Company Name	Hewlett Packard Enterprise
Industry	ICT (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score (*)	44.7 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
5.3	10	A. Governance and Policies
13.1	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
6.3	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
6.2	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
8.9	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
5.0	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 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	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: General HRs commitment: In its Standards of Business Conduct, the Company states: 'Support and respect the protection of human rights and ensure that our business partners and suppliers do the same'. In addition, in its Global Human Rights Policy, the Company states: 'HPE upholds and respects human rights as reflected in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the UN Global Compact, and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which further clarify government responsibility to protect human rights against third party abuses, business responsibility to respect human rights, and a joint responsibility to remedy if rights are not upheld.' [Standards of Business Conduct, 11/2015 & Global Human Rights Policy, 02/2017: hpe.com] • Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Company is a signatory of the UNGC. [Global Human Rights Policy, 02/2017: hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: UNGPs: In its Supplier Code, referring to itself, the Company indicates: 'HPE respects human rights […] We commit to the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • 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 • Not met: ILO Core: Its Standard of Business Conduct includes provisions covering all ILO Core, including: 'Ensure that child labor, prison or forced labor, and physical

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			punishment are never permitted in any operation of HPE, or those of our business partners or suppliers. Respect the right of employees to organize in labor unions and collectively bargain in accordance with local laws and established practices […] Do not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of any characteristic protected by law […]'. However, as it has indicated to respect these rights 'in accordance with local laws', no details found on alternatives for those countries where there are legal restrictions to the exercise of these rights. [Standards of Business Conduct, 11/2015] • Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory to the UN Global Compact [Global Compact signatory, n/a: unglobalcompact.org & Global Human Rights Policy, 02/2017: hpe.com] • Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The supplier code includes provisions covering all ILO Core. These include child labour, forced labour and discrimination. In relation to freedom of association and collective bargaining, it indicates the following: '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, unless it is prohibited by local law. Workers and/or their representatives shall be able to openly communicate and share ideas and concerns with management regarding working conditions and management practices without fear of discrimination, reprisal, intimidation or harassment'. In addition, in its document 'Supply Chain Responsibility - Our approach', the Company says: 'Our SCR program promotes the core labor standards as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998): Freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; Elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor; Effective abolition of child labor; Elimination of discrimination in respect to employment and occupation'. However, as indicated above, freedom of association and collective bargaining rights might be restricted by law at some locations. No evidence found in relation to commitment to alternative mechanisms for dialogue for those scenarios. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: See above [Standards of Business Conduct, 11/2015] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: In addition, its Standard of Business Conduct includes provisions to respect health and safety of its workers. [Standards of Business Conduct, 11/2015] • Met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers: In addition, its Supplier Code of Conduct includes provisions to respect health and safety of its workers, including the following topics: Occupational Safety; Emergency Preparedness; Occupational Injury and Illness; Industrial Hygiene; Physically Demanding Work; Machine Safeguarding; Sanitation, Food, and Housing; and Health and Safety Communication. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: working hours for workers • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: 'Workweeks are not to exceed the maximum set by local law. Further, a workweek should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be allowed at least one day off every seven days.' However, no evidence found of references to standard working week hours or the Company explicitly committing to respect ILO conventions on working hours. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
A.1.3.ICT.a	Commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing in conflict areas: Although the Company states in its 2018 Living Progress Report that its 'aim is to achieve DRC conflict-free status for our products, which requires working closely with our suppliers and peers. HPE encourages responsible sourcing from the DRC and its adjoining countries and is an active member of the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI).', and that it has disclosed a 2018 Conflict Mineral Report, no evidence found of a formal statement committing to responsible sourcing of minerals from conflict affected and high-risk areas. [2018 Conflic Mineral Report, 30/05/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] • Not met: Based on OECD Guidance • Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers: In its Supplier Code the Company indicates: 'Suppliers shall have a policy to reasonably assure that the tantalum, tin, tungsten and gold in the products, parts, components, and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			materials they manufacture does not directly or indirectly finance or benefit armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo or an adjoining country. Suppliers shall exercise due diligence on the source and chain of custody of these minerals and make their due diligence measures available to customers upon customer request.' A similar requirement is included in its Supply Chain Social and Environmental Responsibility Policy': Suppliers are expected to ensure that parts and products supplied to Hewlett Packard Enterprise are DRC conflict-free […]. Suppliers are 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, that are designed to accomplish this goal.' However, although there is a reference to the OECD Due Diligence Guidance, the provision refers only to DRC conflicts, so it is not clear if it covers all conflict affected and high risks areas, and whether the scope goes beyond financing armed groups and includes respecting human rights. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Supply Chain SER Policy, 11/2015: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals • Not met: Suppliers expected to make similar requirements of their suppliers
