

Company Name Ericsson
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
UNGP Core Score (*) 22.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
2	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
2	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
1	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
1.5	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)		
2	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)
2	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
2	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
1	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
22.0	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: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company indicates in its Code of Conduct: 'The Code reflects our company's commitment to conducting business responsibly including: Supporting the United Nations Global Compact ten principles' [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: UNGPs: In addition, the Company states: 'The Code reflects our company's commitment to conducting business responsibly including: [...] Respecting human rights throughout our business operations, according to The United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights' [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com]
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	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: ILO Core: The Company indicates that it respects 'all internationally recognized human rights, including [...] International Labor Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, which address freedom of association and collective bargaining, forced labor, child labor, and non-discrimination'. [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com] • Met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Code of conduct for business partners includes discrimination, forced labour, child labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining. In relation to these, it states that 'all employees shall be free to form and to join, or not to join, trade unions or similar external representative organizations and to bargain collectively. Information and consultation with employees can be done through formal arrangements or, if such do not exist, other mechanisms may be used. In situations where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is restricted by applicable laws and regulations, Business partners are expected to allow alternative forms of worker representations'. [Code of Conduct for Business Partners Updated, 6/2019: ericsson.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company indicates in its Code of Business Ethics: 'All employees shall be free to form and to join, or not to join, trade unions or similar external representative organizations and to bargain collectively. [...] Modern day slavery including forced, bonded or compulsory labor and human trafficking are strictly prohibited. [...] No person shall be employed who is below the minimum legal age for employment. [...] All kinds of discrimination based on partiality or prejudice is prohibited'. [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states in its Code: 'At Ericsson we give high importance to the health and safety of our employees, our partners' employees, our suppliers' employees, and members of the public that may be affected by our operations and shall be prioritized. A healthy and safe working environment, including psychosocial considerations and, if applicable, housing facilities shall be provided for employees, in accordance with international standards and national laws'. [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com] • Met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers: The Code of Conduct for business partners devotes a specific section to health and safety including both generic occupational health and safety and specific requirements and standards. [Code of Conduct for Business Partners Updated, 6/2019: ericsson.com] • Met: working hours for workers: With respect Working Hours, the Company indicates in its Code: 'Working hours shall comply with applicable laws. The normal work week shall not exceed 48 hours. Hours worked beyond the normal work week shall be voluntary, unless a collective bargaining agreement allows for required

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>time under certain conditions and/or, if legal, in exceptional circumstances. Other than in such circumstances, a workweek shall not exceed 60 hours. Exceptional circumstances include short-term business demands and natural disaster. Absent exceptional circumstances, personnel shall be provided with at least one day off in every seven-day period. One day off shall be interpreted as at least twenty-four consecutive hours'. [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: The code for business partners states that 'Business Partners Must follow all applicable laws and regulation and/or collective bargaining agreements with respect to working hours and days of rest, and all overtime must be voluntary. A workweek must be restricted to 60 hours, including overtime. Regular workweeks must not exceed 48 hours. Absent exceptional circumstances, Employees must be provided with at least one day off in every seven-day period [...] Exceptional circumstances include short-term business demands and natural disaster'. [Code of Conduct for Business Partners Updated, 6/2019: ericsson.com]
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company states: 'Ericsson engages with its stakeholders on an ongoing basis in which sustainability and corporate responsibility topics as well as emerging dilemmas are discussed. Example of topics include responsible business, human rights, anti-corruption, supply chain management, climate action, energy performance, digital inclusion and sustainable development. The stakeholder engagement takes a variety of forms such as joint projects and initiatives, dialogues, meetings, surveys, participation in industry groups and representation on decision-making bodies'. As example, 'In 2018, Ericsson conducted a focused employee survey on sustainability and corporate responsibility. The Company's employees were requested to select a and rank the top sustainability and responsible business related topics that they believed were of most significance to them and to Ericsson's business, these results helped inform our materiality assessment'. In addition, the Company publishes its 'Human Rights Statement', where it indicates: 'In our business operations we aim to balance technical considerations with community concerns. Communication and consultation with local communities and stakeholder groups is vital in building trust and establishing a social license to operate'. [Annual Report 2019, 02/2020: ericsson.com & Human Rights Statement, 12/02/2020: ericsson.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
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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: Commits to remedy: The Company's approach to respecting human rights includes: 'Assume accountability by providing grievance mechanisms and access to remedy in cases when we have caused or contributed to adverse human rights impacts'. In addition, in its CHRB Platform Disclosure (formal document), it states: 'Ericsson has a commitment to provide and enable remedy when applicable'. [Human Rights Statement, 12/02/2020: ericsson.com & CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Not obstructing access to other remedies: Its Human Rights Statement reads: 'Ericsson will under no circumstances impede the access to state based judicial or non-judicial mechanism and will cooperate with any such mechanism should the situation arise'. [Human Rights Statement, 12/02/2020: ericsson.com] • Not met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts: In addition, the Company indicates: 'As an example of how Ericsson works with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts, Ericsson engaged with its suppliers following reports in 2019 of modern slavery practices in ICT manufacturing in Malaysia. Ericsson took action by engaging with its own suppliers in Malaysia to evaluate their policies and process to prevent modern slavery, as well as disclose their sub-suppliers in order to enable Ericsson to identify potential risks further upstream in the supply chain. Ericsson also engaged with local NGOs and experts to discuss appropriate actions and remedy. As a member of the Responsible Business Alliance, Ericsson engaged with other members to require audits of the identified manufacturing sites in Malaysia and ensured recruitment fees were reimbursed to the workers.' However, no further information found describing how the Company works with its business partners to provide remedy through partners' mechanisms, or through collaborating with them in the development of third party non-judicial mechanisms. [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org]

