

Company Name Cisco
Industry ICT (Supply Chain only)
UNGP Core Score (*) 15.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
2	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
1	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
2	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0.5	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
2	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
1	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
0.5	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1.5	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
2	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
1	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
15.0	26	

(*) 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	2	<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: General HRs commitment: The company indicates that 'Cisco's Human Rights policy formalizes our long-standing commitment to uphold and respect human rights for all people'. [2020 Global Human Rights Policy, 13/05/20: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: UNGPs: Cisco's approach to human rights is 'anchored to the approach set forth in the UN Guiding Principles. Many leading companies with global operations, including Cisco, have committed to adhering to the UN Guiding Principles which include the development of a human rights policy, a framework to assess and mitigate known risks, and mechanisms to report and remedy grievances where they occur. Cisco is fully committed to this approach'. [2020 Global Human Rights Policy, 13/05/20: cisco.com]
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"> Met: ILO Core: The Company indicates that it 'upholds and respects human rights as contained in (...) the eight Core Labor Conventions developed by the International Labour Organization (ILO)'. [2020 Global Human Rights Policy, 13/05/20: cisco.com] Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Company indicates that it 'has adopted the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct as our code of conduct for supply chain suppliers'. The RBA code includes provisions in relation to discrimination, child labour, forced labour. In relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining, this code states that 'in conformance with local law, participants shall respect the right of all workers to form and join trade unions of their own choosing, to bargain collectively and to engage in peaceful assembly as well as respect the right of workers to refrain from such activities'. The Code also says that 'if however, there are differing standards between the RBA Code and local law, the RBA defines conformance as meeting the strictest requirements'. However, no evidence found in publicly available sources that it will provide alternative mechanisms where there are restrictions to the exercise of these rights (freedom of association and collective bargaining). Furthermore, in its latest Global Human Rights Policy, it states that 'Cisco makes the following commitments to respect, support, and promote human rights. Our (...) suppliers are expected to adhere to these commitments and are held accountable to them. (...) Adopt responsible business practices and a governance structure that promote respect for human rights, including the rights enshrined in the UDHR and the eight Core ILO Conventions'. However, according to CHRB criteria, the Company has to explicitly list each of the ILO core labour standards that it expects its suppliers to commit to. [Supplier Code of Conduct - Web, 15/04/19: cisco.com & RBA Code of Conduct 6.0, 01/2018: responsiblebusiness.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company indicates, in its Human Rights Position Statement, that 'disruptive technologies and trends also bring new and previously unforeseen human rights risks as diverse as non-discrimination, privacy, child rights, security, freedom of expression, and access to employment, housing, credit, and public services'. Moreover, 'new human rights risks and opportunities will arise as AI technologies develop. While not comprehensive, the human rights implications below illustrate the types of potential impacts companies, individuals, and governments will need to address'. The company then states different human rights issues. Furthermore, in its 2019 CSR Report, the Chief People Officer of the Company states that 'We're committed to driving long-term solutions that build fairness into policies, practices, and laws

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>that break down barriers. We must protect and advocate for the equality of transgender, intersex, and gender-expansive people inside and outside the workplace. Cisco is dedicated to taking a stand against any actions that threaten the equal rights, safety, and dignity of all people and will continue supporting the LGBTQ+ community'. The Company has also provided evidence regarding trade unions participation. However, no specific commitment the core ILO principles was found, including an explicit commitment in relation to each of them: discrimination (of any kind), child labour, forced labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Human Rights Position Statements, 2018: https://cisco.com & 2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company indicates that it 'is committed to providing a safe and healthy work environment, one that exceeds government-mandated requirements'. [Health and Safety Web, 15/04/19: cisco.com] • Met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers: The Company indicates that it requires their suppliers to be in full compliance with applicable local, provincial/state, and national/federal laws, regulations and directives. These include, but are not limited to, hazard identification and mitigation; personal protective equipment; electrical safety; radiation safety, blood-borne pathogen exposure, waste management; chemical handling; exposure to noise; use of safe work practices, obtaining all required permits and licenses, and making all required notifications and reports. Cisco also requires the supplier to provide required and appropriate health and safety training and refresher training to its employees and to retain records of such training. [Contractor Safety, n/a: cisco.com] • Not met: working hours for workers • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: The Company states that 'working hours are not to exceed the maximum set by local law. Further, a workweek should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be allowed at least one day off every seven days'. However, no evidence found in relation to standard weekly hours. [RBA Code of Conduct 6.0, 01/2018: responsiblebusiness.org & Working Hours Guidance, 08/2019: responsiblebusiness.org]