A.1.3.ICT.b	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (ICT)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Women's Rights: The Company states in its Supplier Code of Conduct, referring to itself: 'HPE respects human rights as defined by the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). In particular, we respect the rights of vulnerable groups including migrants, children and women, as defined in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: Children's Rights: As indicated above, the Company states that it respect 'the rights of vulnerable groups including migrants, children and women, as defined in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work' [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: Migrant worker's rights: As indicated above, the Company states that it respects 'the rights of vulnerable groups including migrants, children and women, as defined in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work'. In addition, the Company has a specific document to protect Migrants from inadequate recruitment practices: 'Supply Chain Foreign Migrant Worker Standard'. In this policy, the Company states: 'Recognizing the particular vulnerability of foreign migrant workers to exploitative labor practices and risks of forced labor, this policy sets out the minimum requirements for the recruitment, selection, hiring and management of foreign migrant workers by or on behalf of suppliers doing business with Hewlett Packard Enterprise'. [Enterprise Supply Chain Foreign Migrant WorkerStandard, 11/2015: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights: As indicated above, the Company has a specific supply chain foreign migrant worker standards 'for the appropriate and ethical recruitment and management of foreign migrant workers by or on behalf of suppliers doing business with Hewlett Packard Enterprise'. [Enterprise Supply Chain Foreign Migrant WorkerStandard, 11/2015: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • 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 • Met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states in its Disclosure to CHRB Platform: 'HPE is committed to stakeholder engagement and identifies stakeholders through various, complementary approaches, including our materiality assessment and our most recent human rights assessment, which was carried out by a third party.' [Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: In its Modern Slavery Statement, the Company states: 'Hewlett Packard Enterprise engages with a broad range of stakeholders, including workers at HPE supplier facilities (through worker interviews and capability building programs), industry bodies, governments, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This engagement allows us to research and better understand practices that can lead to modern slavery in the supply

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			chain.' As an example, the Company indicates in its 2018 Living Progress Report: 'We continuously engage with our employees through channels including Connect Now, HPE Insider, and Living Progress Champions. […] Every year we seek employee feedback through our Voice of the Workforce survey. In 2018, 73% of employees participated.' [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commits to remedy: The Company states in its Global Human Rights Policy that ' HPE upholds and respects human rights as reflected in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the UN Global Compact, and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which further clarify government responsibility to protect human rights against third party abuses, business responsibility to respect human rights, and a joint responsibility to remedy if rights are not upheld.' In addition, in its 2018 Corporate Responsibility Report, the Company states: ' We reinforce our statements with a transparent approach to identifying risks to these rights across our value chain and work to prevent, mitigate, and remediate any human rights impacts associated with our business.' [Global Human Rights Policy, 02/2017: hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts: In its Modern Slavery Statement, the Company indicates: 'HPE has worked intensively in each instance to remediate the identified issues and to strengthen the facility's policies and systems to guard against reoccurrences.' In addition, in its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company discloses information about a specific case: 'After conducting an audit, we provided TES written guidance materials, and connected them with another local HPE supplier that already successfully followed our no-fees standard. TES worked with us cooperatively to improve its understanding of our standard and then fully reimbursed the recruitment fees to affected workers'. [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com]
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs): In its Disclosure to CHRB Platform, the Company states: 'HPE respects the rights and recognizes the risks faced by human rights defenders. Threats, intimidation, physical or other attacks against individuals are unacceptable'. [Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org] Score 2 • 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	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: CEO or Board approves policy: The Standard of Business Conduct is presented by the CEO and the Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer Standards. [Standards of Business Conduct, 11/2015] • Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: 'HPE Board of Directors' Nominating, Governance, and Social Responsibility Committee: Guides HPE's global citizenship activities, providing strategic direction on policies and programs; Identifies, evaluates, and monitors issues that could significantly affect the company's reputation or operations, including social, political, regulatory, and environmental concerns; Oversees our Political Action Committee (PAC), government affairs, and public policy engagement. HPE Executive Council (led by our CEO): Oversees the Living Progress program'. This includes human rights. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO: The Company's CEO spoke at the latest World Economic Forum annual meeting in Davos on ending modern slavery and the Company's approach to social and environmental responsibility, including human rights. [World Economic Forum: Ending Modern Slavery, 01/2019: webcasts.weforum.org & Live from the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting in Davos, 17/01/2019: hpe.com]
A.2.2	Board discussions	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs: In its 2018 Corporate Responsibility Report, the Company indicates: 'HPE Board of Directors' Nominating, Governance, and Social Responsibility Committee (NGSR): Identifies, evaluates, and monitors issues that could significantly affect the company's reputation or operations, including social, political, regulatory, and environmental concerns.' In addition, according its Charter 'The purpose of the Nominating, Governance and Social Responsibility Committee (the "Committee") of the Board of Directors (the "Board") of Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company ("Hewlett Packard Enterprise") is: [...] To review, assess, report and provide guidance to management and the full Board regarding Hewlett Packard Enterprise's policies and programs relating to global citizenship (which includes, among other things, human rights, [...] and corporate social responsibility) and the impact of Hewlett Packard Enterprise's operations on employees, customers, suppliers, partners and communities worldwide, as well as reviewing the annual Global Citizenship Report; [...] The Committee convenes at least four times each year, with additional meetings as appropriate.' [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com & Nominating, Governance and Social Responsibility Committee Charter, 11/2015: investors.hpe.com] • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion: The Company indicates in its 2018 Living Progress Report: 'Our Board of Directors recognizes the leading role we play and approves our commitments to the UK Modern Slavery Act of 2015 and the Dodd-Frank Act's Section 1502 on Conflict Minerals'. The Company disclosed a Modern Slavery Act Statement 2018, a Conflict Mineral Report 2018, and a new versions of the Supplier Code. Although the Company has provided comments to CHRB in relation to this indicator, no specific evidence of topics discussed during last reporting year was found in publicly available sources. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] Score 2 • 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 • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member: In its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company indicates that 'In 2019, it will establish goals for our senior executives on diversity and employee development and engagement, which will tie to compensation', however the remuneration system is not active yet and CHRB could not find further information describing the incentive mechanism, if board members are included and which specific human rights factors are linked to this mechanism. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] • Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 • 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	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company indicates: 'HPE Living Progress Strategy Council: Evaluates the company's ESG focus areas and priorities; Provides support for Living Progress objectives and commitments; Oversees communication of ESG strategy to internal stakeholders; Leads materiality assessment, reporting activities, and engages with external stakeholders'. This includes human rights. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: The Company also indicates: 'The HPE Office of Legal and Administrative Affairs guides our approach to human rights and works across the business to address specific issues as they arise. We engage with external stakeholders, governments, industry organizations, specialized consultants, and across our own company to identify potential human rights issues to ensure that we focus our resources where they are most needed.' [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain: In its 'Supply Chain Responsibility: Our approach' document, the Company indicates: The Global Social and Environmental Responsibility (SER) Team in the Ethics and Compliance Office, which resides within the Office of Legal and Administrative Affairs, is responsible for establishing and coordinating the policies, programs, and processes governing HPE's approach to human rights and ethical conduct in the supply chain. The Global SER team works closely with dedicated individuals in the product supply chain, indirect procurement, corporate affairs and other organizations to implement and manage policies and programs in our operations and in our supply chain.' [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights: In its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company indicates that 'In 2019, it will establish goals for our senior executives on diversity and employee development and engagement, which will tie to compensation', however the remuneration system is not active yet and CHRB could not find further information describing the incentive mechanism and if it is linked to specific human rights factors. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] • Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: Among the risks identified by the Company in its 10K Form 2018, we can find the following: 'We depend on third-party suppliers, and our financial results could suffer if we fail to manage our suppliers effectively. […] We work with our suppliers to improve their labor practices and working conditions, such as by including requirements in our agreements with our suppliers that working conditions in our supply chain must be safe, that workers receive fair treatment, safe working conditions and freely chosen employment, that materials are responsibly sourced and that business operations are conducted in an environmentally responsible and ethical way. Brand perception and customer loyalty could be adversely impacted by a supplier's improper practices or failure to comply with the above-mentioned requirements or those included in our Supplier Code of Conduct, General Specification for the Environment and other related provisions and requirements of our procurement contracts, […]' In addition, in its Global Human Rights Policy, the Company states that it 'Regularly assess[es] human rights risks, policies, and impacts and provide visibility of the results to senior executives'. No new relevant evidence found in latest report. [10K Form - Annual Report 2017, 12/2017: annualreports.com & Global Human Rights Policy, 02/2017: hpe.com] 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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2. Through the Global Compact. • Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: In its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company indicates: 'All employees must complete the annual SBC refresher course, which covers key policies, procedures, and high-risk issues. Board members take SBC training every two years. New hires complete an SBC course within 30 days of joining HPE.' [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder: Although the Company communicates its human rights policy commitments to employees and suppliers, CHRB could not find information about proactive communication activities focused on other potentially affected stakeholders, including local

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			communities. [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com & HPE Supplier Portal, 08/2019: h20168.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience: The Company indicates that its Living Progress report highlights has been published in 12 languages. However, document publication by itself is not considered a proactive communication activity. [Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org]
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers: See indicator A.1.2 • Met: Requiring ICT suppliers to communicate policy down the chain: In its Supplier SER Agreement, the Supplier 'confirms that it has read Hewlett Packard Enterprise Supplier Code of Conduct […] and Hewlett Packard Enterprise's General Specification for the Environment and agrees with its statement of requirements.' In its Supplier Code, the Company indicates: 'The Hewlett Packard Enterprise Code is a total supply chain requirement. At a minimum, Suppliers shall require their next tier Suppliers to acknowledge and implement the HPE Code and hand the HPE Code down to their sub-tier Suppliers. The requirements apply to all workers including temporary, migrant, student, contract, direct employees, and any other type of worker.' [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: See above. The Agreement also indicates: 'Supplier will be responsible for identifying any areas of its operations that do not conform to Hewlett Packard Enterprise's Supplier Code of Conduct and Hewlett Packard Enterprise's General Specification for the Environment and for implementing and monitoring improvement programs designed to achieve Hewlett Packard Enterprise Supplier Code of Conduct and Hewlett Packard Enterprise's General Specification for the Environment' [SER Agreement, 07/2017: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: Including on ICT suppliers: As indicated above, the code is a 'total supply chain requirement. At a minimum, suppliers shall require their next tier suppliers to acknowledge and implement the HPE Code and hand the HPE Code down to their sub-tier Suppliers'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: In its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company indicates: 'All employees must complete the annual SBC refresher course, which covers key policies, procedures, and high-risk issues. Board members take SBC training every two years. New hires complete an SBC course within 30 days of joining HPE.' [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] • Met: Trains relevant ICT managers including procurement: See above. In its Modern Slavery Statement, it adds: 'HPE requires certain employees to take training courses on key SCR issues and on effective management of suppliers' SCR performance. HPE provides this training for relevant staff who engage with any aspect related to HPE's Supply Chain Responsibility (SCR) program (e.g., procurement, quality control).' [2017 Corporate Responsibility Report: h20195.www2.hpe.com & MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: In its Corporate Governance Guidelines, the Company indicates: 'The Audit Committee periodically reviews compliance with the Standards of Business Conduct. However, no details found on how the company actively monitors compliance within own operations. [Corporate Governance Guidelines, 2016: investors.hpe.com] • Met: Monitoring ICT suppliers: In its 2018 Modern Slavery Act Statement, the Company states: 'We engage with suppliers and monitor their performance through data collection and assessment, consisting of the following elements: Third-party on-site audits. We require regular independent audits against our Supplier Code of Conduct, in two forms: Comprehensive audits conducted by an external organization on behalf of HPE and other RBA member companies. The auditing methodology, the Validated Audit Process (VAP), eliminates duplication and promotes audit sharing by providing a common approach among companies.