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. The Company is signatory to the UN Global Compact. • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company indicates that 'A Corporate Responsibility Expert – Business and Human Rights has the day-to-day responsibility for human rights across the company, including the supply chain and customer relationships, and is part of the Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility leadership team. The role reports to the Head of Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility. The Functional Area is part of Group Function Marketing and Corporate Relations. The Head of Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility reports to the Executive Management Team of Ericsson Group'. As indicated below, the Company relies in a functional area of sustainability. [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: The Company indicates that the 'Functional Area Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility is accountable for defining strategy, target setting, risks management, policies and directives, governance and improvement programs for human rights, as well as other areas within sustainability and corporate responsibility. [...] Moreover, there are several boards at Ericsson with the responsibility for specific human rights related topics such as the Sensitive Business Board, the Environmental Health and Safety Board and the Responsible Sourcing Board. All these boards have high level representatives from different group functions and are chaired by members of the Executive Management Team'. [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain: The Company indicates: 'Ericsson also has a dedicated Responsible Sourcing team, with an appointed Responsible Sourcing program manager for Human Rights, that in tight collaboration with Ericsson's Corporate Responsibility Expert – Business and Human Rights manages the strategy and activities for Human Rights for the sourcing department and for the supply chain, including ICT suppliers'. [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org]
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company states on its website: 'Our commitments to address and engage actively in our salient human rights issues are highlighted in our Code of Business Ethics (CoBE), Code of Conduct for Business Partners (CoC) and Business and Human Rights Statement. We identify and manage human rights issues in a number of ways, including Human Rights Impact Assessments (HRIA), stakeholder consultations in conjunction with HRIAs, and internal processes such as sensitive business and responsible sourcing'. In its submission to the CHRB disclosure platform the company indicates 'Ericsson subscribes to Verisk Maplecroft's risk indices which are updated on an on-going basis'. [Respect for human rights, N/A: ericsson.com & Disclosure to CHRB platform, 07/2019: bhrrc.org] • Met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers: See above. In addition, on its website, the Company indicates: 'Our Human rights impact assessment (HRIA) process considers potential adverse human rights impacts that Ericsson may cause or contribute to through our own activities, or which may be directly linked to our operations, products or services via our business relationships'. [Respect for human rights, N/A: ericsson.com & Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility Report 2019, 03/2020: ericsson.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: In its submission to the CHRB disclosure platform the company indicates 'Ericsson subscribes to Verisk Maplecroft's risk indices which are updated on an on-going basis as well as a Dow Jones sustainability risk tool which is reviewed on a weekly basis and keep us informed of global risks'. [Disclosure to CHRB platform, 07/2019: bhrrc.org] • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: As indicates above, the Company states: 'We identify and manage human rights issues in a number of ways, including Human Rights Impact Assessments (HRIA), stakeholder consultations in conjunction with HRIAs, and internal processes such as sensitive business and responsible sourcing'. [Respect for human rights, N/A: ericsson.