

Company Name BOE Technology Group
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
Overall Score (*) 5.3 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.6	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.4	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.8	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.1	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.5	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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: General HRs commitment Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 Not met: UDHR Not met: International Bill of Rights Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: ILO Core Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company states that "The Company prohibits the use of child laborers and eliminates forced labor. It forbids the use of violence, threats or unlawful restrictions on personal freedom to force employees to work and restrict the freedom of employees (jobs, resignations), and strictly prohibits physical punishment, intimidation, harassment, abuse, and any act that discriminates against employees" Moreover, it claims that "The coverage rate of trade unions in various entities, the rate of employees joining trade unions, and the proportion of employees signing the collective negotiation agreement are all

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>100%" However, there is no reference to freedom of association. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respect H&S of workers: On its CSR report the company state that, in order to ensure the scientific, reasonable and systematic operation of the Company's safety management, 18 subsidiaries under BOE have passed OHSAS 18001 Occupational Health and Safety Management System Certification and have carried out self-discovery and self-correction according to the systematic requirements annually." The company has several health and safety programmes under it's 'Safeguarding Employees' Rights and Interests.' <p>[Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers • Not met: working hours for workers • 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 "In the implementation of raw material procurement policies, BOE has abided by OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas prepared by CFSI, the UN and OECD. The Company and all its suppliers and outsourcers only purchase from smelting plants and refineries approved or certified by CFS, LBMA, or Responsible Jewelry Council. They do not purchase or support the use of any conflict minerals that directly or indirectly fund or support areas affected by armed conflicts, ensuring that all suppliers adopt responsible practices when purchasing minerals and respect human rights and environment in conflict-affected areas." However, it is not clear whether there is a commitment to responsible sourcing (not financing/benefitin armed groups and respecting human rights) that is extensive to high risk areas beyond conflict-affected areas, which include areas characterised by widespread human rights abuses and violations of national and international law. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Met: Based on OECD Guidance: As indicated above, the Company has abide by OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chain of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers: As indicated above "the Company and all its suppliers and outsourcers only purchase from smelting plants and refineries approved or certified by CFS, LBMA, or Responsible Jewelry Council". In addition "they do not purchase or support the use of any conflict minerals that directly or indirectly fund or support areas affected by armed conflicts, ensuring that all suppliers adopt responsible practices when purchasing minerals and respect human rights and environment in conflict affected areas". However, it is not clear whether the commitment is extensive to high risk areas beyond conflict-affected areas, which include areas characterised by widespread human rights abuses and violations of national and international law. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals: As indicated above the Company refers to "any conflict minerals" in its commitment, however it is not clear whether the commitment is extensive to high risk areas beyond conflict-affected areas, which include areas characterised by widespread human rights abuses and violations of national and international law. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Not met: Suppliers expected to make similar requirements of their suppliers: As indicated above the Company refers to "any conflict minerals" in its commitment, however it is not clear whether the commitment is extensive to high risk areas beyond conflict-affected areas, which include areas characterised by widespread human rights abuses and violations of national and international law. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc]
A.1.3.ICT.b	Commitment to respect human rights particularly	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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	relevant to the industry (ICT)		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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that" BOE has been listening to voices of all parties by establishing solid, close relationships with all stakeholders such as employees, customers, suppliers, governments, and communities. By doing so, it can have an understanding of expectations and demands of stakeholders, which is conducive to continuously improving its management and realizing the collaborative development and mutual benefit of BOE and its stakeholders" [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: For the past two years, the Company have had regular engagements with stakeholders. Main methods for communication and the contents are disclosed respectively for each stakeholder group. [Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEO or Board approves policy • 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	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 • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT 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 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: The Company states that " BOE has a strict internal control system. The Board of Directors and the Strategy Committee are responsible for risk management at Company level; the Board of Supervisors oversees risk management conducted by the Board of Directors; the permanent bodies of the Risk Control & Audit Committee under the Board of Directors are the risk control departments and internal control departments, and responsible for overseeing and evaluating risk management and reporting actions being taken to address major risks and the progress in doing so. " However, no further detail regarding human rights is mentioned. In addition, although the Sustainability Report 2018 states that the Company has identified some human rights risks as part of materiality assessment, there is no evidence that shows these issues have been integrated into the Company's internal control system. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] <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 • 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 • 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: The Company states that that " it is an important step for BOE to fulfil its social responsibility in building a sustainable supply chain. BOE believes that a good corporate citizen cannot be alone but give full play to their own strength to drive upstream and downstream enterprises to jointly shoulder social responsibility, so as to boost the sustainable development of economy, environment and society" However, it is not clear how the company communicates its Human Rights policy. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Requiring ICT suppliers to communicate policy down the chain • 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: In those matters, the Company only states that " Well-targeted anti-corruption education was carried out according to the different requirements for different posts. Orientation training was conducted for new employees to enhance their integrity and professionalism. Personnel in key business fields and major projects were trained to be honest, dedicated, and compliant. Newly appointed managerial personnel were educated in integrity, honesty, professionalism and leadership through concrete cases. " No evidence found on human rights training for all. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant ICT managers including procurement • 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	<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: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring ICT suppliers 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: Although the Company has conducted materiality assessment, it is not clear if the Company considered the risks that are specific to locations or activities, covering the Company's operation. [Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Not met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers: The Company states that "Suppliers shall ensure that the gold, tantalum, tungsten, and tin used or contained in their products and packages delivered to BOE are not from the "conflict minerals" from the areas controlled by any armed forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo or its neighboring countries. " However, it is not clear what is the company's process to identify HR risks. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] 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 Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Including in ICT supply chain • Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to	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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	human rights risks and impacts		
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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states that "The Company has established effective complaint channels to prevent rights and interests of employees from damage and put an end to discrimination. Reports and complaints from employees can be delivered to "suggestion box" in written form or through employee representatives and investigated and handled by the professional department." However/ the Company does not make it clear if the channel is accessible to all workers. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: According to the CSR Report, the Company states that "There were no complaints about human rights and the use of child labor in 2017" [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • 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: According to the CSR report, the main methods of communications are "Information disclosure, Field trip and questionnaire survey, Public interest projects, Community volunteer activities" Grievance mechanisms are not mentioned. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] 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: The Company only states that " has established effective complaint channels to prevent rights and interests of employees from damage and put an end to discrimination. Reports and complaints from employees can be delivered to "suggestion box" in written form or through employee representatives and investigated and handled by the professional department." No evidence found on how complainants will be informed. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Who is handling the complaint

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 • 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: Regarding the corruption matters, the Company only states that " The final document for penalty decision is issued by the Professional Ethics Disciplinary Committee of the Strategy Committee under the Board of Directors. The audit department regularly maintains and manages the blacklist and, by the approval, reports cases to the judicial organ and assists it in handling these cases." No further details were found in human rights area and not impeding access to state-based judicial or non-judicial mechanisms. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights • 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 • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Achieved payment of living wage: The Company only indicates that "Over the years, BOE has spared no efforts to safeguard rights and interests of employees, provide employees with competitive salary and benefits" [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • 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: The Company only indicates that " Now, BOE has approximately 4,200 suppliers globally, of which there are over 2,300 suppliers specializing in BOM materials, outsourcing, and consumables, and about 1,900 suppliers of equipment and spare parts. They are mainly distributed in mainland China, South Korea, Japan and Taiwan province of China." Not clear if it identified and mapped them, including also indirect suppliers. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] 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)	0.5	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: The Company states that "The Company prohibits the use of child laborers and eliminates forced labor" and " There were no complaints about human rights and the use of child laborer in 2017." [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • 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: The Company only indicates that "The Company prohibits the use of child laborers and eliminates forced labor. It forbids the use of violence, threats or unlawful restrictions on personal freedom to force employees to work and restrict the freedom of employees (jobs, resignations)".No evidence found in relation to worker mobility, including document retention. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • 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
