

Company Name Intel
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
UNGP Core Score (*) 13.5 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		
2	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
1.5	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
1	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
1	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0.5	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms		
1.5	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
2	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
1.5	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
13.5	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: Its Global Human Rights Principles 'formalizes Intel's commitment to respect human rights and embodies common principles reflected in the United Nations (UN) Global Compact, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, core International Labour Organization Conventions, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and the laws of the countries in which we operate' [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company is signatory of the UNGC. [UN Global Compact Commitment: unglobalcompact.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs: See above. However, the statement is not considered a formal commitment to the UNGP according to CHRB wording criteria, as it indicates that human rights principles embody principles 'reflected' in the UNGPs. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] • Not met: OECD: See above. However, the statement is not considered a formal commitment to the OECD Guidelines for MNEs according to CHRB wording criteria, as it indicates that human rights principles embody principles 'reflected' in the UNGPs. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com]
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: ILO Core: The Company includes in its Global Human Rights Principles provisions in relation to discrimination, child labour, and forced labour. In relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining, the Company indicates states the following: 'Intel recognizes that in many of the locations where we operate, employees have the right to freely associate or no associate with third-party organizations such as labor organizations, along with the right to bargain or not bargain collectively in accordance with local laws. Intel respect those rights and its further committed to treating our employees with dignity and respect [...].' However, no evidence found of a commitment to respect these rights in all contexts and locations, as it is not clear if the Company respects freedom of association and collective bargaining in those locations where they are restricted under local law. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is signatory of the UNGC. [UN Global Compact Commitment: unglobalcompact.org] • Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Company indicates in its Global Human Rights Principles that it 'expects [its] suppliers to maintain progressive employment, environmental, health and safety, and ethics practices that meet or exceed all applicable laws and relevant external codes such as the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct, Intel's Code of Conduct, and these Human Rights Principles.' In addition, the Company used RBA Code of Conduct to set out the expectation to its suppliers. The RBA Code of Conduct includes provisions in relation to forced labour, child labour and discrimination. In relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining, it states the following: 'In conformance with local law, participants shall respect the right of all workers to form and join trade unions of their own choosing, to bargain collectively and to engage in peaceful assembly as well as respect the right of workers to refrain from such activities.' 'However, it is not clear whether the Company is respecting those rights in all contexts, as it indicates 'in conformance with local law'. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com & RBA Code of Conduct (Version 6.0), 2018: responsiblebusiness.org]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: See above. It is not clear if the Company is committed to provide alternative or parallel mechanisms where rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining are restricted under local law. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: According to its Global Human Rights Principles, the Company 'is committed to providing a safe and healthful workplace for our employees, contractors, and communities.' [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] • Met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers: See above. In addition, the RBA Code of Conduct sets out health and safety standards for suppliers. This Code used OHSAS 18001 and ILO Guidelines on Occupational Safety and Health as reference to set the standards. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com & RBA Code of Conduct (Version 6.0), 2018: responsiblebusiness.org] • Not met: working hours for workers: The Company indicates in its Global Human Rights Principles document: 'Working hours are not to exceed the maximum set by local law or no more than 60 hours per week, whichever is stricter. Workers should not work longer than 6 consecutive days without at least one day off. [...] Intel expects its suppliers to comply with these expectations.' However, no evidence found of references to standard weekly hours or the Company explicitly committing to respect ILO conventions on working hours. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: See above. In the RBA Code of Conduct, used by the Company in its Supply Chain, it is indicated: 'Working hours are not to exceed the maximum set by local law. Further, a workweek should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be allowed at least one day off every seven days.' However, no evidence found of references to standard weekly hours or the Company explicitly committing to respect ILO conventions on working hours. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com & RBA Code of Conduct (Version 6.0), 2018: responsiblebusiness.org]