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company indicates: 'Since 2012 we work with Shift, the leading non-profit center of expertise on the UNGPs, to systematically embed a human rights framework across our company. This work significantly strengthens our due diligence processes.' [Respect for human rights, N/A: ericsson.com] • Met: Triggered by new circumstances: In its CSR Report 2019, the Company indicates that it 'has integrated human rights due diligence into its sales process through the Sensitive Business program. The program aims to ensure that business opportunities and engagements are conducted in accordance with international human rights standards. [...] When risks are identified in a sales opportunity by the Sensitive Business automated tool, the Market Area must submit an approval request. Submissions are evaluated according to the sensitive business risk methodology (see graph) and may be approved, approved with conditions or rejected. Conditional approvals include technical and/or contractual mitigations, and its implementation is monitored to ensure adherence. During 2019, country human rights risk assessments were conducted for Uzbekistan, Kirgizstan and Saudi Arabia. These risk assessments include mitigating actions that need to be implemented for further business engagements. Such actions include ensuring that certain functionalities or products are not sold in specific countries, conducting occupational health and safety screenings of potential business partners, and providing training to Ericsson personnel as well as customers and suppliers on responsible business practices.' [Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility Report 2019, 03/2020: ericsson.com]
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 states that 'We have identified the following areas below as salient, and therefore prioritized. Salient human rights issues are the human rights at risk of the most severe negative impact through the company's activities and business relationships. [...] Ericsson has developed the list of salient supply chain human rights issues based on internal and external expertise and stakeholder consultations, audit results, and comprehensive analysis of our supplier categories, including factors such as relevant industry, type of activities, country of operations, nature of the workforce, including potential vulnerable groups, etc. While we currently prioritize the below identified salient risks, through focused efforts and collaborative engagements, the full scope of human rights risk is continuously managed through our Responsible Sourcing Program'. [Salient human rights risks, N/A: ericsson.com] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: 'We have identified the following areas below as salient [...]: Trade union rights, Forced labor, Occupational health and safety, Living wage, Working hours, Conflict-related impacts, Non-discrimination.' [Salient human rights risks, N/A: ericsson.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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: Action Plans to mitigate risks: On its website, the Company states: 'Ericsson prioritizes the identified salient human rights issues when developing strategies and proactive actions to prevent adverse human rights impacts. Ericsson's Responsible Sourcing Human Rights strategy includes activities such as supplier capacity building, audits and improvement programs, risk and impacts assessments, policy implementation, stakeholder dialogue and engagement, and benchmarking. The strategy is continuously evaluated and updated based on results and learnings from these activities. The strategy is managed in tight collaboration with the Ericsson Sustainability & Corporate Responsibility team. Progress and targets are regularly reviewed by Ericsson's Executive Team. We also collaborate with external parties such as civil society organizations, customers and suppliers, industry peers and experts in order to develop the area.' It also describes its different strategies, including: 'free suppliers trainings in areas related to human rights [...]. [...] engage key 1st tier suppliers in activities such as trainings and surveys, to reach further upstream where the risks are most severe [...]. [...] tools such as audits, self-assessments, automated screenings and surveys to evaluate and follow up on human rights risks in the supply chain. [...] benchmarking and dialogue with suppliers, customers, industry and civil society organizations, affected stakeholders, experts etc. we develop our policies and practices [...]. [...] statements and policies relating to human rights in our supply chain [...].' In addition, it indicates in its CHRB Platform Disclosure: 'Based on the identified salient human rights issues (see Ericsson.com) Ericsson has initiated a number of proactive actions to act on findings and prevent risks. The Responsible Sourcing and Sustainability & Corporate Responsibility functions have developed a specific human rights activity plan, which is reviewed and updated regularly based on factors such as media and NGO reports, stakeholder dialogue, audit results, impact assessment findings, and learnings from actions taken. The action plan includes activities such as internal and external trainings and capacity building, implementation