D.4.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own production or manufacturing operations)	1	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 • Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: Although the Company indicates that "The rate of employees joining trade unions, and the proportion of employees signing the collective negotiation agreement are all 100%" it does not disclose the percentage of its workforce whose terms and conditions of work are covered by collective bargaining agreements. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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"> • Not met: Injury Rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosure • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements • 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: The Company indicates that "The Company has given high priority to equal rights for men and women and resolutely put an end to discrimination against women in employment, with the proportion of female employees and managers increasing steadily" However, it does not describe its process to prohibit harassment and violence against women. • Not met: Working conditions take account of gender • Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels: The Company indicates that "The Company has given high priority to equal rights for men and women and resolutely put an end to discrimination against women in employment, with the proportion of female employees and managers increasing steadily" However, it does not describe how it provides the 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
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Working hours in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours 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.4.10.a	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Arrangements with Suppliers and Smelters/Refiners in the Mineral Resource Supply Chains	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: Responsible mineral sourcing due diligence in supplier contracts: The Company indicates that "In the implementation of raw material procurement policies, BOE has abided by OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas prepared by CFSI, the UN and OECD. The Company and all its suppliers and outsourcers only purchase from smelting plants and refineries approved or certified by CFS." However, there is no evidence that the Company incorporating this evidence into the contracts or agreements. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Not met: Builds capacity with smelters/refiners <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Disclosure of smelter information in supplier requirements • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals
D.4.10.b	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Identification in Mineral 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: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance • Not met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD due diligence: The Company states that "it uses CFSI-CMRT annually to conduct conflict minerals surveys throughout the supply chain. In 2017, BOE conducted investigations on 89 suppliers of resistors, inductors, capacitors, IC, LED, and connectors that may contain gold, tantalum, tungsten and tin, and all supplier offered feedbacks". The investigation results showed that gold, tantalum, tungsten and tin in BOE's raw materials come from 194 smelters, which meet CFSI's requirements and BOE's supply standard." However, no evidence found on how the company assessed and determined that those smelters carried out due diligence processes covered by the OECD Guidance. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD due diligence: No evidence found of lists of smelters/refiners considered to be conformant with to the due diligence processes covered by the OECD Guidance. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals
D.4.10.c	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Management in the Mineral 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: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain: In its CSR report the Company states that "BOE uses CFSI-CMRT annually to conduct conflict minerals surveys throughout the supply chain. In 2017, BOE conducted investigations on 89 suppliers of resistors, inductors, capacitors, IC, LED, and connectors that may contain gold, tantalum, tungsten and tin, and all supplier offered feedbacks. The investigation results showed that gold, tantalum, tungsten and tin in BOE's raw materials come from 194 smelters, which meet CFSI's requirements and BOE's supply standard." However, he Company does not disclose a summary of the risk management plan. However, it is not clear the steps the company takes to manage and respond to risks in its mineral supply chain. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Not met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Supplier and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy: The Company states that "Suppliers shall ensure that the gold, tantalum, tungsten, and tin used or contained in their products and packages delivered to BOE are not from the "conflict minerals" from the areas controlled by any armed forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo or its neighboring countries. Suppliers shall formulate their own policies on conflict minerals in accordance with OECD requirements on due diligence, and convey the policies to next-level suppliers. Suppliers shall investigate their supply chain in detail, identify and trace the sources of gold, tantalum, tungsten, and tin, ensure the legitimacy of the source of raw materials, and truthfully fill in and submit the CMRT questionnaire or other document." However, the Company should include evidence of consultation with suppliers and stakeholders about the approach to follow, not just indicating which are the requirements for suppliers. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • 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 4.25 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.06 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	0.46 out of 4	Out of a total of 52 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, BOE Technology Group made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 6 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.46 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 reports on GRI in its CSR report. [Sustainability Report, 2017: waterdrop.cc & Sustainability Report 2018, 2019: waterdrop.cc] • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	BOE Technology Group 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.