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			We request that our suppliers use the VAP as an independent assessment of their performance; Audits conducted by an external organization to verify audits, or to provide independent investigations of allegations. Alongside regular audits, we sometimes undertake additional assessments on specific risk areas including vulnerable worker groups such as student, dispatch, and foreign migrant workers.' In addition, in its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company indicates: We undertake regular, independent audits against our Supplier Code of Conduct, 36 supported by targeted assessments on specific risk areas including foreign migrant workers. In 2018, we arranged third-party audits of suppliers representing 95% of our spend.' [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Met: Describes corrective action process: It also states: 'In any event, in a case of non-compliance, a supplier is required to produce a corrective action plan to outline how it intends to resolve the issue. HPE then reviews the plan and approves or requires further refinement. A supplier must cease any practice that contributes to a critical labor issue and must promptly report its corrective actions to HPE. Hewlett Packard Enterprise or a third-party auditor will then re-examine the finding through a site visit to confirm resolution.' In addition, the Company discloses information about the number of incidents: 82 major non-conformance related to health and safety, 61 to labor, 23 to management systems and 3 to ethics. [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: Example of corrective action: The Company indicates that it identified 'two critical findings, including: payment of excessive recruitment fees; and requirement for workers to lodge deposits at the outset of employment. In each case, we worked closely with the relevant supplier to remediate the issue and strengthen management systems to guard against reoccurrence. We conduct follow-up assessments using third-party auditors to validate that all corrective actions are completed. Specific remedial actions have included suppliers: repaying recruitment fees; returning deposits; changing company policies and procedures; updating worker contracts; amending labor agent contracts; enhancing labor agent due diligence and monitoring; and clearly communicating changes to policies and practices with workers'. [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: Discloses % of ICT supply chain monitored: Although it indicates that audited suppliers representing 95% of spend, not clear the percentage/proportion to the supply chain that this figure represents. [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com]
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: HR affects ICT selection of suppliers: 'We consider the risk profile of every supplier and conduct a formal preliminary risk assessment if necessary. Key suppliers may also undergo site-based onboarding assessments. This motivates suppliers to value SER performance and build relevant standards into their management systems early in the business relationship. We assess the following risk factors: Location […]; Procurement category […]; External stakeholder reports […]; Supplier-specific factors […]'. However, it is not clear how the preliminary assessment may affect supplier selection. [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: HR affects on-going ICT supplier relationships: In its 'Supply Chain Responsibility: Our Approach' document, the Company indicates: 'Our SER Scorecard ties ongoing procurement decisions to supplier SER performance and participation in capability building. Suppliers with strong SER performance improve their opportunities for new or expanded business. Suppliers with poor SER performance risk a reduction in the business.' [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Met: Working with ICT suppliers to improve performance: In addition, the Company adds: 'Capability-building programs address the most significant supply chain SER issues as identified by audit trends, external stakeholder input, and other intelligence. We often pair supplier assessments with capability-building opportunities to facilitate improvement. In conjunction with local and international NGOs and training groups, we have delivered four types of training and capability-building programs: Supplier-specific capability-building (Virtual and on-site programs that help suppliers develop sustainable management systems and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			remediation plans for specific SER issues); Broad-topic capability-building (Programs and events that address industry-wide key issues, emerging risks, and new requirements across our supply chain); Worker well-being (Programs with a focus on worker empowerment and well-being. These are designed to have a positive impact beyond the workplace); Worker voice (A program designed to engage workers and create capability-building initiatives driven by their needs)'. [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Stakeholder process or systems: In its 'Supply Chain Responsibility: Our Approach', the Company indicates: 'Stakeholder engagement: Hewlett Packard Enterprise engages with a broad range of stakeholders, including workers at HPE supplier facilities (through interviews and capability building programs), industry bodies, governments, socially responsible investors, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This engagement allows us to research and better understand practices that can lead to forced labor and human trafficking in the supply chain.' However, CHRB could not find a information about how the Company has identified affected and potentially affected stakeholders. [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: The Company indicates in its 2018 Living Progress Report that it 'continuously engage with our employees through channels including Connect Now, HPE Insider, and Living Progress Champion. [...] Every year we seek employee feedback through our Voice of the Workforce survey. [...] Through ongoing stakeholder engagement, we continuously evaluate the issues most relevant to our business and our stakeholders.' In addition, in its Disclosure to CHRB Platform it adds: 'Various triggers – both proactive and reactive – can lead to engagement with workers in our supply chain including: Concerns related to working conditions; A need to engage with vulnerable workers to better understand their experience and needs, such as foreign migrant worker interviews, female worker interviews through HER Finance, Laborlink mobile solution, the Worker Sentiment Survey and Impactt's Restart Program, a training program based on principles of social psychology that builds respect and understanding between workers and management; As a part of root cause analysis of nonconformances on site, and the development of an improvement plan that is tailored to the needs of workers; As a key piece of monitoring supplier improvement, and checking that improvements are having a positive impact on workers' [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com & Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org] • Not met: Workers in ICT SC engaged: The Company engages with workers in IT supply chain through interviews and capability building programmes. However, no details found about frequency or description of identification, as noted above. [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: Communities in the ICT 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	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Identifying risks in own operations: In its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company states: 'Guided by the HPE Global Human Rights Policy, we seek to reduce the potential for our products or services to be used by companies, individuals, organizations, or regimes to infringe on people's human rights, by: [...] Conducting due diligence on relevant business activities in appropriate circumstances.' In addition, in its Disclosure to CHRB Platform, the Company indicates: 'Our Global SER team recently engaged an independent third party to carry out a corporate-wide human rights assessment. The scope of the assessment covered identification of the most salient risks, a review of existing policy, a review of process and due diligence tools and a scan of published media, concerns and opinions of HPE. [...]. In addition to our corporate-wide human rights assessments, we review risks when we have a relevant change to the business.' [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com & Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			• Met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers: In its Modern Slavery Statement, the Company indicates: 'We work to identify emerging risks in our supply chain at global, regional, and local levels. We analyze information from our supplier monitoring program, worker engagement, extensive stakeholder network, and other external sources to look for, and address risks proactively'. In addition, in its 2018 Living Progress Data Summary, it adds: 'In 2018, we continued to undertake stringent due diligence within our supply chain to uncover risks—including through additional specialized assessments against our Foreign Migrant Worker Standard.'. [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: As indicated above, the Company reports on its 2018 work in relation to risk identification and assessment. It also says that carries out process when there are changes in circumstances. [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: In consultation with stakeholders: See above, it reports analyzing information from stakeholder network for supply chain, although it is not clear how it identifies risks in own operations including through (affected) stakeholder consultation. [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: In consultation with HR experts: The Company indicates that it engaged an independent third party to carry out a corporate-wide human rights assessment. No further details found in publicly available sources. • Not met: Triggered by new circumstances: The Company indicates that 'in addition to our corporate-wide human rights assessments, we review risks when we have a relevant change to the business'. However, although it has provided more details to CHRB in relation to this, evidence couldn't be found in publicly available sources. [Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org]