of improvement areas, collaborations with customers and suppliers on specific human rights topics, continuous supply chain mapping and impact assessments, trend analysis, benchmarking activities etc.' [Human rights governance, N/A: ericsson.com & CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Including in ICT supply chain: See above. [Human rights governance, N/A: ericsson.com] • Met: Example of Actions decided: 'Examples of initiated or ongoing efforts are: 1) As an effort to prevent modern slavery practices in the ICT supply chain in Malaysia, Ericsson has initiated a collaboration with key suppliers based in the country to organize capacity building workshops with 2nd tier suppliers. The aim of the workshops will be to strengthen the 2nd tier suppliers understanding of modern slavery risks, provide tools and knowledge on how to identify and prevent such risks, and establish closer relationships with the suppliers in Malaysia to increase joint leverage. The workshops were planned for Q2 2020 but had to be postponed due to travel restrictions. We are now evaluating, together with the suppliers, what actions can be taken remotely or through virtual meetings, and plan to move forward with the in-person workshops as soon as travel is possible. 2) Ericsson conducted a number of worker voice surveys, in collaboration with an external third-party, specifically focused on modern slavery, with selected 1st tier and 2nd tier suppliers in China and India. This was initiated due to the fact that modern slavery practices are often difficult to detect through audits. Based on the findings we had additional dialogue with the relevant suppliers to develop their policies and procedures on preventing modern slavery. [...]'. [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	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: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company indicates: 'Ericsson continuously tracks and evaluates the effectiveness of activities related to human rights risks in our supply chain, both the reactive and proactive actions, in order to provide input to future plans and activities. The result of performed activities are reviewed based on direct effectiveness, meaning, if it gave the intended result, if not and it should be discontinued, and what valuable learnings it gave, even if it did not result in the intended outcome. Lessons learned are shared internally with relevant stakeholders involved in the actions taken, as well as externally in dialogue with customers, suppliers, investors, civil society organizations and other stakeholders'. [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org] Met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: Some examples of lessons learned: 'While the worker voice surveys provided valuable additional information, besides audit results, they also confirmed that the most severe risks of modern slavery exist further upstream in our supply chain. The set up of the surveys requires buy in from all tiers of the supply chain to reach the right level, which was proven to be difficult due to a lack of awareness in many cases. In order to more effectively reach further upstream, and build trust with all relevant tiers, Ericsson decided to initiate targeted collaborations in specific markets to build joint capacity and raise awareness. The pilot project in Malaysia (mentioned under indicator B.2.3) is a first attempt. Based on these outcomes, the surveys were discontinued. Once the collaborative efforts have shown increased awareness, the surveys might once again be an effective additional tool to identify impacts'. [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	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: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B.2.1 Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B.2.2 Met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: See indicator B.2.3 Met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: See indicator B.2.4 Met: Including ICT suppliers: See indicators B.2.1-B.2.4 <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: The Company indicates that its Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility Report 'has been prepared in accordance with GRI Standards: Core option. By applying the GRI's international guidelines, Ericsson aims at reporting for sustainability related content that is relevant to its stakeholders in a transparent and balanced way.' However, this indicator looks for evidence of how the Company ensures that, for specific human rights concerns raised by affected stakeholders, these are able to access to the Company's response and communications. [Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility Report 2019, 03/2020: ericsson.com]