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: The Company states in its CSR 2019 that it is 'committed to operating with transparency and, through open and direct communication, we work to develop trusted relationships with all stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, governments, and communities.' [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csreportbuilder.intel.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: In addition, it states: 'We use a range of methods and inputs to identify priority topics and emerging issues from our stakeholders. SOURCES: [...]; Results of community advisory panels and surveys; Employee open forums and surveys; Human rights impact assessment and ethics and compliance processes; [...]. We review issues and consider both the potential impact on stakeholder decisions and the impact on Intel's business and external systems.' Additionally, on its Report Builder website, under Salient Human Rights Risk Mapping, the Company provides a detailed chart explaining the salient risks, the rightsholders, and the stakeholders engaged. However, it is not clear how specifically engages with affected stakeholders to inform human rights approach or monitoring. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csreportbuilder.intel.com & CSR Report Builder, N/A: intel.com]
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: In its Human Rights Principles document, the Company states: 'We have put in place formal grievance and remedy processes to enable anyone, including employees, employees of Intel's suppliers, and other external stakeholders, to report human rights concerns through our third-party-operated ethics reporting portal. We will promptly investigate allegations and pursue action to mitigate any adverse human rights impacts.' However, the commitment to remedy is not clear in terms of remedying any adverse impacts that it has caused or contributed to, as it seems to focus on reports made through the grievance mechanisms to initiate a process. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts: The Company states in its CSR Report from 2019-2020 it has 'worked to build a strong system to detect and address risks of forced and bonded labor among our suppliers and their recruiting and labor agents, including reaching over 160 suppliers at the tier 2 level.' Additionally, in its Statement on Combating Modern Slavery, the Company provides evidence of educating suppliers on forced labour. However, no evidence found of commitment or work carried out collaboratively with suppliers to provide remedy either through the suppliers own mechanisms or through the development of third party non-judicial remedies. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com & Statement on Combating Modern Slavery 2019, 05/2020: intel.com]

Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is committed to UNGC. • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its CSR 2019-2020, the Company indicates: 'We have established cross-functional Management Review Committees (MRCs) consisting of senior executives who manage corporate responsibility and sustainability activities across the organization. Our global Corporate Responsibility Office acts as an internal adviser to the business groups and MRCs to drive strategic alignment and incorporate external stakeholder input into decision processes'. Sustainability and corporate responsibility include human rights. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition, the Company indicates that 'responsibility is also embedded across the company through a cross-Intel Human Rights Steering Committee and close partnerships with global teams that develop and implement policies and actions related to our human rights risks'. Moreover, the Company discloses further information in its Salient Human Rights Risk Mapping Report, where it shows how each of its salient human rights risks is integrated into its value chain and is overseen by the most relevant business unit. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com & CR 2018 - Salient Human Rights Risk Mapping: intel.com] • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain: The Salient Human Rights Risks Mapping Report, include issues related to Supply Chain, such as: force labor, legal wages, working hours or mineral from conflict affected and high-risk areas. In this document, the Company discloses the units/teams in charge to implement its policy commitments for each one of the issues. For instance, to face the 'Force Labor' risks, the Company applies the Intel Corporation Anti-Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement and the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Commitment Letter through the following teams: Corporate Responsibility Office, Employment Labor and Benefits, Global Supply Management, Government, Markets, and Trade Group, Legal. [CR 2018 - Salient Human Rights Risk Mapping: intel.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	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: Identifying risks in own operations: In its CSR 2018, the Company indicates: 'In 2016, we engaged a third party to conduct a human rights impact assessment (HRIA) to review our processes and validate our human rights risks. The HRIA confirmed that we were addressing our most salient human rights risks, and reaffirmed our need to assess potential risks associated with emerging technologies. In 2018, we built on the results of that assessment and conducted an additional internal Artificial Intelligence and Autonomous Driving HRIA, including assessment of potential risks related to product misuse, algorithmic bias, algorithmic transparency, privacy infringement, limits on freedom of expression, and health and safety. In 2019, an internal multi-disciplinary team continued development of new internal resources and processes to advance responsible AI practices and ensure that AI lives up to its potential as a positive transformative force for the global economy, health, public safety, and industries such as transportation, agriculture, and healthcare that touch billions of people.' In 2017 report it also indicated that In response to the HRIA, in 2017: We launched a Human Rights Steering Group responsible for reinforcing Intel's culture of respecting human rights corporate-wide. The group meets quarterly or as necessary to develop strategies to avoid contributing to human rights abuse through our operations, supply chain, and products; consider emerging issues; and address any violations as they occur; We engaged human rights experts to facilitate a cross-functional workshop to enable us to more effectively identify and manage the potential human rights impacts of emerging technologies'. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com & Corporate Responsibility Report 2017, 2018: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] • Met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers: See above. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com & Corporate Responsibility Report 2017, 2018: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: See above [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. • Met: In consultation with HR experts: See above. Although the Company does not name the experts it worked with, it details the work carried out by it. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com & Corporate Responsibility Report 2017, 2018: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	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: Salient risk assessment (and context): In its CSR 2019-2020, the Company indicates: 'In 2016, we engaged a third party to conduct a human rights impact assessment (HRIA) to review our processes and validate our human rights risks. The HRIA confirmed that we were addressing our most salient human rights risks, and reaffirmed our need to assess potential risks associated with emerging technologies. In 2018, we built on the results of that assessment and conducted an additional internal Artificial Intelligence and Autonomous Driving HRIA, including assessment of potential risks related to product misuse, algorithmic bias, algorithmic transparency, privacy infringement, limits on freedom of expression, and health and safety. In 2019, an internal multi-disciplinary team continued development of new internal resources and processes to advance responsible AI practices and ensure that AI lives up to its potential as a positive transformative force for the global economy, health, public safety, and industries such as transportation, agriculture, and healthcare that touch billions of people.' Additionally, in its Statement on Combating Modern Slavery, it states 'We combine insights from these reports with our own questionnaire responses, audit results, and input from experts in this area to continuously refine and strengthen our overall risk management and verification processes.' However, no evidence found on how different factors were taken into account, such as geographical, economic, social or other factors in determine saliency of different human rights issues. The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com & Statement on Combating Modern Slavery 2019, 05/2020: intel.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company discloses its salient human rights issues in its CSR 2019-2020: 'Discrimination; Forced Labor; Freedom of Expression and Privacy; Health and Safety; Living wage; Raw minerals; Water; Working Hours'. [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company states in its CR Report 2018: 'To begin addressing these challenges, in 2018 we formed an internal AI Ethics and Human Rights team and co-hosted a Business and Human Rights AI roundtable that brought together leading technology companies to improve learning about potential human rights risks related to emerging technologies.' However, no further information found about the steps taken / Action Plan designed to face the human rights risks identified and assessed, particularly related to labour rights. No further evidence could be found in the latest report. [CSR Report 2018, 2019: csrreportbuilder.intel.com & 2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] • Not met: Including in ICT supply chain: The Company describes the following in its CSR Report 2019-2020: 'Supplier Program to Accelerate Responsibility and Commitment (SPARC). This collaborative and proactive initiative is designed to help our tier 1 critical suppliers build internal capacity around corporate responsibility through rigorous annual commitments to compliance, transparency, and capability-building.' However, no system to take action to prevent, mitigate or remediate salient human rights issues in the supply chain found (not description on whether capability building is intended to face specific salient issues). The Company has provided additional comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material (seems focused in compliance monitoring actions). [2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] • Met: Example of Actions decided: In addition, it indicates: 'In 2017, we required that 17 of our suppliers who employ foreign and migrant workers embark on deep analyses of their risk-management approaches. The process includes an audit of at least one recruiting agent per supplier. Thus far, five audits have been conducted, with positive results overall. Suppliers are addressing common findings such as inconsistent communications, monitoring, and management systems. As a result of these efforts, we have pinpointed risks deeper in our supply chain. In 2018, we identified risks and gaps in the areas of construction and packaging, and are now looking more broadly at suppliers in those areas. We also required that approximately 50 of our suppliers work with at least three of their own major suppliers to assess and address their risks of forced and bonded labor. Our work at this tier 2 level has resulted in changes to supplier