

Company Name Hanesbrands
Industry Apparel (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
UNGP Core Score (*) 13.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
1.5	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)		
1	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
1	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
1	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1.5	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
1.5	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
0	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
13.0	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	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: General HRs commitment: In the document Global Human Rights Policy, the Company states 'Respect for human rights is fundamental to who we are at HanesBrands. We are committed to ensuring that all people are treated with dignity and respect, and we are committed to providing certain fundamental rights at work so that all those working for us have the opportunity to fully achieve their human potential'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs: In its Global Human Rights Policy, the Company states that the development of its policy was informed by the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights , but it does not specify a formal commitment. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com]
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of 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: ILO Core: The Company's Global Human Rights policy states that it supports each of the four ILO core standards. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com] • Met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for AP suppliers: The requirements are outlined in the Global Standards for Suppliers, requiring suppliers to sign to state that its Employment Practices support all four ILO standards: Child Labor; Non-discrimination; Forced Labor; Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining. In relation to these last two it states: 'Suppliers will recognize and respect the right of employees to exercise their right of freedom association. Similarly, Suppliers will recognize and respect the rights of their employees to choose or not choose collective bargaining'. [Global Standards for Suppliers 2018, 2018: hanesforgood.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Global Human Rights policy includes an explicit commitment to each ILO standard of child labour, forced labour, discrimination, freedom of association and collective bargaining. In relation to these two, it indicates the following: 'Hanes Brands respects the rights of our employees and those of our suppliers to join, form (or not join or form) a labor union. We protect the free exercise of those rights without fear of reprisal of any kind. Where employees are represented by a union, we are committed to establishing a constructive dialogue with their freely chosen representatives and to bargain collectively in good faith with them'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Global Human Rights Policy states that 'Hanesbrands is committed to providing a safe and healthy workplace and complying with applicable safety and health laws, regulations and our own internal requirements.' [Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com] • Met: H&S applies to AP suppliers: The Company expects its suppliers to 'operate a safe and healthy work environment for their employees. Suppliers must be committed to eliminating unsafe acts and conditions, thereby preventing harm to their workers, customers and the general public. Where applicable, this also applies to housing and eating facilities'. [Global Standards for Suppliers 2018, 2018: hanesforgood.com] • Not met: working hours for workers: The Company indicates, in its document Global Standards for Suppliers, that 'suppliers will comply with all applicable laws and regulations regarding working hours. Other than in exceptional circumstances, workers must not work over the legal limits or over 48 regular hours plus 12 overtime hours per week whichever is lower. Suppliers must allow workers at least 24 consecutive hours of rest following 6 consecutive working days. Overtime shall not be requested on a regular basis and is voluntary'. However, it is not clear that

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>the same applies for the Company's own workers. [Global Standards for Suppliers 2018, 2018: hanesforgood.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Working hours for AP suppliers: The Company indicates, in its document Global Standards for Suppliers, that 'suppliers will comply with all applicable laws and regulations regarding working hours. Other than in exceptional circumstances, workers must not work over the legal limits or over 48 regular hours plus 12 overtime hours per week whichever is lower. Suppliers must allow workers at least 24 consecutive hours of rest following 6 consecutive working days. Overtime shall not be requested on a regular basis and is voluntary'. [Global Standards for Suppliers 2018, 2018: hanesforgood.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: Commits to stakeholder engagement: In their Human Rights Policy, the Company states that it 'engages with stakeholders to ensure we are listening to, learning from and taking into account their views on human rights issues. We are especially committed to engaging in appropriate dialogue with stakeholders on our human rights program.' [Disclosure 2019, 17/07/19: business-humanrights.org & Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com] Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company communicates through the public disclosure to CHRB that 'We meet or talk regularly "in person" or by phone on a range of issues with the FLA [Fair Labour Association], Workers Rights Consortium ("WRC"), Maquiladora Solidarity Network, the America's Group, representatives of the International Labour Organization Better Work programs globally, local members of the NGO community and labour organizations (including unions that exist in many of our facilities)'. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] <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 states in its Human Rights policy 'Hanesbrands respects human rights, and we are committed to identifying, preventing, and remediating adverse human rights impacts that results from or are caused by our business activities'. The Company also discloses that 'we are committed to investigating, addressing and responding to any such issues raised and to taking appropriate corrective action in response to any violation of this policy'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Not obstructing access to other remedies: The Company communicates in its Human Rights Policy that 'We have not and will not impede state-based judicial or non-judicial actions in favour of persons making allegations of adverse human rights actions and have not and will not require anyone to waive legal rights as a condition of participating in our grievance process'. [Human Rights Policy, N/A: hanesforgood.com] Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives Not met: Work with AP suppliers to remedy impacts