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: The Company indicates on its website: 'Employees are encouraged to report any conduct that they believe, in good faith, to be a violation of laws or the Code of Business Ethics to their manager or in accordance with locally established procedure. If the manager is involved in the situation or cannot or has not adequately addressed the concerns, employees are advised to report to a manager of higher rank or in accordance with locally established procedure.' Moreover, the Company indicates in its Code of Business Ethics: 'If the above channels for reporting are not available or appropriate, and if the alleged violation is conducted by group or local management, and relates to corruption, questionable accounting, [...] or otherwise seriously affects vital interests of Ericsson or personal health and safety, the violation may be reported through the Group's external whistle-blower process: the Ericsson Compliance Line.' [Reporting Compliance Concerns, N/A: ericsson.com & Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.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: The Company reports: '[Allegation Management Office] AMO saw an increase in compliance concerns reported from 445 in 2018 to 538 in 2019. [...] Corporate Investigations closed 566 cases in 2019, including some related to compliance concerns reported before 2019. As of December 31, 2019, 167 cases remained open, all of which relate to compliance concerns reported in 2019.' Furthermore the company discloses a chart where is indicated the percentage of cases received corresponding to each category: 35% Fraud, corruption and regulatory breach, 12% Operations, 9% Conflicts of interest, 6% Security, 24% Human resources, 0% Sustainability. Not clear, however, which are related to human rights. [Annual Report 2019, 02/2020: ericsson.com] • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: 'The Ericsson Compliance Line is available via phone or secure website, 24/7, 365 days a year in 188 countries and in over 75 languages.' [Annual Report 2019, 02/2020: ericsson.com] • Met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers: The Company indicates in its CoBE: 'Suppliers, customers and other partners involved with Ericsson may report suspected violations of laws or The Code to the local operations manager or in accordance with locally established procedure. If the above channels for reporting are not available or appropriate [...] the violation may be reported through the Group's external whistle-blower process: the Ericsson Compliance Line'. [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com]
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: The Company indicates in its CoBE: 'Suppliers, customers and other partners involved with Ericsson may report suspected violations of laws or The Code to the local operations manager or in accordance with locally established procedure. If the above channels for reporting are not available or appropriate [...] the violation may be reported through the Group's external whistle-blower process: the Ericsson Compliance Line'. In addition, in its Annual Report 2019, it states: 'Compliance Concerns may relate to [...], occupational health and safety, human right matters, or other matters that could constitute a breach of law, seriously affect vital interests of the Company or personal health and safety.' Moreover, on its website 'Reporting Compliance Concerns, it indicates: 'Ericsson provides employees and external stakeholders a dedicated communication channel for reporting serious compliance concerns.' [Code of Business Ethics, 2019: ericsson.com & Annual Report 2019, 02/2020: ericsson.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: 'The Ericsson Compliance Line is available via phone or secure website, 24/7, 365 days a year in 188 countries and in over 75 languages.' [Annual Report 2019, 02/2020: ericsson.com] • Met: Expects ICT supplier to have community grievance systems: In its Code of Conduct for Business Partners, the Company indicates that its grievance channels are available to its business partners and their workers, and it adds: 'This provision does not preclude Business Partners from making available appropriate whistleblowing systems and grievance mechanisms to their Employees and interested parties, including affected communities, to make comments, recommendations, reports or complaints concerning the workplace, the environment or overall business practices.' [Code of Conduct for Business Partners Updated, 6/2019: ericsson.com] • Not met: ICT supplier communities use global system: The company indicates 'The Compliance Line is Ericsson's whistle-blower tool enabling employees and external parties to report serious breaches that would otherwise not be reported. You can report via phone or via a secure web site. The Compliance Line is implemented in all countries where Ericsson is active in one global launch'. However in the company's FAQ document it indicates that 'Compliance Line's should only be used for compliance concerns that involves group or local management'. Therefore, it is not clear whether it can be used by anyone to file a complaint against suppliers. [Compliance Line Frequently Asked Questions, N/A: ericsson.com & Code of Conduct for Business Partners Updated, 6/2019: ericsson.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: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company indicates in its Disclosure to CHRB Platform: 'An example of where remedy was provided is the case of modern slavery in ICT manufacturing in Malaysia [...]. Together with under RBA members, Ericsson pushed for the reimbursement of recruitment fees to

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>affected migrant workers.' [CHRB Platform Disclosure 2020, 07/2020: business-humanrights.org]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <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

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

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

Disclaimer

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

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

The Benchmark is made available to 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