

Company Name TE Connectivity
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
UNGP Core Score (*) 4.5 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 |
| 0 | 2 | A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders |
| 0.5 | 2 | A.1.5 Commitment to remedy |
| Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence | | |
| Embedding respect | | |
| 0 | 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 | | |
| 1.5 | 2 | C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers |
| 1 | 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 |
| 4.5 | 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: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact since 2011. [UN Global Compact: unglobalcompact.org] <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"> • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact since 2011. [UN Global Compact: unglobalcompact.org & 2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.com] • Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Company has policy on forced labour, child labour, anti-discrimination, and freedom of association in its Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility. However, the Company does not have policy on collective bargaining. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company states 'We are committed to human rights, which includes prohibiting all forms of forced labor, the hiring of underage individuals and the hiring of individuals under the age of 18 for positions where hazardous work is required. We also prohibit any form of physical punishment or abuse.' It also states 'For us, an acceptable standard of human rights means freely chosen employment that provides employees with freedom of association, equal opportunities, clean and safe working environments, protection from any form of harassment, and all benefits mandated by applicable laws.' Also, it commits to base its employment decisions according to 'applicable union collective bargaining agreements'. [2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states that it is committed to providing a safe working environment for all employees. It does this by following strict safety and security rules and practices. Its Health and Safety principles and practices include occupational safety, occupational injury and illness reporting and investigation, industrial hygiene, etc. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019] • Met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers: The Company states that it also requires its suppliers to follow its Health and Safety principles and practices. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019] • Not met: working hours for workers: The Company states that it supports the principles that work weeks are not to exceed the maximum allowable hours set by local law. A work week 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 per seven-day week. The Company also states 'We closely monitor our facilities to protect fair and reasonable working hours, wages and benefits for all employees.' However, no evidence found of references to standard weekly hours (no more than 48 hours excluding overtime) or the Company explicitly committing to respect ILO conventions on working hours. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019 & 2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.com] • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: The Company states that it also requires its suppliers to follow its Labour and Human Rights related principles, including working hours. However, no evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019] |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|
| A.1.4 | Commitment to engage with stakeholders | 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 stakeholder engagement: The Company states that it engages with its stakeholders, including customers, community leaders, employees, commercial partners and investors, to gather their views and interests about the Company, its performance, culture and community engagement. However, we could not find a commitment to stakeholder engagement on the company's documents. [2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.com] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: Although the Company reports how it engages with stakeholders, no evidence found indicating ongoing process of engagement. [2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.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 | 0.5 | <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 remedy: The Company has provided comments to CHRB regarding this indicator. However, evidence was not material. [Slavery and Modern Slavery Statement, 2019: te.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 • Met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts: The Company states that its remediation of instances of non-compliance can include a number of activities, such as the Company and suppliers working together to create a corrective action plan for achieving compliance in a clearly defined and reasonable time frame, encouragement for improvement through regular communications with non-compliant suppliers, defining a roadmap for gradually increasing standards and expectations; and termination of a supplier relationship when serious compliance issues are not remedied in spite of repeated notifications. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019] |

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 | <p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. The Company is signatory to the UN Global Compact. • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: Although the Company states: 'We are good corporate citizens, who value our place in the global community and respect all applicable civil rights, human rights and labor laws in the locations where we operate', there are no further evidences indicating a senior responsibility for human rights issues. [Guide to Ethical Conduct, 2020: te.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • 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 • 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 |
| B.2.2 | Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks) | 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: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|---|
| B.2.3 | 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 | 1.5 | 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 maintains an Office of the Ombudsman, an independent, impartial and confidential resource for its employees, suppliers, investors and customers to report and/or discuss possible violations of laws, policies, rules, regulations of the Guide to Ethical Conduct. In addition, the Company also has an independently managed 24-hour reporting hotline and website to provide a safe and anonymous means for employees and external stakeholders to report any possible violations of laws, policies, rules, regulations or the Guide. [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 2018: te.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company states that 'In fiscal year 2019, the Office of Ombudsman received approximately 1,000 cases. Of cases closed during fiscal year 2019, approximately 46 percent were substantiated, and appropriate actions were taken to address those matters. Of the unsubstantiated allegations, approximately 19 percent led to additional corrective actions even though unsubstantiated, enabling TE to change a business process, rectify an inefficiency or clarify a policy'. However, it is not clear how many of them addressed human rights issues. [Office of Ombudsman, N/A: te.com & 2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.com] Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages Not met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems Met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers: See above. The office of the Ombudsman is open to suppliers. [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 2018: te.com] |
| C.2 | Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external | 1 | 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 states 'The Ombudsman is a TE employee and the Office of Ombudsman acts as an independent, impartial, and confidential resource to whom employees, suppliers, investors, customers, and other third parties can communicate questions or address concerns about potential violations of the Guide, TE policies, ethics and compliance, applicable laws or regulations, safety, or other serious concerns. All issues reported are taken seriously and appropriately investigated and resolved. TE |

| Indicator Code | Indicator name | Score (out of 2) | Explanation |
|----------------|---|------------------|---|
| | individuals and communities | | encourages all employees to report their concerns, and retaliation is prohibited for reports made in good faith'. [Office of Ombudsman, N/A: te.com] Score 2 <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 | 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 • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <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