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context): 'Our Global SER team recently engaged an independent third party to carry out a corporate-wide human rights assessment. The scope of the assessment covered identification of the most salient risks, a review of existing policy, a review of process and due diligence tools and a scan of published media, concerns and opinions of HPE.' However, CHRB could not find further information describing the process for assessing human rights risk, including how relevant factors were taken into account to determine salience (geographical, social, economical, etc) [Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: 'Our most salient risks, identified in the assessment, are risks common throughout the IT industry: responsible use, responsible product development, modern slavery and decent work, conflict minerals, diversity and inclusion, and water use.' In addition, in its Modern Slavery Statement, the Company indicates: 'Through research, on-site due diligence, and engagement with supplier facilities and industry groups, HPE identified the following high risks in its supply chain: the risk of forced student labor in China, and the risk of forced labor specific to foreign migrant workers in Taiwan, Malaysia, and Singapore.' [Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org & MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company indicates that it addresses risks 'to workers and the environment in the following ways: 1. Remediation. Using information from audits and assessments, we improve SER performance through: Defined corrective action plans with focused follow-up assurance activities; Escalated remediation for critical findings and situations when effort beyond standard corrective action is needed. 2. Capability building. We help suppliers improve SER performance through programs and partnerships with NGOs, training partners, and governmental organizations focusing primarily on worker empowerment and management systems development. 3. Business integration. Our program relies on procurement operations to motivate and incentivize suppliers, including through regular supplier business reviews and day-to-day engagement. 4. Multi-industry collaboration. We work with industry peers and consortia to influence industry alignment and direction. Collaboration can entail general sharing of best practices, or consulting on amendments to the RBA Code of Conduct. We also participate in multi-industry collaboration to drive and support

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			change beyond the IT industry.' [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Including in ICT supply chain: See above • Met: Example of Actions decided: See above. In addition, in its 2018 MSA Statement, the Company indicates: 'In 2017, HPE promoted training courses provided by RLI to suppliers and recruitment agents for additional training and guidance on industry standards. […] HPE provided on-site capability building services to a supplier in Taiwan. This localized engagement focused on reviewing HPE's prohibition of recruitment fees, conducting root cause and gap analyses, and developing new processes and policies that if implemented, would improve the supplier's ability to avoid, recognize, and resolve issues in the future.' Forced labor and forced labour specifically to migrant is considered a salient issue for the Company. [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • 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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: System to check if Actions are effective • Met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness: According to its 2018 MSA Statement: 'We have taken significant action in the past few years to improve our efforts to mitigate the risks of forced labor, bonded labor, and human trafficking, particularly in our supply chain. This has included tightening our supply chain standards, developing more specialized tools for monitoring supplier performance, developing supplier guidance materials, and conducting specific supplier trainings (as well as the promotion of non-HPE training materials). […] We started our deep monitoring for risks related to the recruitment and employment of foreign migrant workers at supplier sites at the end of 2015 and continue that work today. […] As anticipated, by conducting more in-depth assessments at sites evaluated as potentially higher risk, we found more issues of non-compliance with HPE policies and standards, including high-risk practices, as well as inadequate policies and programs to protect against risks of forced labor. In particular, we identified two critical findings related to risks of forced labor in our supply chain in FY18. The types of findings included: Payment of excessive recruitment fees; and Requirements to lodge deposits at the outset of employment or to take leave'. [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Comms plan re identifying risks: See indicator B.2.1 • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See indicator B.2.2 • Met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: See indicator B.2.3 • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans: See indicator B.2.4 • Not met: Including ICT suppliers: Evidence refers mainly to supply chain, although as indicated above, evidence is still not sufficient in relation to assessment process for determining salience or systems to track effectiveness of actions taken to prevent/mitigate risks. Score 2 • Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • 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	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: In its website section 'Report Ethic Concerns', the Company indicates: 'We encourage anyone with a concern to speak up and report things that don't seem right. We provide multiple channels, making it easy to ask questions or report a concern. Use any of the options listed on this page when you have questions or concerns about a potential violation of law, company policy, or HPE's Standards of Business Conduct.' [Report Ethic Concern, 04/2019: hpe.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2
			• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company indicates in its 2018 Living Progress Report that it tracks ' the nature of ethics and compliance items reported to us each year. In 2018, the majority of items related to labor law' (40%). However, no evidence found of information about the number or percentage of grievances filed, addressed or resolved related to human rights. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com & Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
			• Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company indicates: 'Call the GuideLine from anywhere in the world 24 hours a day. Translators are available and callers can remain anonymous, except where anonymous reporting is prohibited by local law.' On the other hand, in its Ethics Point FAQ document, the Company indicates that this channel is operated by Navex an independent third-party company recognized as one of the premier providers of this service. According to NAVEX website it provides over 150 languages. [Report Ethic Concern, 04/2019: hpe.com & Ethics Point FAQ, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com]