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company indicates: 'Cisco makes the following commitments to respect, support and promote human rights. (...) Engage openly with stakeholders on issues that impact human rights, including with affected or potentially affected rightsholders'. Moreover, 'Cisco's approach to human rights is (...) anchored to the approach set forth in the UN Guiding Principles. (...) Cisco is fully committed to this approach. (...) The UN Guiding Principles also require proactive engagement with both rightsholders (or their legitimate representatives) and stakeholders as a way to help companies identify and mitigate potential risks and develop positive opportunities for impacted communities'. [2020 Global Human Rights Policy, 13/05/20: cisco.com] • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company discloses its stakeholder groups, including communities, employees, and suppliers. It also discloses external engagement forums, such as Partner community forums, Public Policy Engagement Website, Social media and internal engagement forums, for instance EthicsLine and Team Listening. Regarding its socially responsible supply chain, it states that 'We also collaborate extensively with industry groups, peers, suppliers, and other stakeholders to advance responsible supply chains across our industry'. Finally, 'Through regular dialogue, we can better align our business to social and environmental needs. We partner with a wide range of global and local organizations to shape and extend the reach of our CSR programs, including (...) non-profits, (...). In addition to the formal materiality assessment, Cisco's environment team independently gathers feedback on emerging issues, the quality of our reporting, and our sustainability performance from sources including stakeholder inquiries and key rankings and ratings. "Stakeholder inquiries" is the umbrella term we use for questions we receive from a variety of sources, including: (...) Employees; (...) Environmental advocacy groups (...). Environment-related topics form the vast majority of stakeholder inquiries that Cisco receives'. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: It states that 'Cisco's CSR business process is based on strong stakeholder engagement and an annual materiality assessment'. The Company's team Business and Human Rights at Cisco, indicates 'we'll rely on external stakeholders to support continuous and shared learning'. As for its Environmental Policy, 'We will listen. The earth's ecosystem is

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			complex, and there is much to be learned from our customers, our employees, advocacy groups, academia, and other stakeholders'. Also, 'We will identify our environmental impact through annual sustainability materiality assessments informed by stakeholder listening'. However, no evidence found that the company regularly engages with affected stakeholders and their legitimate representatives in the development or monitoring of its human rights approach. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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"> • Met: Commits to remedy: The company indicates that 'many leading companies with global operations, including Cisco, have committed to adhering to the UN Guiding Principles which include the development of a human rights policy, a framework to assess and mitigate known risks, and mechanisms to report and remedy grievances where they occur. Cisco is fully committed to this approach'. [2020 Global Human Rights Policy, 13/05/20: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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 ICT suppliers to remedy impacts: The Company indicates that 'Cisco works with suppliers to develop corrective action plans, identify the root cause of the non-conformance, and ensure that corrective actions are implemented in the shortest possible timeline'. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator, including the provision of different cases of cooperation to provide remedy. This includes, after overseeing remediation of reimbursement of fees, coaching of suppliers 'across multiple years if needed' and a specific case of concern raised in 2018 'Cisco worked with the supplier through FY19 to resolve them. Cisco first commissioned a thorough investigation to assess the supplier's conformance to Cisco's Code, local laws, and international standards on ethical recruitment and employment. The investigation identified foreign migrant workers who had paid excessive relocation costs. Some workers struggled to understand the terms of their contracts and disciplinary proceedings due to lack of written communication in a language they understood [...] as part of corrective actions, Cisco worked to ensure the supplier addressed the non-conformances in a timely manner including the immediate reimbursement of costs and fees paid by workers. In partnership with RBA, Cisco provided localized training on the Code, ethical labor standards and recruitment practices to staff at the supplier facility and labor recruitment agencies'. However, evidence seems to refer to how the company ensures the supplier remedies and it carries out actions to prevent repetition. Specific cases of remedies provided and actions to stop repetition are assessed under in indicator C.7. [2019 Modern Slavery Statement, 01/2020: cisco.com & 2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com]