policies and procedures, and stronger engagements with recruiting and labor agents. We have uncovered and are now addressing a number of issues, including fees and passport holding.' [CSR Report 2018, 2019: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. It seems to focus in audits and corrective action plans. This indicator looks for evidence of how the Company tracks broad risk mitigation measures for specific salient issues, to determine whether actions have been effective. • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0.5	<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: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B.2.1. The Company has describes system to identify risks in both own operations and supply chain. This is on going and includes human rights expert consultation. • 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 • 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including ICT suppliers: In order to be awarded this indicator, the Company has to achieve a full score in B.2.2/B.2.3/B.2.4 and at least 1,5 points in B.2.1 Score 2 • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company indicates in its Global Human Rights Principles that it has 'put in place formal grievance and remedy processes to enable anyone, including employees, employees of Intel's suppliers, and other external stakeholders, to report human rights concerns through our third-party-operated ethics reporting portal.' [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: Its Ethics Point Portal is available in English, Spanish and Chinese. In addition, in its Anti-Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, the Company indicates that 'Individuals can report concerns to Intel by email, telephone, or letter, in English or their local language.' [Reporting Portal, Ap 2019: secure.ethicspoint.com & Anti-Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement 2018, 05/2019: intel.com] • Met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: The RBA Code of Conduct indicates that suppliers' management systems should contain: '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.' And it also requires that 'At a minimum, Participants shall also require its next tier suppliers to acknowledge and implement the Code.' [RBA Code of Conduct (Version 6.0), 2018: responsiblebusiness.org] • Met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers: See above [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.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 Global Human Rights Principles that it has 'put in place formal grievance and remedy processes to enable anyone, including employees, employees of Intel's suppliers, and other external stakeholders, to report human rights concerns through our third-party-operated ethics reporting portal'. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: Its Ethics Point Portal is available in English, Spanish and Chinese. In addition, in its Anti-Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, the Company indicates that 'Individuals can report concerns to Intel by email, telephone, or letter, in English or their local language.' [Reporting Portal, Ap 2019: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Met: ICT supplier communities use global system: See above, the Company's systems are open to anyone. [Global Human Rights Principles 2019 update, 11/2019: intel.com]
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Company indicates in its CSR Report 2019-2020: 'As a result of our efforts, our suppliers have returned over \$15 million in fees to workers since 2014. [...] Our ongoing assessments and efforts to reach deeper into the supply chain encompass more than 38,000 workers in our extended supply chain.' In addition, in its Anti-Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement 2018, it declared: 'Our diligence continues to positively impact workers throughout the supply chain, having returned approximately \$15 million in fees to more than 13,100 workers since 2014. Since that time, new rigorous practices and policies also help ensure fee collection does not easily recur. To date, we have improved the lives of approximately 38,000 workers through fee repayments, returned passports, amended contracts, and other improvements related to anti-

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>slavery and human trafficking'. [Statement on Combating Modern Slavery 2019, 05/2020: intel.com & 2019-2020 CSR Report, 2020: csrreportbuilder.intel.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Changes introduced to stop repetition: In its 2018 CR Report, the Company states: 'As a result of our efforts, our suppliers have returned over \$14 million in fees to workers since 2014. In some instances, we have faced challenges in gaining cooperation in repaying workers quickly, and we work closely with suppliers to determine acceptable gap closure plans. As we have learned more about the contributing factors to forced and bonded labor, we have adjusted our tools and processes to align with likely risks. Many challenges exist in combating this issue, in particular, lack of full visibility into our multi-tier supply chain and difficulty in tracing the multiple levels of recruiting and labor agents who source workers. Through our work on this issue, we have found that some of the agents take advantage of vulnerable workers. We believe that addressing agent risks is a critical part of eliminating the root causes of the issue. In 2017, we required that 17 of our suppliers who employ foreign and migrant workers embark on deep analyses of their risk-management approaches. The process includes an audit of at least one recruiting agent per supplier. Thus far, five audits have been conducted, with positive results overall. Suppliers are addressing common findings such as inconsistent communications, monitoring, and management systems.' [CSR Report 2018, 2019: csrreportbuilder.intel.com] • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material.

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