.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in MO suppliers: BAIC states that 'The Group has comprehensively promoted the construction of a responsible supply chain and incorporated environmental and social risks into its supplier management system. We have formulated and implemented the Measures for Management and Control of Green Supply Chain of BAIC Motor'. However, no evidence found regarding how human rights risks and impacts in supply chain were identified. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company presents a graphic containing its analysis of material issues. However, no evidence regarding salient human rights risks was found. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	(salient risks and key industry risks)		Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
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 • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in MO supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
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 • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
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 • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company needs to achieve at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2 • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including MO suppliers: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2/B.2.3/B.2.4 and at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 Score 2 • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company discloses in its ESG Report a table containing all stakeholders and communication mechanisms. The Company also states: 'There are many reporting channels, such as complaint mailbox, tip-off hotline, complaint box, visit via letter, telephone number and mailbox of discipline inspection commission leaders, etc'. However, it is not clear that this includes a channel where employees are able to raise complaints, including human rights, as they seem to cover specific topics related to investors, accounting. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect MO supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to MO supplier workers
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 • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company indicates that it has established 'external whistle-blowing platforms, such as discipline inspection whistle-blowing hotline, letters and visits, leader's mailbox of the Company etc.' in order to improve its anti-corruption prevention and supervision system. However, it is not clear if this mechanism may be used to address human rights issues and whether it is available to external stakeholders. On its 2019 ESG Report it indicates: 'During the investigation and handling of reported cases, the Interim Measures of BAIC Motor Corporation Limited on Real-name Whistle-blowing and other relevant regulations will be strictly implemented to protect the rights, interests and safety

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			of whistleblowers'. No further evidence found on latest reports. [2017 ESG Report, 24/07/2018: baicmotor.com & 2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects MO supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: MO supplier communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Example of how they do this Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: MO suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed • Not met: Who is handling the complaint Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects MO suppliers to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
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"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (20% of Total)

D.5 Automotive Manufacturing

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.1.a	Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe: The Company discloses its 'employee benefits': Wages and salaries, Pension scheme and other social security costs ,Welfare, medical and other expenses. Housing benefits However, no evidence about setting a living wage was found. [2019 Annual Report, 21/04/2020: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how living wage determined
D.5.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.5.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with 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"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.5.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	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"> • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to product source: The Company states that ' In 2017, the Group had totally 328 long-term and fixed cooperative suppliers, and the suppliers performing relevant practices accounted for 92.4% of the total number of suppliers.' Moreover, on its 2019 ESG Report the Company discloses the number of suppliers per region in China. However, no further details found on whether it maps suppliers, including indirect suppliers. [2017 ESG Report, 24/07/2018: baicmotor.com & 2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why: Although the Company indicates the percentage of suppliers performing relevant practices, it does not define the meaning of relevant practices, nor discloses the names and addresses of those suppliers. No further details found in latest reports. [2017 ESG Report, 24/07/2018: baicmotor.com]
D.5.4.a	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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"> • Met: Does not use child labour: BAIC states that the Company has 'regulated the recruitment processes and standards to guarantee their equality, impartiality and openness, and prevent the occurrence of discrimination and use of child or forced labour'. [2017 ESG Report, 24/07/2018: baicmotor.com] • Not met: Age verification of job applicants and workers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remediation if children identified
D.5.4.b	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	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"> • Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.5.5.a	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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"> • Not met: Pays workers in full and on time • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.5.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	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"> • Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.5.c	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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"> • Not met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How sure about agencies or brokers

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.5.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosure: The Company discloses: 'The lost days due to work injury was 268 days. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: On its 2019 ESG Report, the Company indicates the number and rate of work-related fatalities [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Set targets for H&S performance • Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.5.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements • Not met: Injury rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosures Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.8.a	Women's rights (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Process to stop harassment and violence • Not met: Working conditions take account of gender • Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Meets all of the requirements under score 1
D.5.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.9.a	Working hours (in own production or manufacturing operations)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations: The Company indicates that ' We have continuously improved the salary and benefit system, carried out production and business activities according to the working hours specified by law, and provided sound social security for employees [...] The Group has formulated and implemented the Measures of BAIC Motor for Attendance and Vacation Management, adopting the 8-hour standard working hour system in general. For special posts, the Group has applied for a comprehensive working hour system in accordance with laws and regulations'. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: www1.hkexnews.hk]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Not met: How it implements and checks this
D.5.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Working hours in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.10.a	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Arrangements with Suppliers and Smelters/Refiners in the Mineral Resource Supply Chains	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Due diligence in accordance with OECD Guidance in supplier contracts • Not met: Works with smelters/refiners and suppliers to build capacity Score 2 • Not met: Contractual requirement to disclosure smelter/refiner information • Not met: Contractual requirement covers all minerals
D.5.10.b	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Identification in Mineral Supply Chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance • Not met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD Guidance Score 2 • Not met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD Guidance • Not met: Risk identification and disclosure covers all minerals
D.5.10.c	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Management in the Mineral Supply Chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain • Not met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time Score 2 • Not met: Disclose better risk prevention/mitigation over time • Not met: Suppliers and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy • Not met: Risk management and response processes cover all minerals
D.5.11	Responsible Materials Sourcing	[SD.5.10]	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Due diligence for raw materials in supplier code/contracts • Not met: Works with suppliers to build capacity in risk assessment and due diligence Score 2 • Not met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not met: Identify the sources of high-risk raw materials in its supply chain

E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (20% of Total)

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, and so the score of 3.56 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 0.89 out of 20 points for theme E.

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	0.27 out of 4	Out of a total of 60 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, BAIC Motor made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 4 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.27 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 • Met: Company reports on GRI: The Company states that 'This Report is compiled in accordance with the Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Reporting Guide issued by the Hong Kong Exchanges and Clearing Limited (HKEX or the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong), the Sustainability Reporting Guidelines issued by the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and other standards.' Moreover, it discloses the Index to GRI Indicators within the report. [2017 ESG Report, 24/07/2018: baicmotor.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	<p>BAIC Motor met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator.</p> <p>Specificity and use of concrete examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) <p>Discussing challenges openly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned <p>Demonstrating a forward focus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 1 for D.5.1.a: Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations) • Not met: Score 2 for D.5.7.a: Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)

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