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	2	<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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [2019 Annual Report, 18/10/19: cisco.com] • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company indicates that 'we created a new legal function led by Mark Chandler, Executive Vice President, Chief Legal Officer, and Chief Compliance Officer, to address human rights issues that arise in our business'. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: The Company indicates that in FY19, it created a new team: 'Business and Human Rights at Cisco (BHR at Cisco). (...) This team sits in our legal department and is staffed by human rights specialists. It's led by Lynn Easterling, Vice President and Deputy General Counsel, who reports to Executive Vice President Mark Chandler. Creating this team within the legal function allows for input on legal, regulatory, and policy decisions related to human rights impacts. BHR at Cisco will continue to leverage the Human Rights Working Group for insights across Cisco functions'. It also states that 'Cisco formally began to put policy into practice when we created our Human Rights Working Group (HRWG). The group includes experts from all parts of the business', including: Supply Chain; Security & Trust; Legal; Engineering; Customer Experience; Office of Inclusion and Collaboration; Government Affairs; Sales & Marketing; Corporate Communications; Investor Relations; Corporate Affairs. 'The purpose of the HRWG group is to: Inform our human rights strategy and policy; Track and share our progress; Champion human rights externally and within their own functions; Consider external perspectives on human rights'. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain: Also, 'We initiated the Supply Chain Human Rights Governance Committee in FY2019 to help assure progress against our priorities, including freely chosen employment. This committee establishes executive oversight of human rights risks and opportunities within the supply chain. The committee oversees the integration of human rights policies and priorities into business operations and regularly reviews audit findings and forced labor allegations. The committee convenes our Senior Vice President of Supply Chain Operations with other executives representing Global Manufacturing Operations, Global Supplier Management, Technology & Quality, Supply Chain Transformation, and Legal'. [2019 Modern Slavery Statement, 01/2020: cisco.com]
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company indicates: 'We address our remaining environmental issues through normal operational due diligence by the responsible business functions'. Also, 'Cisco uses environmental impact assessments to evaluate the biodiversity and land-use impacts of our sites. We generate annual biodiversity summary reports for all land and property we own'. However, it is not clear how it identifies its human rights risks and impacts in specific locations or activities, covering its own operations (i.e. impacts to which it may cause or contribute). [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] • Met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers: The Company indicates, in its 2017 CSR, that 'to understand our impact' we commissioned BSR to conduct our first Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA) of our supply chain. We wanted to identify our human rights impacts risks and opportunities, identify how they can be managed, and understand how we perform against the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs). Moreover, in its 2019 CSR, it states that 'In FY17, we completed a Human Rights Impact Assessment. In accordance with its recommendations, we expanded our scope of assessments to include logistics suppliers during FY19'. Furthermore, Cisco 'evaluates our supply base for social and environmental risk factors, inherent risks from operations and production, and exposure to those risks. We rely on reputable sources to assess vulnerabilities and protections in the geographies where suppliers operate. These data sources include: The UN Human Development Index; World Bank Governance Indicators; Other indicators for environmental performance and the presence of forced labor'. In addition, 'We continually conduct due diligence on minerals in our supply chain to ensure their mining and sale is not benefiting armed groups or actors that commit human rights violations'. [CSR Report 2017, 10/2018: cisco.com & 2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Ongoing global risk identification: The Company indicates, in its Human Rights Statement, that ‘a variety of disruptive technologies and trends are shaping our future, and in doing so will transform the business and human rights landscape. (...) However, these disruptive technologies and trends also bring new and previously unforeseen human rights risks as diverse as non-discrimination, privacy, child rights, security, freedom of expression, and access to employment, housing, credit, and public services. These developments are relevant across Cisco’s value chain, including our supply chain, our own operations, and the use of our products, services, and technologies by our customers. In accordance with our Human Rights Policy, we are committed to identifying these human rights impacts, mitigating risks, maximizing opportunities, and fostering collaborative and transparent engagement with our stakeholders. This document describes the relevance of disruptive technologies and trends for human rights at Cisco and sets out our significant activities and point of view for each’. The Company then describes the context of each of these disruptive technologies, its human rights impacts and Cisco’s approach. However, these do not refer to key industry risks covered by this benchmark, and no details found of this process being applied on an ongoing basis (human rights due diligence in supply chain refers to 2017). Moreover, in its 2019 Sustainability Report, it states that ‘As an internal clearinghouse for human rights matters, we will answer questions, conduct due diligence to inform business decisions and product development, and