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 committed to each ILO core

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company states on its website that 'our Vice President, Corporate Social Responsibility, formally manages our social responsibility and environmental compliance programs. He is responsible for ensuring organizational alignment and managing our social and environmental partnerships and business partner communications. He leads a department comprising a worldwide network of more than 15 internal corporate social responsibility employees based in the United States, Latin America and Asia. This team is responsible for developing and overseeing the Global Ethics and Compliance program' and 'oversight of the program at the executive level rests with our Chief Legal Officer, as well as a Corporate Social Responsibility executive steering committee (our Chief Executive Officer and his direct reports) that meets three times a year to assess the program's effectiveness. Day-to-day responsibility for our Corporate Social Responsibility program rests with our vice president of corporate social responsibility'. The Responses to Corporate Human Rights Benchmark document discloses that the Vice President of Corporate Social Responsibility 'works very closely with the President Global Supply Chain and his direct team who oversee our internal manufacturing and product sourcing operations. The Vice President of Corporate Social Responsibility sits in the President Global Supply Chain's weekly staff meetings and discusses human rights and other issues in real time with him and his entire team and provides quarterly updates of key issues and trend data generated from our scorecard audit process'. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: The Hanesbrands human rights program is overseen by the Vice President of Corporate Social Responsibility, who reports directly to the company's Chief Administrative Officer, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary. He also works very closely with the President Global Supply Chain and his direct team who oversee our internal manufacturing and product sourcing operations. The VP CSR sits in the President Global Supply Chain's weekly staff meetings and discusses human rights and other issues in real time with him and his entire team and provides quarterly updates of key issues and trend data generated from our scorecard audit process. In addition, the VP of Corporate Social Responsibility provides quarterly reporting to a CSR committee composed of, among others, the Chief Executive Officer and his senior executive team. This organization structure was designed to embed the respect for human rights throughout our organization – and to have both senior-level oversight and day-to-day engagement in our human rights program. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for AP in supply chain: See above.
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company discloses in its Responses to Corporate Human Rights Benchmark document that its scorecard audit process, covering over 200 questions to its owned and contractor facilities, 'provides a wealth of information about our substantive and geographic risks'. In the Disclosure Document 2019, the company indicates that 'our nearly constant access and review of our scored audits is the process of identifying and analyzing our human rights risks'. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org & Disclosure 2019, 17/07/19: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Identifying risks in AP suppliers: As above. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org & Disclosure 2019, 17/07/19: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company states in its Response to CHRB Company Assessment that 'addresses its salient human rights issues through its extensive ERM process. The leadership team charged with oversight of the ERM process meets regularly (3 – 4 times a year) with the VP CSR and others to discuss those risks. There is a specific section in the ERM document reviewed with the Audit Committee of the Board that is dedicated to human rights risks and is updated several times each year'. However the Company does not describe how geographical, economic, social or other relevant factors are taken into account neither discloses the results of the assessment. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in AP supply chain • Met: Example of Actions decided: The Company discloses in its Responses to Corporate Human Rights Benchmark document its understanding of 'withholding passports and recruitment fees can often lead to situations tantamount to forced labour' and provides the example of 'a number of occasions when we have required contractors to stop withholding passports and/or to repay employees for recruitment fees that employees improperly incurred as a condition of continuing our business with them'. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company discloses in its Responses to Corporate Human Rights Benchmark document that tracks 'corrective action plans developed as part of our scorecard auditing process in custom designed, web-based software. This software allows us and the suppliers, easy access to a facility's required corrective actions. Our internal compliance teams work closely with each supplier to ensure appropriate remedial actions are taken and corrective action plans are closed in the system'. The Company states in its Response to CHRB Company Assessment that 'We routinely use the data generated to make decisions on who we should focus our remedial efforts on and which facilities should be excluded from our supply chain network. In 2017, we will disapprove in excess of 50 factories based on data generated in the software.' [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: As for lessons learned, the Company states that by using a scored auditing tool, they numerically track improvement (or lack thereof) over time. Improvements on issues like hours worked are often driven by the leverage the Company has with a facility. The Company states 'We have learned through this process that we need fewer, larger facilities to have the leverage to continue to sustainably effect positive change on a range of human rights issues'. However, this indicator looks for evidence of lessons learn tracking effectiveness of actions taken to specifically face a particular salient issue. Evidence found refers to lessons learnt in terms of system operation rather than how actions taken for a particular issue prove to be effective. No further evidence found. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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 • 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: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.3

