

Company Name Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd. (Foxconn)
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
UNGP Core Score (*) 4.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
Governance and Policy Commitments		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
0.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
1	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence		
Embedding respect		
0.5	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
0	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
0	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
0	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
4.0	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 its Code of Conduct Policy, the Company states that it 'is committed to uphold the human rights of workers, and to treat them with dignity and respect as understood by the international community. This applies to all workers including temporary, migrant, student, contract, direct employees, and any other type of worker.' [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: UDHR: The Company indicates that 'The recognized standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) have been used as references in preparing this Code.' However, to have used a standard as reference is not a commitment to respects the rights set out in the standard. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: International Bill of Rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs • Not met: OECD
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"> • Not met: ILO Core: The Code of Conduct Policy includes provisions for all ILO core: Non-Discrimination; Child Labor Prohibition and Young Workers Protection; Freedom of association and collective bargaining ('IN accordance with local law Foxconn respects the rights of all workers to associate freely, join labor union, bargain collectively, and engage in peaceful assembly as well as respects the right of workers refrains from such activities.'); • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: See above. In addition, the Company states: 'Foxconn's downstream suppliers are required to comply with this CoC policy to the same level of standards which the supply-chain partners and industrial associations set for the ICT industry.' [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: See above [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Code also includes provisions to respect Health and Safety of workers, including the following topics: Machine Safeguarding; Industrial Hygiene; Occupational Safety; Emergency Preparedness; Occupational Injury and Illness; Ergonomics; Sanitation, Food, and Housing; and Health and Safety Communication. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers: See above. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: working hours for workers: With respect Working hours, the Company indicates in its Code: 'Except in emergency under some unusual situations, a workweek shall be restricted to 60 hours including overtime, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off for every six days worked as stipulated in the RBA CoC'. 'In addition, overtime shall be voluntary, and vacation, leave periods, and holidays should be rendered consistently with applicable laws and regulations'. However, no evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. In addition, it not clear what 'exceptional or unusual situations' would be. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: See above [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.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"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: In its website section 'Stakeholder engagement', the Company discloses a table summarizing its stakeholder engagement activities per group, including communities, suppliers and employees. For each one it discloses communication channels, frequency, topics and issues of interests and 'efforts and outcomes'. [Stakeholder engagement actions, 04/2019: ser.foxconn.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	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy <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

Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0.5	<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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its SER Report 2017, the Company indicates: 'In March 2007, Foxconn established the Group's Global Social and Environmental Responsibility Committee (FGSC). [...] Every year, the FGSC conducts evaluations and audits of the various business groups to ensure that the SER policy is integrated across Foxconn's operations and at every manufacturing facility. [...] the committee has established independent and professional bodies and separate SER teams within the business groups to ensure that social and environmental responsibility is fully integrated into the company's corporate culture and that our SER policy is adhered to, implemented, and monitored by the FGSC.' Additionally, The Company states in its 2019 CSR Report that its CSR Committee organizes internal audits activities each year to ensure compliance with its CSR policies, it includes ethics, health and safety. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, 06/2018: foxconn.com & CSR Report 2019, N/A: foxconn.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: See above. In addition, it states: 'Foxconn has established a team of more than 1,000 SER professionals to work with customers, government agencies, and the community, to enhance transparency and to implement Foxconn's SER duties and responsibilities.' The Company also states in its CSR Report, that: ' As of 2019, The Group has established a full-time CSR team composed of 1,000 people from our plants all around the world to interact closely with our clients, the government, and all sectors of society, which helps to enhance corporate transparency as part of our comprehensive commitment to promotion of our social and environmental duties.' [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, 06/2018: foxconn.com & CSR Report 2019, N/A: foxconn.com] • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: Against its human rights Policy, the Company states that conducts annual risk assessment and audits. Additionally, it states that requires relevant units to implement timely improvements to ensure the rights to ensure the rights and benefits of its employees. However, no further details against human rights risks identification. [CSR Report 2019, N/A: foxconn.com] • Not met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers <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): Although the Company indicates in its SER Report 2017 that it has Risk Assessment and Risk Management Systems, no further information found on a specific system to assess Human Rights Risks. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, 06/2018: foxconn.com & CSR Report 2019, N/A: foxconn.com] 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	0	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 ICT supply chain Not met: Example of Actions decided 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: System to check if Actions are effective Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness 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 Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans Not met: Including ICT suppliers Score 2 <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	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: In its SER 2017, the Company indicates: 'The Labor Union has instituted an integrated system to care for, protect the rights of, and support our employees. This includes hotlines at all of our campuses, and dedicated phone numbers to reach key business functions and departments, for employees to share feedback, and to provide employees with care and counseling services. [...] employees are able to communicate with the unions and the company's management team directly'. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, 06/2018: foxconn.com & CSR Report 2019, N/A: foxconn.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company discloses some information such as 'In 2017, Foxconn received a total of 28,000 employee feedback submissions and achieved a successful case resolution rate of 99.3%', however, there is no specific information about the number of grievances related to human rights. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, 06/2018: foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: foxconn.com] Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: Its Code of Conduct requires to have in place a management system which includes a 'Worker Feedback, Participation and Grievance Ongoing processes, including 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'. However, no evidence found of a requirement to cascade the same expectation down its suppliers' supply chain. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	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: Grievance mechanism for community <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects ICT supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: ICT supplier communities use global system
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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: Describes how remedy has been provided • 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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline: Foxconn accused by China Labour Watch of non-respect of working conditions • Area: Working hours • Story: China Labor Watch (CLW) published the report of investigation it conducted at Hengyang Foxconn, a unit of Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd. (Foxconn). The factory manufactures Amazon's Kindle, Echo Dots and tablets. The report detailed issues of working conditions at the factory between August 2007 and April 2018. The issues identified in the report include excessive working hours (over 100 hours of overtime per month at peak production season) exceeding the legal overtime limit in China. In addition, it was claimed that some workers worked 14 days in a row with no days off. • Sources: [The Verge, 11/06/2018: theverge.com][China Labor Watch, 10/06/2018: chinalaborwatch.org][Reuters, 10/06/2018: reuters.com][Reuters, 10/06/2018: reuters.com]
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	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: Public response available: The Company states that "We are carrying out a full investigation of the areas raised by that report, and if found to be true, immediate actions will be taken to bring the operations into compliance with our Code of Conduct." [Reuters' article on excessive working hours in China, 06/2018: reuters.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response goes into detail: The Company did not publish details of the case.
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	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: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that "The recognized standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) have been used as references in preparing this Code", "Foxconn recognizes that unreasonable overtime for workers will result in reduced productivity, increased turnover, and increased injury and illness rates. Except in 6 emergency under some unusual situations, a workweek shall be restricted to 60 hours including overtime, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off for every six days worked as stipulated in the EICC CoC." [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "Foxconn's downstream suppliers are required to comply with this CoC policy to the same level of standards which the supply chain partners and industrial associations set for the ICT industry." [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company states that "Foxconn recognizes that unreasonable overtime for workers will result in reduced productivity, increased turnover, and increased injury and illness rates. Except in 6 emergency under some unusual situations, a workweek shall be restricted to 60 hours including overtime, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off for every six days worked as stipulated in the EICC CoC." [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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: The Company stated "If infractions are identified, we work to immediately rectify them". However, there is no evidence found of the Company's providing remedies. [Reuters' article on excessive working hours in China, 06/2018: reuters.com] • Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company reviewing the system followed by the case. Score 2 <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