

Company Name Kyocera
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
Overall Score (*) 7.7 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.9	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.7	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.8	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.9	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.5	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.8	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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: General HRs commitment: Kyocera discloses on its website that "shall respect the human rights of employees and not treat them severely or inhumanely, including abuse or any type of harassment". [Corporate Social Responsibility, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] Met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: The Kyocera Group joined the United Nations Global Compact, a global platform setting out 10 fundamental principles relating to human rights, labor, environment, and anti-corruption, out of agreement with the main purport of the Compact. [Promotion of diversion and inclusion - Human Rights, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Kyocera Group joined the United Nations Global Compact, a global platform setting out 10 fundamental principles relating to human rights, labor, environment, and anti-corruption, out of agreement with the main purport of the Compact. [Promotion of diversion and inclusion - Human Rights, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Company explicitly list for its suppliers about the right of freedom of association, prohibition of discrimination, forced and child labor. However, no mention found to collective

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>bargaining. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Company discloses on its website that do not allow forced or child labor and do not engage in unfair and discriminatory treatment, respect the right of freedom of association. In addition, the Kyocera Group discloses that practice the ten principles of UNGC without fail and explicitly list all of the ten principles on its website, which includes that "businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining". [Corporate Social Responsibility, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company discloses that "shall observe laws and regulations related to health and safety and undertake health and safety measures more actively and continuously including through the implementation of risk assessment and emergency". [Corporate Social Responsibility, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] • Met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers: Kyocera states in its supply chain CSR development that "suppliers are requested to apply appropriate safety measures for equipment and instruments used in their company. Appropriate safety measures mean the management to prevent accidents and health problems occurring on the job". [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] • Not met: working hours for workers: The Company discloses that human resource departments undertake independent checks for legal violations such as working hour management according to labor-related laws and regulations, in-house rules, and labor agreements with unions. However, to check for legal violations does not imply a formal commitment to respect working ours for workers including maximum working hours and minimum rest periods. [Promotion of diversion and inclusion - Human Rights, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: Kyocera states in its supply code that "suppliers are requested to regulate employee's working hours/holidays/vacations not to exceed the legal ceiling". However, there is no mention to maximum working hours and minimum rest periods. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com]
A.1.3.ICT.a	Commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing in conflict areas • Met: Based on OECD Guidance: "Kyocera designed due diligence in conformity with the internationally recognized due diligence framework set forth in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas, Third Edition (2016), and related supplements therein". [Conflict Minerals Report, May 30, 2018: global.kyocera.com] • Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers: The Company states on its Supply Chain Code that "suppliers are requested not to purchase conflict minerals which would cause social problems such as violation of human rights". However, there is no mention about high risk areas and to suppliers conduct due diligence upholding the OECD Guidance. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals: The Company based its due diligence to conflict mineral sourcing based on the organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas, Third Edition (2016), which covers as all materials. [Conflict Minerals Report, May 30, 2018: global.kyocera.com] • 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)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's Rights: Although the Company has a policy to Promote the Careers of Women in the Workplace by increase the number of female on manager position. CHRB couldn't find a policy in which it commits specifically to respect women's rights • Not met: Children's Rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEO or Board approves policy • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both examples and process
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Senior responsibility for HR <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&S <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The Kyocera Group faces various risks that may affect the credibility or business sustainability of the Kyocera Group, including changes in the market environment, occurrence of

