

Company Name Amphenol Corporation
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
Overall Score (*) 4.9 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.7	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.5	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
1.0	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
0.9	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 indicates in the slavery statement that "Amphenol's commitment to human rights is reflected in the various provisions of our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, which, together with this statement, has been approved by the company's Board of Directors". However, no evidence found in the Company's code of conduct, nor the slavery statement, of a formal statement of commitment to respect human rights. Although the Company is committed to the RBA code of conduct, it also has its own code of conduct, containing provisions related to labour standards and human rights. [Anti-Human trafficking & Slavery Statement, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com & Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 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	0.5	<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: Although the Company commits to the RBA code on its website, it has its own code of business conduct, which includes company's position in relation to labour rights. Please, see explanation below about the Company's commitment to labour standards contained in the code. [Code of

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com & Sustainability, 07/05/2019: amphenol.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Company indicates in its supplier Code of Conduct that suppliers shall not use forced or bonded labour, child labour, shall not discriminate, and "In conformance with local law, Suppliers 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'. [Supplier Code of Conduct: amphenol.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: No evidence found of formal commitment to respect each of discrimination, forced labour, child labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining. It indicates that "It is the Company's intention to comply with all local Fair Labor Standards, including, but not limited to child labor, work hours, minimum wage, overtime, statutory benefits, and collective bargaining". However it states "intention to comply", which is not considered a formal commitment. Similar statement can be found in the sustainable business report. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com & Sustainability report, 31/12/2016: amphenol.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The code of business conduct and ethics states that "We also want to ensure a safe and healthy work environment for all of our employees. Amphenol employees must follow applicable safety and health laws and regulations of the countries and communities where we operate and related rules, regulations and procedures issued by the Company". [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • Not met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers • Not met: working hours for workers: To award this indicator, Company's commitment to respecting labour standards on working hours is needed. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers
A.1.3.ICT.a	Commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals	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: Responsible mineral sourcing in conflict areas: The Company states that it 'is committed to ensuring its products are DRC conflict-free, that is, they do not contain metals derived from conflict minerals - tantalum, tin, tungsten, gold(3TG) - which directly or indirectly finance or benefit armed groups through mining or mineral trading in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) or an adjoining countries (and lists adjoining countries)'. However, it is not clear whether the commitment is extensive to high risk areas beyond DRC and adjoining countries. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com & Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • Met: Based on OECD Guidance: The Company states that its conflict minerals compliance programme has been developed in conjunction with reference to the 2nd edition of the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] • Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers: The Company states that its commitment include "encouraging suppliers whose products contain 3TG to establish policies, due diligence frameworks, and management systems consistent with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High Risk Areas that are designed to accomplish these goals, and requiring their suppliers to do the same". As above, however, commitment seems to refer to "DRC and adjoining countries". Although the Company uses the word "encouraging", it also indicates that if non-compliance is found and suitable action is not taken, it "will look to alternative sources for the product". [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals • Not met: Suppliers expected to make similar requirements of their suppliers: Its commitment includes encouraging suppliers to establish policies, due diligence frameworks, and management systems consistent with the OECD Guidance that are requiring their suppliers to do the same. To award this indicator, the Company need to include all minerals. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.3.ICT.b	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (ICT)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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 Score 2 <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: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	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 stakeholder engagement • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects ICT 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: CEO or Board approves policy: The Company indicates that "Amphenol's commitment to human rights is reflected in the various provisions of our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, which, together with this statement [Anti-Human Trafficking & Slavery Statement] has been approved by the company's Board of Directors". The document is signed by the CEO. [Anti-Human trafficking & Slavery Statement, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <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	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company states that it operates the Corporate Sustainability Group, which is led by the director of corporate sustainability. The director of corporate sustainability acts as the conflict minerals programme manager. Senior management is briefed about the process and results on a regular basis. There is also a "Sustainable Steering Committee", a "cross-functional sustainability steering committee is in place to drive Amphenol's sustainability efforts. The committee is comprised of representatives from legal, human resources, procurement, engineering and EH&S". [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com & Sustainability report, 31/12/2016: amphenol.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: The sustainability working group is a team comprised primarily of corporate and business unit EH&S and sustainability professionals focused on implementation of the Company's sustainability goals and initiatives and our operating units. [Sustainability report, 31/12/2016: amphenol.com] • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain: The management system within its Corporate Sustainability Group covers communicates with suppliers and conducts relevant training and surveys. However, this evidence seems focused in conflict minerals suppliers. Not clear how suppliers general compliance for human rights is managed within the company. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com]
