

Company Name ANTA Sports Products
Industry Apparel (Supply Chain and Own Operations)
Overall Score (*) 7.5 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.3	10	A. Governance and Policies
1.1	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.8	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.1	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.5	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.6	10	F. Transparency

(*) Please note that any small differences between the Overall Score and the added total of Measurement Theme scores are due to rounding the numbers at different stages of the score calculation process.

Please note also 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 2019 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

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	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: General HRs commitment: The Company describes that human rights is the most relevant key issue for its stakeholders. However, the Company does not explicitly disclose about a commitment related to human rights. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company has statement about Sustainable Development Goals but we were not able to find evidence as to whether the company has a commitment to UN Global Compact. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] Not met: UDHR 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	<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: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company states: 'To ensure our long-term development will be steady and progressive, we promise to fully abide by all kinds of law and regulations, including the "Labor Law of the People's Republic of China" and the "Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China".' However, there is no reference to ILO Conventions. It also indicates: 'We have formulated the "Child Labor Prohibition Policies and Remedial Procedures" to ensure zero child labor or forced labor in our

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>business. ' However, CHRB could not find these policies in the public domain. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for AP suppliers: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company states: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' These principles include: Child Labor, Forced Labor, Non discrimination, Health and Safety and Working hours; however it does not comply all requirement to met this indicator: 1. There is no commitment to respect human rights according to ILO Conventions; 2. Child Labor Principle refers only to local minimum working age; 3. There is no mention to freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: See above • Not met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company states that 'As a responsible employer, we do not want our staff to sacrifice themselves for the Group's revenue, and we will never exchange the health and safety of our employees for immediate benefits. We believe that only if staff feel the caring and respect from us, they would enjoy devoting into their work and develop their career [...] we do not encourage working overtime and we do not want our employees to be in an anxious state at work for a long time, so that they can stay physically and mentally healthy. However, we found no evidence of a H&S commitment. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: H&S applies to AP suppliers: Although the Company states that provides mechanisms to respect the health and safety of its workers, there is no evidence that these methods also applies to its suppliers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: working hours for workers: The Company mentions that 'during the peak production seasons, we will hire short-term employees to supplement the tight manpower situation'. However, there is no description about what are the maximum working hours for workers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Working hours for AP suppliers: See above. In addition, Working hour principles refer to 'provide wages and work record' [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]
A.1.3.AP	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (AP)	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: Women's Rights • Not met: Children's Rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
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 discloses that 'We believe stakeholders' views can help improve our policies and serve as a reference for the Group's sustainable development strategies. In order to ensure quality communication, we continued to invite professional third party as consulting company to collect stakeholders' opinions and gain a better understanding and evaluation on the potential risks. As usual, we continue to maintain two-way communication with both internal and external stakeholders. We collected their views to improve our current measures and provide some basis for the management to formulate cooperating policies'. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: In its Environment, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: ' We also engaged a consultancy firm to complete a wide range of tasks, including stakeholder engagement and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>materiality assessment. We had thorough communication with our stakeholders with the participation of independent third parties, so as to examine the overall performance of the Company.' The Company summarized its stakeholder engagement during the year in a table, which includes stakeholder group and topics. However, no evidence found on details of the engagement. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]</p> <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 AP suppliers to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	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: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects AP suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	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: CEO or Board approves policy • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	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: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	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: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key AP HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence (25% of Total)

B.1 Embedding Respect for Human Rights in Company Culture and Management Systems (10% of Total)