train employees who may face human rights challenges in the course of their daily work’. In addition, in its Global Human Rights Policy, it commits to ‘Implement policies and processes to identify, prevent, mitigate and remediate human rights risks and impacts’. Nevertheless, it is not clear the global systems in place to identify its human rights risks and impacts. [Human Rights Position Statements, 2018: https://cisco.com & 2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders: The Company indicated above: ‘In FY17, we completed a Human Rights Impact Assessment. In accordance with its recommendations, we expanded our scope of assessments to include logistics suppliers during FY19’. Moreover, ‘all of our strategic logistics suppliers completed SAQs (Self-Assessment Questionnaires). They will continue to be part of Cisco’s supplier engagement process in FY20’. However, it is not clear if affected stakeholders are consulted as part of the identification/assessment process. Current evidence seems to refer to compliance monitoring assessments. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances: The Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Chief Compliance Officer states: ‘With opportunity comes responsibility. Innovation must advance hand in hand with thoughtful policies and practices, including undertaking due diligence on how new products and services may impact human rights in the future’. The Company has also provided extra comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material as it describes Cisco’s approach to key emerging human rights challenges in the technology sector, but makes no reference to human rights risk assessment. The Company has also provided comments to CHRB regarding privacy. However, evidence was not material for this indicator. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com]

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)	2	<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: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company indicates, in its 2018 CSR, that 'Cisco conducted the first Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA) of our supply chain in FY17. The goal of this assessment was to identify impacts and opportunities, determine how they can be managed, and understand how we perform against the UN Guiding Principles (UNGPs) on Business and Human Rights. The study concluded our current supply chain assessment and audit process identifies actual and potential human rights impacts with a high degree of thoroughness and conforms to a majority of the expectations of the UNGPs'. Also, in its 2019 Modern Slavery Statement, it states that 'we evaluate and address risks of human trafficking and slavery through conformance to the Code and using a risk-based approach. Cisco conducts an annual risk assessment by evaluating the supply base on social and environmental risk factors. This evaluation includes indicators for forced labor and human trafficking risks in addition to the potential presence of vulnerable worker groups such as foreign migrant workers. In 2018 statement referred indicated also includes indicators for forced labor risks such as 'operations located within a country with weak government response'. The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, its content has not been found in publicly available sources. [CSR Report 2018, 03/2019: cisco.com & 2019 Modern Slavery Statement, 01/2020: cisco.com] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company indicates that 'we had identified the most severe risks as relating to working hours, emergency preparedness, freely chosen employment, young workers/child labor, and wages and benefits. BSR's assessment added privacy and raw materials sourcing to the list'. The assessment also highlighted opportunities. [CSR Report 2018, 03/2019: cisco.com & CSR Report 2017, 10/2018: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: Following the assessment carried out in 2017 (supply chain), the Company indicates in its 2018 CSR report that 'the assessment informed the 3-year roadmap for our priority areas. We recognize these issues are constantly evolving but also systemic and will require several years of focus to address'. These key supply chain areas to focus following the human rights impact assessment are 'freely chosen employment, young workers and child labor, pollution prevention and hazardous materials, ethical sourcing of raw materials, women's empowerment and promoting reskilling for the future of work'. However, no details found about the action plan to manage these priority issues. [CSR Report 2018, 03/2019: cisco.com] • Not met: Including in ICT supply chain: The Company indicates that 'Freely chosen employment and forced labor remain salient issues that Cisco monitors carefully and addresses with suppliers as necessary'. It then discloses various action taken to remedy nonconformities. The Company provides evidence on how the risk assessment takes place in its supply chain and a list of audit findings by category for all audits in FY 2019. Moreover, it discloses its corrective action plans. 'When audit identifies nonconformances, suppliers must develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs). (...) If a CAP does not meet our requirements, Cisco coaches them in root cause analysis using best practice frameworks, such as the 5 Whys or Fish-Bone mapping. This work drives lasting positive change by addressing the root cause rather than implementing short-term fixes'. However, this indicator looks for a proactive risk-based approach to mitigation rather than corrective action plans following audits, which seems to refer to a re-active approach in the context of compliance monitoring (assessed under indicator b.1.6) [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] • Met: Example of Actions decided: The Company indicates that 'in FY19, Cisco did not observe any cases of young workers at risk or any cases of underage child labor. However, audits identified suppliers who did not have written procedures to address underage child labor if children were to be discovered working on site. In these cases, Cisco works with suppliers to close gaps. We help them strengthen their management systems so they can responsibly resolve these issues if they occur'. This indicator looks for wider actions to mitigate or prevent risks. Despite current example is related to the audit process, it seems to be a programme carried out to improve generally, rather than correct wrongdoings. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com & 2019 Modern Slavery Statement, 01/2020: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to 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"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company indicates that 'We'll continue to evaluate our effectiveness at addressing human rights impacts and will integrate what we learn as we continue to improve'. Moreover, 'In FY19, we assessed the effectiveness of our CAP (Corrective Action Plans) management. We found an inconsistency in how we define closure rate. Before, if a previous finding was still open at the time of an audit, it was closed and reflected as a new finding in the new audit. This essentially restarted the time suppliers had to resolve it. Now, we've revised our definition to account for repeat findings in successive audits. This new approach more accurately reflects persistent issues. We'll report our findings in this way going forward'. However, no description found of a system for tracking the actions taken in response to human rights risks and impacts assessed and for evaluating whether the actions have been effective or have missed key issues or not produced the desired results. Indicator looks for wider actions to mitigate risks faced, rather than outcomes of specific actions in specific suppliers. Evidence found seems to focus in system design to track specific non-compliances as part of the audit process. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: In FY19, 'we assessed the effectiveness of our CAP management. We found an inconsistency in how we define closure rate. Before, if a previous finding was still open at the time of an audit, it was closed and reflected as a new finding in the new audit. This essentially restarted the time suppliers had to resolve it. Now, we've revised our definition to account for repeat findings in successive audits. This new approach more accurately reflects persistent issues. We'll report our findings in this way going forward'. However, this evidence seems to refer to management processes rather than effectiveness of actual measures. In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company needs to provide an example of the specific conclusions reached and actions taken or to be taken in relation to a salient human rights issue. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	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"> • 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 • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B.2.2. [2019 Modern Slavery Statement, 01/2020: cisco.com & CSR Report 2018, 03/2019: cisco.com] • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.3 • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.4 • Not met: Including ICT 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 <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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	1.5	<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: Channel accessible to all workers: In its Code of Business Conduct, the company discloses various channels to report a concern or a grievance. In specific, the Online option explicitly states that it is for Cisco employees, as well as for other non-employees and anonymous reporting. Moreover, as it is stated in the Global Human Rights Policy: 'Cisco expects all employees, contractors, customers, partners, suppliers, shareholders, and stakeholders to speak up promptly about any conduct or circumstances they believe may constitute a violation of this policy or any other policy. Concerns from employees, contractors, suppliers, partners, or any other stakeholder can be communicated through the same channels as any other ethical issue'. [2019 Code of Business Conduct, 04/2019: cisco.com & 2020 Global Human Rights Policy, 13/05/20: cisco.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: In FY19, the Ethics Office received 1,338 inquiries. However, it is not clear the number of grievances about human rights issues filed and addressed or resolved. The Company has provided comments to CHRB. However, no further evidence found in the Company's feedback regarding this indicator. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com] • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The company indicates that 'the multi-lingual EthicsLine is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, worldwide, with country-based, tollfree phone numbers'. [2019 Code of Business Conduct, 04/2019: cisco.com] • Met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: The company states that 'the Supplier Code of Conduct requires our suppliers to have mechanisms in place to allow workers to file, track, and resolve formal grievances'. The RBA code, which is the code of conduct for suppliers requires them to have 'an effective grievance mechanism, to assess employees' understanding of and obtain feedback on or violations against practices and conditions covered by this Code and to foster continuous improvement'. Also, 'participants shall also requires its next tier suppliers to acknowledge and implement the code'. [CSR Report 2018, 03/2019: cisco.com & RBA Version 6.0, 01/2018: responsiblebusiness.org]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	<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: Grievance mechanism for community: In the tab Share your Concerns, the company indicates that 'employees, customers, partners, vendors, suppliers, service providers, shareholders and every other stakeholder or third party has a responsibility to promptly speak up about any issues or concerns they believe, in good faith, may constitute a violation of the Code of Business Conduct or any other Cisco policy'. There is a link for non-employees. Moreover, as