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 ICT 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 <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • 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	<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 all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers • Not met: Communicating policy down the whole ICT supply chain • Not met: Requiring ICT suppliers to communicate policy down the chain <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on ICT suppliers
B.1.5	Training on 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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments • Not met: Trains relevant ICT managers including procurement: The Company states that management and key product stewardship personnel of each groups were given Reasonable Country of Origin Inquiry (RCOI) materials prepared with reference to the OECD Guidance and it held internal training sessions delivered by the internal team regarding its RCOI process. However, no evidence found of managers and teams including procurement being trained in human rights policies. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on 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 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Met: Monitoring ICT suppliers: The Company indicates that "Supplier assessments and audits are managed at the Operating Unit level at Amphenol. Cross-functional teams, including, for example, representatives from procurement, quality, engineering and product stewardship, routinely evaluate their supply chain partners capabilities to provide cost-effective, quality products, delivered on-time and in accordance with specified sustainability, social responsibility and customer requirements. Additionally, Operating Units may also implement supplier engagement, appreciation, score-carding and escalation programs to ensure supply chain continuity and performance awareness". The supplier assessment and audit programme "also encourages suppliers to adopt the EICC [now RBA] Code of Conduct [Sustainability report, 31/12/2016: amphenol.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of ICT supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging 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: HR affects ICT selection of suppliers • Not met: HR affects on-going ICT supplier relationships Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with ICT suppliers to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: Workers in ICT SC engaged • Not met: Communities in the ICT SC engaged Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers: Although the Company refers to the process to identify suppliers that fall in the category of conflict minerals, no further evidence suppliers of the Company describing a process to identify human rights risks in its supply chain. Conflict minerals issues are assessed in its own specific indicators. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks: Although the Company discloses possible risks related to 3TG minerals in products could benefit armed groups in the Conflict Region, this is assessed in conflict minerals specific indicators. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating	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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Example of Actions decided: Although the Company reports in the context of conflict minerals, this is assessed under its own specific indicators. No evidence found of examples of actions decided to human rights salient issues. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] 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

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	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 states that employees may contact the Legal Department, the Audit committee or call the hotline phone number posted on employee bulletin boards throughout the Company. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community 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.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: ICT suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed • Not met: Who is handling the complaint Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Company states that it will not permit retaliation of any kind against good faith reports or complaints of violations of the Code of Conduct or other illegal or unethical conduct. However it is not clear whether the protection covers other stakeholders as well as employees. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to prohibit retaliation
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.4.1.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: The Company states that 'it is Amphenol's intention to comply with all local Fair Labour standards, Protective Labour requirements, Safety and Health Standards, including minimum wage'. However it is not sufficient as evidence for living wage. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • 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.4.1.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.4.2	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.4.3	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 Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.4.a	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (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: Does not use child labour: The Company states that 'it is Amphenol's intention to comply with all local Fair Labour standards, Protective Labour requirements, Safety and Health Standards, including child labour'. However no formal commitment or declaration found. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com] • Not met: Age verification of job applicants and workers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Remediation if children identified
D.4.4.b	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (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: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour 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.4.5.a	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (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: Pays workers in full and on time • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.4.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: The company indicates in its supplier Code of Conduct that 'Suppliers shall not use forced, bonded (including debt bondage) or indentured labor, involuntary or exploitative prison labor, slavery or trafficking of persons...Workers shall not be required to pay employers' or agents' recruitment fees or other related fees for their employment. If any such fees are found to have been paid by workers, such fees shall be repaid to the worker.' [Anti-Human trafficking & Slavery Statement, 07/05/2019: s22.q4cdn.com & Supplier Code of Conduct: amphenol.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.5.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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How sure about agencies or brokers
