

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Heilan Home
Industry Apparel (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score (*) 0.0 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.0	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.0	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.0	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
0.0	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
0.0	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 2018 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 • Not met: General HRs commitment • Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 • Not met: UDHR • Not met: International Bill of Rights Score 2 • Not met: UNGPs • Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: ILO Core • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: All four ILO for AP suppliers Score 2 • Not met: All four ILO Core • Not met: Respect H&S of workers • Not met: H&S applies to AP suppliers • Not met: working hours for employees • Not met: Working hours for AP suppliers
A.1.3.AP	Commitment to respect human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Women's Rights

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	particularly relevant to the industry (AP)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: Respecting the right to water • 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 AP 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 AP suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0	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 AP 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: Senior responsibility fo HR (inc ILO) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility in supply chain
B.1.2	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: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key AP HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: HR part of enterprise risk system Score 2 • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations Score 2 • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs • Not met: Including to AP suppliers Score 2 • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on AP suppliers
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments • Not met: Trains relevant managers including procurement Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments • Not met: Monitoring AP suppliers Score 2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: HR affects selection of suppliers • Not met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with 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 • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement • Not met: workers in the SP engaged • Not met: communities in the SC engaged Score 2 • 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 • Not met: Identifying risks in own operations • Not met: Identifying risks in AP suppliers Score 2 • 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	and key industry risks)		
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: Example of Actions decided • Not met: Including in AP supply chain 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 Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Including AP suppliers • 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	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 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 AP supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to AP supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	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 AP supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: AP supplier communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	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: AP suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly	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 Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	available and explained		
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 AG 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.2.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.2.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to product source (farm, ranch etc) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why
D.2.4.b	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 in progress made
D.2.5.b	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.2.5.d	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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			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.2.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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.2.7.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 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.2.8.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.2.9.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

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 thresholds were found, and so the score of 0.00 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 0.00 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 out of 4	Out of a total of 40 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Heilan Home made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 0 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0 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	Heilan Home met 0 of the 8 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
			<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

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 2018 Key Findings report 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.