it is stated in the Global Human Rights: 'Concerns from employees, contractors, suppliers, partners, or any other stakeholder can be communicated through the same channels as any other ethical issue'. [Share Your Concerns - Cisco, 16/04/19: cisco.com & 2020 Global Human Rights Policy, 13/05/20: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: See above. It is available in 18 different languages and online. [Share Your Concerns - Cisco, 16/04/19: cisco.com & Non-employee grieving channel, 16/04/19: cisco3b.tnwreports.com] • Met: ICT supplier communities use global system: As indicated, above, 'employees, customers, partners, vendors, suppliers, service providers, shareholders and every other stakeholder or third party has a responsibility to promptly speak up about any issues or concerns they believe, in good faith, may constitute a violation of the Code of Business Conduct or any other Cisco policy'. There is a link for non-employees. [Share Your Concerns - Cisco, 16/04/19: cisco.com & Cisco System for Ethics web, 01/05/19: cisco3b.tnwreports.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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"> • Met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks: The Company provides and example of approach to take for cases of imposing financial burdens on workers (in the supply chain): 'Cisco works with suppliers to develop corrective action plans, identify the root cause of the non-conformance, and ensure that corrective actions are implemented in the shortest possible timeline. Corrective actions may include the immediate return of passports or reimbursement of paid recruitment fees within 90 days of discovery. Corrective actions are followed by preventative actions to ensure that non-conformances do not reoccur and to reduce future risk. Such actions may include ensuring the facility has a policy in place and workers are aware of the policy, and that contracts are clear and in a language workers can understand'. [2019 Modern Slavery Statement, 01/2020: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition: Regarding its Corrective Action Plans (CAP), the Company indicates that 'In FY19, we assessed the effectiveness of our CAP management. We found an inconsistency in how we define closure rate. Before, if a previous finding was still open at the time of an audit, it was closed and reflected as a new finding in the new audit. This essentially restarted the time suppliers had to resolve it. Now, we've revised our definition to account for repeat findings in successive audits. This new approach more accurately reflects persistent issues. We'll report our findings in this way going forward'. However, the Company provides an example of a change to an internal procedure to keep track of CAPs. In this indicator, the Company is expected to provide a description of changes in actions carried out to prevent repetition. [2019 CSR Report, 12/2019: cisco.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Workers at CommScope, Foxconn, and others protest sexual harassment, discrimination, and other workplace issues • Area: FoA & CB • Story: In Mexico, workers at large assembly plants owned by Commscope, Eaton, Foxconn (supplier of Cisco) and Lexmark, producing electronics, auto parts and printing supplies for U.S. market, have launched a series of protests against low wages, unsafe working conditions, sexual harassment and discrimination. In several cases, workers have attempted to form independent unions to defend their rights and have a voice at work. According to a press, hundreds of workers are facing unjust dismissals, threats and lawsuits because of these union activities. One of the leaders of the workers' protest, engineer Carlos Octavio Serrano, was one of the workers who were fired following the strike. • Sources: [Truthout, 13/01/16: truthout.org][Good Electronics, 03/11/15: goodelectronics.org]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response available: CHRB could not find the evidence of the Company's response in public regarding this case and though the Company's supplier (Foxconn) responded, CHRB requires the company itself to respond. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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"> • Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that "Cisco upholds and respects human rights as contained in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the eight Core Labor Conventions developed by the International Labour Organization (ILO), the UN Global Compact, and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights." [Global Human Rights Policy, 10/12/2018: cisco.com] • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "The scope of Cisco's human rights policy applies to all employees, partners, suppliers, and contractors, and supports the human rights of all Cisco stakeholders including internet users." [Global Human Rights Policy, 10/12/2018: cisco.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: Although the company is a member of the RBA, this is not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of this indicator. Additionally the CHRB could not find evidence of Cisco's measures to prohibit retaliation or intimidation against workers' union activities.
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	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: Engages with affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find the evidence of the Company's engagement with affected stakeholders. • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: CHRB could not find the evidence of the Company's encouraging its business partners to engage with the affected stakeholders. • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company providing remedies. • Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company reviewing the system followed by the case. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims • Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company's improving the system or engaging with stakeholders followed by the case.

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