			• Met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: In its Supplier Code, the Company indicates: 'Suppliers should have a communicated process for their personnel and workers to be able to raise any concerns without fear of retaliation.' It also requires that 'At a minimum, Suppliers shall require their next tier Suppliers to acknowledge and implement the HPE Code and hand the HPE Code down to their sub-tier Suppliers'. In addition, the Company has a Supply Chain Foreign Migrant Worker Policy, which indicates: 'Suppliers shall have effective, confidential grievance mechanisms, available in the foreign migrant worker's native language, and shall ensure that workers can raise grievances without intimidation or fear of retaliation. Such mechanisms should also include the ability to report grievances anonymously if desired, unless restricted by law'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 11/2015: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Enterprise Supply Chain Foreign Migrant WorkerStandard, 11/2015: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
			• Met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers: See above. In addition, in its 2018 Corporate Responsibility Report, the Company states: 'We encourage anyone with a concern or question about business conduct to raise it via one of our reporting channels, without fear of reprisal .' [Report Ethic Concern, 04/2019: hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com]
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In its website section 'Report Ethic Concerns', the Company indicates: 'We encourage anyone with a concern to speak up and report things that don't seem right. We provide multiple channels, making it easy to ask questions or report a concern. Use any of the options listed on this page when you have questions or concerns about a potential violation of law, company policy, or HPE's Standards of Business Conduct.' In addition, in its 2018 Living Progress Report, the Company states: 'We encourage anyone with a concern or question about business conduct to raise it via one of our reporting channels, without fear of reprisal .' [Report Ethic Concern, 04/2019: hpe.com & 2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: In addition, it indicates: 'Call the GuideLine from anywhere in the world 24 hours a day. Translators are available and callers can remain anonymous, except where anonymous reporting is prohibited by local law.' However, no further details found on channel being available in all appropriate languages (not clear if translators are available in all cases). [Report Ethic Concern, 04/2019: hpe.com] • Not met: Expects ICT supplier to have community grievance systems: Although the Company indicates in its 2018 Living Progress Report that 3rd party audits are carried out using the RBA Validated Audit Process, and that the RBA Code include requirements related to accessible grievance channels for workers and local communities, it is not clear how many of its suppliers are audited according to RBA Code. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com & Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: ICT supplier communities use global system: See above [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com]
C.3	Users are involved in the design and	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)		Score 2 • 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Response timescales • Met: How complainants will be informed: On its website 'Ethics Point', the Company indicates: 'You will be contacted within two business days with confirmation of your submittal or to request additional information, if you have provided your contact information. […] After you complete your report you will be assigned a unique code called a "report key." Write down your report key and password and keep them in a safe place. After 3 business days, use your report key and password to check your report for feedback or questions.' Furthermore in its FAQ document, It says: 'You may identify yourself or remain anonymous. If you choose to remain anonymous, you will be given a report number and PIN to use if you call back for a progress report.' [Ethics Point FAQ, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Met: Who is handling the complaint: In the Ethics Point FAQ document, the Company indicates: 'When you call the hotline, it is answered by NAVEX Global, an independent third-party company recognized as one of the premier providers of this service. Calls are answered in a central location, making it easier to respond quickly and identify areas that might require corrective action. […] Your report is submitted to the HPE Ethics and Compliance Office. Every concern is handled promptly, discretely, and professionally. ' [Ethics Point FAQ, N/A: secure.ethicspoint.com] Score 2 • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Company states in its Standard of Business Conduct that it 'does not tolerate retaliation against anyone who raises a concern or question honestly and in good faith' [Standards of Business Conduct, 11/2015] • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company indicates in its website that when calling to the Guideline 'callers can remain anonymous, except where anonymous reporting is prohibited by local law.' Not clear, however, whether there are alternatives on practical measures to prevent retaliation in such cases. [Report Ethic Concern, 04/2019: hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice: The Company indicates that 'HPE respects the rights and recognizes the risks faced by human rights defenders. Threats, intimidation, physical or other attacks against individuals are unacceptable'. However, no indication found of the Company indicated that has never retaliated against people filing complaints. [Supplement disclosure to CHRB, 19/07/2019: business-humanrights.org] • 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 • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 • 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	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Describes how remedy has been provided: In its 'Living Progress Data Summary 2018' document, the Company indicates: 'Specific remedial actions have included suppliers: repaying recruitment fees; returning deposits; changing company policies and procedures; updating worker contracts; amending labor agent contracts; enhancing labor agent due diligence and monitoring; and clearly communicating changes to policies and practices with workers'. [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: Changes introduced to stop repetition: In its Modern Slavery Statement, the Company indicates: 'Our supply chain responsibility program reflects years of research and engagement and incorporates our ongoing risk assessments. […] We

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			have taken targeted steps to enhance protection for particularly vulnerable groups that are at heightened risk of exploitation. […] our approach has been to: Map and identify the key risks related to how workers are recruited and employed; Develop specialized supplier standards—in addition to our Supplier Code of Conduct—to address key risk areas (Supply Chain Foreign Migrant Worker Standard and Student and Dispatch Worker Standard for Supplier Facilities in the People's Republic of China); Conduct supplier training and education on the standards and best practices for employing these workers' [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • 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.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts: The Company indicates in its Supplier Code: 'Compensation paid to workers shall comply with all applicable wage laws, including those relating to minimum wages, overtime hours and legally mandated benefits.' No evidence found on living wage. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 • 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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs • Met: Positive incentives to respect human rights: In its 'Supply Chain Responsibility: Our approach' document, the Company indicates: 'Our SER Scorecard ties ongoing procurement decisions to supplier SER performance and participation in capability building. Suppliers with strong SER performance improve their opportunities for new or expanded business. Suppliers with poor SER performance risk a reduction in the business. The SER Scorecard includes a management system component, which enables suppliers to demonstrate integration of SER issues within their own management systems, and to demonstrate a proactive approach on key risks.' [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.4.