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"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for AP in supply chain
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	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: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key AP HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	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: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: In its Annual Report, the company presents the main risks faced by the Group, however there is no mention to human rights. [Annual Report, 2018: files.services]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'To ensure our long-term development will be steady and progressive, we promise to fully abide by all kinds of law and regulations, including the "Labor Law of the People's Republic of China" and the "Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China". We also implement a set of internal employees policies and procedures, with reference to the principle of voluntariness, consensus and honesty. By doing so, we can ensure that there will be no forced labor or child labor, and thus create a safe and friendly work environment. For instance, in terms of equal opportunities, we value the individual preferences of our employee, regardless of their gender, age, religion and race, and we hope to provide opportunities based on talents and merits.' Also, the Company states that 'for communication channels, we continued to organize an annual conference for distributors this year, getting all of them together and enhanced mutual communication'. However, there is no further information describing the steps taken to communicate these policies and there is no reference to human rights policy. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers Not met: Communicating policy down the whole AP supply chain: In its Annual Report, the Company indicates: 'Apart from maintaining close contact with suppliers, we also hosted several training camps and annual meetings with suppliers, to share our plans and trends within the industry. These initiatives have encouraged suppliers to produce more innovative products.' However, the Company does not describes how is the communication about its human rights policy and also does not mention human rights on this statement. In addition, in its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles. [...] we have established the "Certification on Quality Control Management Methods" that clearly listed the training content and operation standards of our suppliers.' The 10 principles include provisions related to Child Labor, Forced Labor and Discrimination. However, no details found on steps taken to communicate policies. [Annual Report, 2018: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Requiring AP suppliers to communicate policy down the chain: See above [Annual Report, 2018: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services] Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: See above [Annual Report, 2018: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services] Not met: Including on AP suppliers: See above [Annual Report, 2018: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2 Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments Not met: Trains relevant AP managers including procurement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2 Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Met: Monitoring AP suppliers: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: '[...] we assessed the performance of suppliers in the areas mentioned above [10 principles which include provisions related to Child Labor, Forced Labor, Discrimination, Working Hours, etc.] , then classified the suppliers into five groups based on the score: "Very satisfactory", "Satisfactory", "Acceptable", "Terminate cooperation" and "Unacceptable." If a supplier violates the "Zero Tolerance Indicator", it will immediately fall into the "Terminate cooperation" category. Unless the relevant issue has been resolved during the follow-up process, no new orders will be placed once the existing orders are completed. If a supplier violates other indicators, they have to improve in a required time frame, otherwise it will immediately fall into the "Terminate cooperation" category, and will not be permitted to manufacture any products for the Group. [...] We will send management staff to inspect the suppliers' factory, check all products and their manufacturing process on a regular basis, to ensure the overall performance will meet the required standards.' [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process: The company describes corrective action process. However, no evidence found on number of incidences. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of AP supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	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: HR affects AP selection of suppliers • Met: HR affects on-going AP supplier relationships: In its Environment, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' These Principles include provisions related to Child Labor, Forced Labor, Discrimination, Working Hours, Health and Safety, etc. In addition it states: 'If a supplier violates the "Zero Tolerance Indicator", it will immediately fall into the "Terminate cooperation" category. Unless the relevant issue has been resolved during the follow-up process, no new orders will be placed once the existing orders are completed. If a supplier violates other indicators, they have to improve in a required time frame, otherwise it will immediately fall into the "Terminate cooperation" category, and will not be permitted to manufacture any products for the Group. [...] We have started to implement a comprehensive reform of supply chain management. Through consolidating the assessment criteria of suppliers for all business units, we readjusted the assessment criteria. We are adopting a stricter assessment mechanism that includes the measurement of corporate social responsibility, including the requirements from international certification.' [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with AP suppliers to improve performance: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: We have the responsibility to monitor the suppliers' performance, so to ensure they are in compliance with the law and match with public expectation in the area of environment, social and governance; We are responsible for supervising suppliers so as to ensure they are in compliance with the "Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China" and relevant laws and regulations, and to give their employees reasonable treatment and protection; and We try our best to incorporate environmental protection elements into design and procurement consideration, and to provide more environmentally-friendly products for the customers. However, no details found on actual work carried out to improve suppliers' human rights performance. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services & Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially	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: Stakeholder process or systems: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company summarizes the engagement activities by

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	affected stakeholders		<p>stakeholder group. However, there is no information describing how it has identified its affected stakeholders nor the frequency and triggers for engagement on human rights issues. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: See above. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Workers in AP SC engaged [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Communities in the AP SC engaged [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]

B.2 Human Rights Due Diligence (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 AP 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
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in AP supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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 • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: 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 AP suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns • Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	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: Channel accessible to all workers: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In terms of reporting channels, we have established multiple channels for communication as usual. Employees can make an anonymous report to the audit department'. The Company provide its hotline number in which workers can make complaints. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company discloses number of complaints made by consumers. However, there is no description about human rights complaints received through its hotline mechanism. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect AP supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates that it started to 'integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' One of these principles is: 'Set up complaints mechanism and communication channels'. However there is no further information about this complaint mechanism, so it is not clear if the channel is also available for suppliers and the principle does not convey its suppliers to establish a grievance mechanism. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • 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	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 AP supplier to have community grievance systems: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates that it started to 'integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' One of these principles is: 'Set up complaints mechanism and communication channels'. However there is no further information about this complaint mechanism, so it is not clear if the channel is opened to communities or other external stakeholders. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: AP supplier communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	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: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: AP suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	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: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	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: Public statement prohibiting retaliation • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects AP suppliers to prohibit retaliation

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
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

D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.2.1.a	Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Achieved payment of living wage • Not met: Regularly review definition of living wage with unions
D.2.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.2.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.2.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to product source: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates that it has over 645 China Suppliers, and over 8 overseas Suppliers during 2017. However, there is no further information, so it is not clear whether it includes all direct and indirect suppliers and they are mapped. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why
D.2.4.a	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Does not use child labour: In its ESG Report, the Company states: 'We have formulated the "Child Labor Prohibition Policies and Remedial Procedures" to ensure zero child labor or forced labor in our business. We have signed labor contracts with employees to clearly designate the treatment for violations and responsibilities.' [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Age verification of job applicants and workers: See above. However, CHRB could not find referenced documents in the public domain, so there is no further information about the existence of age verification of applicants and workers procedures. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remediation if children identified: In addition, it indicates: 'Once we found that child labor is recruited by mistake, we will immediately take