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 AP 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns [Disclosure 2019, 17/07/19: business-humanrights.org] • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company's Global Code of Conduct, which contains the human rights policy, discloses the options for employees to raise concerns. Among them, a third-party ethics point website, an email address and a toll-free phone line with translators 'available to speak in your native language'. Moreover, the Responses to Corporate Human Rights Benchmark document discloses that Hanesbrands uses a third-party resource, Navex Global, to answer and log employee 'complaints/issues in over 20 different languages. There are toll-free "Resource Lines" in every country in which we do business (nearly 40) accessible 24/7, 365 days/year, as well as a web link that employees (...) can use to come forward with a complaint or issue confidentially and without fear of any reprisal' and 'retaliation in any form will not be tolerated'. [Hanesbrands Global Code of Conduct, 03/05/2018: hanesforgood.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: In its public disclosure in CHRB Platform, the Company indicates that 'the channel is available in over 20 languages. All appropriate languages'. [Disclosure 2019, 17/07/19: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Expect AP supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: In their response to the CHRB the Company states 'We also have well-developed open door policies that employees in our plants and elsewhere have helped to design and implement. We expect our third party suppliers to have similar, appropriate grievance systems, and monitor them through our scorecard auditing process.' In addition the Company clarified to the CHRB that 'All suppliers are given a full copy of our audit protocol so this requirement is conveyed to them. If they fail to do so, they are required to implement an appropriate grievance system as part of the corrective action process.' [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org & CHRB Score Sheet Response, 18/06/2018] • Not met: Opens own system to AP supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company's Responses to Corporate Human Rights Benchmark document discloses that Hanesbrands uses a third-party resource, Navex Global, to answer and log 'third-party complaints/issues in over 20 different languages. There are toll-free "Resource Lines" in every country in which we do business (nearly 40) accessible 24/7, 365 days/year, as well as a web link that (...) third-parties can use to come forward with a complaint or issue confidentially and without fear of any reprisal' and 'retaliation in any form will not be tolerated'. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: See above • Not met: Expects AP supplier to have community grievance systems: The same document states that Hanesbrands expects its suppliers 'to have appropriate grievance systems and monitor that through our scorecard auditing process'. However it is unclear if they convey the same expectation to their suppliers. [Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: AP supplier communities use global system
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and	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: The Company explains in its Response to CHRB Company Assessment the scorecard auditing process. The

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	incorporating lessons learned		<p>Company states ' As items are corrected, the facility's score increases, and we are able to track those increases over time.' Moreover, In its public disclosure in CHRB Platform 2019, the company indicates that 'as for the corrective action process, our internal compliance teams work directly with factories on all open corrective action items until they are fully remediated. A simple example is finding a blocked fire extinguisher and seeing to it that the blockage is removed. (...) All identified corrective actions are tracked in a sophisticated software system by our compliance teams who work directly with facilities to ensure corrective actions are fully implemented'. No evidence found with regards to how 'items are corrected' and the process for providing remedy for individuals (timely remedy for any salient adverse human right impacts or the approach taken in case any identified).</p> <p>[Submission to the CHRB Disclosure Platform: 'Response to CHRB', 28/03/2018: business-humanrights.org & Disclosure 2019, 17/07/19: business-humanrights.org]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <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 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