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Identifies suppliers back to product source: The Company discloses in its 'Suppliers Reference Guide' document a list of ' of Hewlett Packard Enterprise production suppliers and information about their sustainability practices. These suppliers represent more than 95% of HPE's procurement expenditures for materials, manufacturing, and assembly at the time of publication. This list includes final assembly suppliers, which may include contract manufacturers, electronic manufacturing service providers, and original design manufacturers, as well as commodity and component suppliers.' The Company indicates that commodity and components suppliers are indirect suppliers. [Suppliers reference guide, 06/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why: The Company discloses its Supplier List which 'represent more than 95% of HPE's procurement expenditures for materials, manufacturing, and assembly at the time of publication. This list includes final assembly suppliers, which may include contract manufacturers, electronic manufacturing service providers, and original design manufacturers, as well as commodity and component suppliers.' [Suppliers reference guide, 06/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: Its Supplier Code includes a section dedicated to the prohibition to Child Labour and the management of Young workers. On the other hand the Company indicates in its 2018 MSA: 'Comprehensive, independent third-party audits evaluate supplier performance against our Supplier Code of Conduct, including the provisions on freely chosen employment. The majority of these audits are conducted through the RBA Validated Assessment Process (VAP).' The VAP includes requirements related to age verification. However, it is not clear if the VAP guidelines has been consistently applied throughout supply chain and whether it is applied as a set of requirements (as we understand it as guide that companies might choose to follow). In addition, no evidence found in relation to remediation programmes. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress: In its Living Progress Data Summary, the Company discloses information about the number of 'critical finding related to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work: freedom of association; freedom from forced, bonded, or indentured labor; from child labor; or from discrimination' for 2017 (4) and 2018 (2). However, there is no detailed information related only to child labor. [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
D.4.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code, the Company indicates: 'Forced, bonded (including debt bonded) or indentured labor; prison labor; or slavery or trafficking of persons shall not be used. […] Workers shall not be required to pay for their employment. Suppliers shall maintain adequate controls to ensure that workers have not been charged recruitment or placement fees during their recruitment process and Suppliers are responsible to repay any such fees charged to worker.' In addition, the Company put in place the Supply Chain Foreign Migrant Worker Standard which sets put 'minimum requirements for the appropriate and ethical recruitment and management of foreign migrant workers by or on behalf of suppliers doing business with Hewlett Packard Enterprise'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees: In its Modern Slavery Statement, the Company indicates: 'In 2017, HPE promoted training courses provided by RLI to suppliers and recruitment agents for additional training and guidance on industry standards. […]. [MSA 2018, 04/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above • Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made: In its Living Progress Data Summary, the Company discloses information about the number of 'critical finding related to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work: freedom of association; freedom from forced, bonded, or indentured labor; from child labor; or from discrimination' for 2016 (15), 2017 (4) and 2018 (2). It also reports on major nonconformances of sites audited, which include 'Freely chosen employment management systems', which cover debt bondage and freedom of movement. In 2017, there were 7 nonconformances related with this issue, in 2018 there were 10. [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Living Progress Data Summary 2017: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
D.4.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code, the Company indicates: 'There shall be no unreasonable restrictions on workers' freedom of movement in the facility, nor unreasonable restrictions on entering or exiting company-provided facilities […]. All work must be voluntary, and workers shall be free to leave work at any time or terminate their employment. Suppliers and agents may not hold or otherwise destroy, conceal, confiscate or deny access by employees to employees' identity or immigration documents, such as government-issued identification, passports, or work permits, unless the holding is required by law'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			• Met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters: In its 'Living Progress Data Summary 2017' document, the Company indicates: 'we identified four critical findings, including: payment of excessive recruitment fees; restriction of workers access to personal documentation; [...]. In each case we worked closely with the relevant supplier to remediate the issue and strengthen management system to guard against reoccurrence. [...] Specific remedial actions have included suppliers [...] returning personal documents, deposits and savings; changing company policies and procedures; updating workers contracts, amending labor agent contracts, enhancing labor agent due diligence and monitoring; and clearly communicating changes to policies and practices to workers.' No new relevant evidence found in latest report. [Living Progress Data Summary 2017: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made: In its Living Progress Data Summary, the Company discloses information about the number of 'critical finding related to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work: freedom of association; freedom from forced, bonded, or indentured labor; from child labor; or from discrimination' for 2016 (15), 2017 (4) and 2018 (2). On the other hand, the Company reports on major nonconformances of sites audited, which include 'Freely chosen employment management systems', which cover debt bondage and freedom of movement. In 2017, there were 7 nonconformances related with this issue, in 2018 there were 10. [Living Progress Data Summary 2017: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
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 • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code, the Company indicates: '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, unless it is prohibited by local law. Workers and/or their representatives shall be able to openly communicate and share ideas and concerns with management regarding working conditions and management practices without fear of discrimination, reprisal, intimidation or harassment.' However, as it has indicated to respect these rights 'unless it is prohibited by local law', it is not clear whether it requires alternative mechanisms for those countries where there are legal restrictions to the exercise of these rights. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB: The Company indicates in its document 'SCR: Our approach': 'Capability-building programs address the most significant supply chain SER issues as identified by audit trends, external stakeholder input, and other intelligence. [...] In conjunction with local and international NGOs and training groups, we have delivered four types of training and capability-building programs: Supplier-specific capability-building. Virtual and on-site programs that help suppliers develop sustainable management systems and remediation plans for specific SER issues. [...]; Broad-topic capability-building. Programs and events that address industry-wide key issues, emerging risks, and new requirements across our supply chain; Worker well-being. Programs with a focus on worker empowerment and well-being. These are designed to have a positive impact beyond the workplace; Worker voice. A program designed to engage workers and create capability-building initiatives driven by their needs.' However, no evidence found in relation 'freedom of association and collective bargaining' actions. [Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
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 • Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Company's Supplier Code includes provisions with respect Health and Safety, including the following topics: Occupational Safety, Emergency Preparedness, Occupational Injury and Illness, Industrial Hygiene, Food, Sanitation and Housing among others. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: Injury rate disclosures: The Company indicates in its 2018 Living Progress Report that its 'recordable incident rate, also below industry standards, was 0.12.' [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com & Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			• Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures: The Company reported: 'In 2018, our lost workday case rate was 0.05, a rate well below industry standards.' However, this figure does not include the workers of suppliers. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com & Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: Fatalities disclosures • Not met: Occupational disease rates Score 2 • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