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>the remedial solutions. First, a report will be sent to the labor department for review and verification. At the same time, the related staff will be asked to stop working immediately and they will be sent to the hospitals for a health check. If the staff is confirmed to be child labor, we will issue the full wages and notify the child's parents, so that the child will be passed to the hands of their guardians in a timely manner. Besides, we will retain the copy of the proof of age documents for record.' However, there is no information about how the company develops, participates in or contributes to programmes for transition from employment to education, enabling children to attend and remain in education when child labour is found in its operations and how it addresses working conditions for young workers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]</p>
D.2.4.b	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	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: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' The first principle is about Child Labor: 'Employees must meet the local minimum working age requirement; Obtain identification documents of the employee's age'. In addition, it states: 'We have formulated the "Child Labor Prohibition Policies and Remedial Procedures" to ensure zero child labor or forced labor in our business. We have signed labor contracts with employees to clearly designate the treatment for violations and responsibility. [...] When child labor is suspected, we will take corrective action immediately by reporting and verifying the case with labor department while sending the involved to hospital for check-up. Once it is confirmed, we will pay full salary, notify his/her family, and hand over to the guardian. Meanwhile, his/her information such as age certificate documentation is kept properly for record.' However, it is not clear if the 'Child Labor Prohibition Policies and Remedial Procedures' applies also for suppliers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress: In addition, it adds: 'During the year, we did not employ any employees under the age of 16'. However, no evidence found in relation to suppliers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2017: files.services]
D.2.5.a	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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: Pays workers in full and on time • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.2.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	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: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' One of these principles is related to Forced Labor: 'Cannot force employees to work, irrespective of their wills; Employment based on prison labor or collateral terms are not permitted'. However, there is no further information about debt bondage guidelines. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.2.5.c	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement Score 2 • Not met: How sure about agencies or brokers
D.2.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' One of these principles is related to Forced Labor: 'Cannot force employees to work, irrespective of their wills; Employment based on prison labor or collateral terms are not permitted'. However, there is no further information about guidelines on worker' freedom of movement. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.2.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: In its ESG Report, the Company discloses that the Number of work-related injuries in the last year is 58. Office Staff = 11 people, Retail Staff = 23 people, Factory Staff = 24 people; Ratio of work-related injuries: Office Staff = 0.2%, Retail Staff = 0.3%, Factory Staff = 0.3%; Number of work-related death: 0 people; Ratio of work-related death: 0%'. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosure: In its ESG Report, the Company discloses health and safety figures related to lost days due to work injuries: 'Office Staff = 319 days, Retail Staff = 1068 days, Factory Staff = 1104 days'. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Met: Fatalities disclosures: In its ESG Report, the Company discloses health and safety figures related to fatalities: ' Number of work-related death: 0 people; Ratio of work-related death: 0%. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] Score 2 • Not met: Set targets for H&S performance: In its ESG Report, the Company states: 'Through implementing various safety policies and procedures, we are committed to minimizing the potential risks in the work environment and avoid work injury.' However, there is no information about H&S targets. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Met targets or explains why not

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.2.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	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: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' One of these principles is related to Health and Safety: 'All facilities and their usage should obtain relevant operating and fire permits; Electrical equipment should be kept in good condition and properly maintained; Each workshop must be equipped with two exits, which led to a safe outdoor area; Keep emergency exits open'. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Injury rate disclosures: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company discloses figures about injury rates. However, it is not clear whether these figures include suppliers' workers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company discloses about lost days and fatalities. However, it is not clear whether these figures include suppliers' workers. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: Fatalities disclosures: See above [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.8.a	Women's rights (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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: Process to stop harassment and violence • Not met: Working conditions take account of gender • Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels: In its ESG Report, the Company states: 'in terms of equal opportunities, we value the individual preferences of our employee, regardless of their gender, age, religion and race, and we hope to provide opportunities based on talents and merits.' However there is no further information describing how it provides equality of opportunity for women in the workforce [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Meets all of the requirements under score 1
D.2.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	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: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.9.a	Working hours (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How it implements and checks this
D.2.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	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: Working hours in codes or contracts: In its Environmental, Social and Governance Report, the Company indicates: 'In order to strive for continuous improvement, we started to integrate the requirements for suppliers during the year by readjusting assessment criteria and include corporate social responsibility as one of the assessment standards. We formulated a rigorous assessment mechanism and established 10 basic principles.' One of these principles is related to Working hours: 'Provide wages and work record'. However, it is not sufficient to meet the indicator as it does not make any reference to international standards concerning maximum hour , minimum breaks and rest periods. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services] • Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (20% of Total)

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, and so the score of 5.97 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.49 out of 20 points for theme E.

F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	0.58 out of 4	Out of a total of 48 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, ANTA Sports Products made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 7 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.58 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Company reports on GRI: The company's Environmental, Social and Governance Report follows GRI, and includes a GRI Content Index. [Environmental, Social and Governance Report, 2018: files.services]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	ANTA Sports Products met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 1 for D.2.1.a : Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations) Not met: Score 2 for D.2.7.a : Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)

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 2019 Key Findings report and 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 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 CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHRB Ltd 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 CHRB Ltd 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 Ltd's 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 English law and submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of England and Wales.

As CHRB Ltd, 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.