D.4.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The Company indicates that suppliers are expected to adhere to the requirements in its Supplier Code of Conduct which states 'All work must be voluntary, and workers shall be free to leave work at any time or terminate their employment. Employers and agents may not hold or otherwise destroy, conceal, confiscate or deny access by employees to their identity or immigration documents, such as government-issued identification, passports or work permits, unless such holdings are required by law.' [Supplier Code of Conduct: amphenol.com] • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters Score 2 <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.4.6.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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.4.6.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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The company indicates, "Since the publication of our 2016 Sustainability Report, we have established formal safety committees at most of our global manufacturing facilities to further support our dedication to employee health and safety. Our focus on this important area has resulted in total lost-time accidents falling to 302 in 2018, down from 317 in 2017, and our lost-time injury frequency declining to 0.38 per 100 employees in 2018, down from 0.46 in 2017." [2018 Sustainability Report: amphenol.com] • Met: Lost days or near miss disclosure: The company indicates, "Since the publication of our 2016 Sustainability Report, we have established formal safety committees at most of our global manufacturing facilities to further support our dedication to employee health and safety. Our focus on this important area has resulted in total lost-time accidents falling to 302 in 2018, down from 317 in 2017, and our lost-time injury frequency declining to 0.38 per 100 employees in 2018, down from 0.46 in 2017." [2018 Sustainability Report: amphenol.com] • Not met: Fatalities disclosures • Not met: Occupational disease rates Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Set targets for H&S performance • Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.4.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Company indicates that suppliers are expected to adhere to the requirements in its Supplier Code of Conduct which sets out Health and Safety expectations on subjects including: Occupational Safety; Emergency Preparedness; Occupational Injury and Illness; Industrial Hygiene; Physically Demanding Work; Machine Safeguarding; Sanitation, Food and Housing; Health and Safety Communication. [Supplier Code of Conduct: amphenol.com] • Not met: Injury rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosures • Not met: Occupational disease rates Score 2 <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.4.8.a	Women's rights (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: Process to stop harassment and violence • Not met: Working conditions take account of gender • Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Meets all of the requirements under score 1
D.4.8.b	Women's rights (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: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.9.a	Working hours (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations Score 2 • Not met: How it implements and checks this
D.4.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Working hours in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.10.a	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Arrangements with Suppliers and Smelters/Refiners in the Mineral Resource Supply Chains	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing due diligence in supplier contracts: The Company states that its commitment includes encouraging suppliers to establish policies, due diligence frameworks, and management systems consistent with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High Risk-Areas. However no evidence found of the Company incorporating this requirement into commercial contract / written agreement with suppliers. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] • Not met: Builds capacity with smelters/refiners: The Company states that it strives to enhance supplier communication, engage with certain suppliers to build supplier capability for conflict minerals supply chain traceability, and communicate training and escalation processes to improve due diligence data accuracy and completion. However, no further details found, including capacity building of smelters/refiners. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] Score 2 • Not met: Disclosure of smelter information in supplier requirements: The Company states that it sent requests for information about the source of 3TG contained in the components supplied. However it does not incorporate into commercial contract / written agreement with suppliers. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals
D.4.10.b	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Identification in Mineral Supply Chain	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance: However, the Company states that "will continue to seek to identify cost effective methodologies and to monitor practices used by other companies and industry associations to enhance visibility to subsequent tiers of the supply chain". It states that "because of our size, the breadth and complexity of the raw materials and components used in our products, and the constant evolution of our supply chain, identifying actors upstream from our direct suppliers is a challenge". [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] • Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD due diligence: The Company indicates that it reached out to suppliers that provide components or materials that are likely to contain 3TG. Each operating unit conducted its own reasonable country of origin inquiry (RCOI). 5.970 suppliers were within the scope of the RCOI and obtained 5.404 responses. In the course of the RCOI and due diligence the Company determined that "certain elements of our supply chain originate in the Conflict Region. It indicates that it does not perform direct audits. "However, we do utilize information made available by and rely upon industry efforts to influence smelters and refineries to become audited and compliant through the Responsible Minerals Initiative. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] Score 2 • Met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD due diligence: The Company lists the validated smelters or refineries in its Conflict Minerals report. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals
D.4.10.c	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Management in the Mineral Supply Chain	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain: The Company states that to mitigate possible risk, it has continued to increase the number of personnel with responsibility for supply chain due diligence efforts. It strives to enhance supplier communication, engage with certain suppliers to build supplier capability for conflict minerals supply chain traceability, and communicate training and escalation processes to improve due diligence data accuracy and completion. [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time [Conflict minerals report, 31/12/2017: amphenol.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Supplier and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals

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 3.95 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 0.99 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	0.85 out of 4	Out of a total of 52 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Amphenol Corporation made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 11 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.85 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Company reports on GRI • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Amphenol Corporation 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.4.1.a: Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations) • Not met: Score 2 for D.4.7.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.