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 • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights: In its 2017 Living Progress Report, the Company disclosed information about its HERfinance program: 'In 2017, we concluded our partnership with BSR to deliver a HERfinance program with four suppliers in Mexico. Designed to have a positive impact beyond the workplace, the program involved workers in peer-to-peer on-site financial literacy training. HERfinance program summary: Factory workers trained as peer educators: 205; Beneficiaries across four suppliers: 5,126; Participants now saving money each month: 64% (from 46% baseline); Participants feeling comfortable meeting future expenses in the next two years: 57% (from 35% baseline); Participants with knowledge of saving fund available in the factory: 78% (from 38% baseline).' However, CHRB could not find further information about this program. [2017 Corporate Responsibility Report: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Working hours in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code, the Company indicates: 'Workweeks are not to exceed the maximum set by local law. Further, a workweek should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be allowed at least one day off every seven days.' However, no evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. In addition, it not clear what 'exceptional or unusual situations' would be. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours: In its 'Living Progress Data Summary 2018' document, the Company indicates: 'We are expanding the reach of our working hours assessments to include more small and high-risk suppliers, and we will continue to work with suppliers to raise standards by: Frequent monitoring of conformance with working hours and day of rest requirements for certain suppliers through our KPI program; Engaging with supplier management to address root causes of nonconformances.' In addition, in its 'SCR: Our approach' document, it states: 'We require key suppliers in high-risk locations to provide additional monthly reporting on KPIs such as working hours,[…]' However, it is not clear how specifically works with suppliers to improve performance in its practices in relation to this issue. [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Supply Chain Responsibility _ Our Approach, 06/2018: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made: In its 'Living Progress Data Summary 2018' document, the Company indicates: 'In 2018, an average of 96% of workers at supplier sites in the KPI program worked less than 60 hours per week, compared to 97% in 2017. On average, 98% of workers at supplier sites received at least one day of rest in every seven-day period, compared to 99% in 2017. We are expanding the reach of our working hours assessments to include more small and high-risk suppliers, […]' [Data Summary 2018, 2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com]

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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing due diligence in suppler contracts: The supplier code states: 'Suppliers shall have a policy to reasonably assure that the tantalum, tin, tungsten and gold in the products, parts, components, and materials they manufacture does not directly or indirectly finance or benefit armed groups that are perpetrators of serious human rights abuses in the Democratic Republic of the Congo or an adjoining country. Suppliers shall exercise due diligence on the source and chain of custody of these minerals and make their due diligence measures available to customers upon customer request.' A similar requirement is included in its Supply Chain Social and Environmental Responsibility Policy': Suppliers are expected to ensure that parts and products supplied to Hewlett Packard Enterprise are DRC conflict-free […]. Suppliers are 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, that are designed to accomplish this goal.' In addition, in its Modern Slavery Act, the Company states: 'Hewlett Packard Enterprise's supplier agreements require suppliers to comply with all applicable laws and regulations and include requirements relating to HPE's Supplier Code of Conduct.' However, although there is a reference to the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict - Affected and High-Risks Areas, the provision refers only to DRC conflicts, so it is not clear if it covers all conflict affected and high risks areas. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 07/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com & Supply Chain SER Policy, 11/2015: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: Builds capacity with smelters/refiners Score 2 • 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	0.5	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 • Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD due diligence: In its Conflict Mineral Report 2018, the Company indicates that it 'surveyed 3TG Direct Suppliers during the reporting period of this Conflict Minerals Report using the Template […] and required those suppliers to make similar efforts to survey their supply chains using the Template; reviewed information obtained through those surveys on 3TG facilities, and any mine or location of origin information if it was provided; and assessed any information on countries of origin available through our membership in RMI for 3TG facilities.' 'Because participation in an independent assessment program, such as RMAP, provides us with a level of assurance of an upstream facility's sourcing practices, we track and report on this participation'. [2018 Conflic Mineral Report, 30/05/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] Score 2 • Met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD due diligence: The Company discloses in its Conflict Minerals Report 2018 the List of all qualified smelters/refiners in it supply chain that it has independently judged, and it indicates: 'Our suppliers reported 302 total 3TG facilities in 2018, 94% (284) of which (as of the 2019 Cut-Off Date) are conformant with or active with an independent assessment program, are believed to source from outside the Covered Countries, or are exclusively providing conflict minerals from recycled or scrap sources. Only 6% (18) of the supplier-reported 3TG facilities are facilities for which we have limited or no information on the sourcing of necessary conflict minerals (both because they are not yet participating in an independent assessment program and because we found no information giving us reason to believe they were sourcing from outside the Covered Countries or exclusively from recycled or scrap sources). [2018 Conflic Mineral Report, 30/05/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain: The Company includes in its Conflict Minerals Report a list of 'Steps to Further Mitigate Risk and Improve Due Diligence in 2019', however these steps are not related with the management and respond to risks identified in its mineral supply chain. [2018 Conflic Mineral Report, 30/05/2019: h20195.www2.hpe.com] • Not met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 • 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 35.80 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 8.95 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	3 out of 4	Out of a total of 44 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Hewlett Packard Enterprise made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 33 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 3 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 • Met: Company reports on GRI: The 2018 Living Progress Report has a GRI Index. [2018 Living Progress Report, 05/2019: assets.ext.hpe.com] • Met: Company reports on SASB: See above [2017 Corporate Responsibility Report: h20195.www2.hpe.com]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Hewlett Packard Enterprise 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 • 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 • 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 • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management

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.