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			natural disasters, incidents and accidents, the impact of climate change, information leakage, deficiencies of labor conditions in the supply chain, and violation of human rights. [Risk Management and Compliance, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.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	0	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 • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations Score 2 • Met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2 • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder: Although Kyocera discloses that provides each year a meeting with local communities to discuss about the CSR Economic, Social and Environmental Report Meetings since 2005, there is no description about Company's policy communication to the local communities. [Corporate Social Responsibility, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
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 • Not met: Communicating policy down the whole ICT supply chain • Met: Requiring ICT suppliers to communicate policy down the chain: On its Supplier Code, Kyocera states that "build a chain structure that one supplier requires CSR activity to its suppliers and the said suppliers require CSR activity to the suppliers of the next tier. Then, we make this chain practice to the whole supply chain". [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] Score 2 • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: Although Kyocera states in its Supplier Code that prohibit inhumane treatment and infringement of human rights, there is no evidence that this statement is a contractual arrangement. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] • Not met: Including on ICT 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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company discloses that in 2018 to promote diversity and inclusion, made training on LGBT to managers of the personnel and general affairs departments. However, CHRB couldn't find an evidence that Kyocera provided training on human rights issues for all workers. [Promotion of diversion and inclusion - Human Rights, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] • Not met: Trains relevant ICT managers including procurement Score 2 • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	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 • Not met: Monitoring ICT suppliers Score 2 • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of ICT supply chain monitored
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: HR affects ICT selection of suppliers • Not met: HR affects on-going ICT supplier relationships: The Company discloses that expect suppliers to understand the CSR Supplier guideline and promote CSR activities eagerly and will reluctantly have to reconsider whether to continue the business with partner, in case that the activities are not approved by the supplier. However, this statement does not imply in a direct consequence if the supplier do not follow the human rights principles described on the Supplier Code. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met Not met: Working with ICT suppliers to improve performance
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Stakeholder process or systems Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement Not met: Workers in ICT SC engaged Not met: Communities in the ICT SC engaged Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Identifying risks in own operations Not met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Ongoing global risk identification Not met: In consultation with stakeholders Not met: In consultation with HR experts Not met: Triggered by new circumstances
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context) Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Kyocera Group discloses that endeavours to reduce and mitigate risks while acting on the Basic Policy on Risk Management put in place for this purpose. However, does not describe its global system to take action to prevent, mitigate or remediate its salient human rights issues. [Risk Management and Compliance, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] Not met: Including in ICT supply chain Not met: Example of Actions decided Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: System to check if Actions are effective Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans Not met: Including ICT suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company discloses that has a Hot-Line Center in which its workers can consult for a diverse range of issues. Employees can seek advice and consultation, as well as report actions that are or may be in violation of laws and internal regulations relating to human rights, labor, safety and health, environment, fair business practices, etc. [Risk Management and Compliance, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company discloses that in 2018 were undertaken 27 consultations on different matters. However, does not describe how many cases are related to human rights issues. [Risk Management and Compliance, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages • Not met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems • Not met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Grievance mechanism for community <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects ICT supplier to have community grievance systems • Not met: ICT supplier communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: ICT suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed • Not met: Who is handling the complaint <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.1.a	Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Achieved payment of living wage • Not met: Regularly review definition of living wage with unions
D.4.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts: The Company discloses in its Supplier Code that "suppliers are requested to pay legal minimum wage or more, and not to practice unfair wage deduction as means of a disciplinary action". However, no evidence found in relation to living wage. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.4.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.4.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to product source Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why
D.4.4.a	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Does not use child labour: The Kyocera Group explicitly prohibits the use of child labor. [Promotion of diversion and inclusion - Human Rights, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Age verification of job applicants and workers • Not met: Remediation if children identified
D.4.4.b	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code the Company states that "Suppliers are requested not to employ children who are under the lowest labor age and not to assign such jobs that impair children's development". However, there is no mention to verify the age of job applicants and workers and remediation programme if some child is found working. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.4.5.a	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Pays workers in full and on time: The Company discloses that "human resource departments undertake independent checks for legal violations such as discrimination, appropriate payment and working hour management according to labor-related laws and regulations, in-house rules, and labor agreements with unions". However, CHRB couldn't find evidence that the Company pays workers in full and on time. [CSR Report, 2018: global.kyocera.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.5.c	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How sure about agencies or brokers
D.4.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: Kyocera discloses in its supplier code that: "Suppliers are requested to employ all employees on a voluntary basis, and not to commit forced labor" and the Company define the "Obligation to deposit identification cards/passports/work permit cards with employers" as forced labor. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation: The Kyocera Group is a participant of the United Nations Global Compact and in its CSR report describe all the ten principles of the UN Global Compact, in which principle 3 is described that " business should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining". However, there is no reference about not interfering on the exercise of these rights. [Corporate Social Responsibility, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
D.4.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: The Company states in its supplier code that "Suppliers are requested to respect the rights to freedom of association of employees, as means of employer-employee consultation, in order to settle working conditions and/or wage issues, etc". However, there is no mention to the right of collective bargaining and not interfering with rights to exercise these activities. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Injury Rate disclosures: The Company provides a graphic that describe the evolution of lost time accident rate (number of afflicted person/1 million hours) per year and discloses that "the lost time accident rate of the Kyocera Group (Japan) in 2018 was 0.27". [Building a Safe & Secure Work Environment, 5/7/2019: global.kyocera.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosure • Not met: Fatalities disclosures • Not met: Occupational disease rates

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Set targets for H&S performance: Although the Company states that "will continue to take action to reduce industrial accidents and create a safe working environment safe for all its employees", there is no quantitative information about target for health and safety performance. [Building a Safe & Secure Work Environment, 5/7/2019: global.kyocera.com] Not met: Met targets or explains why not
D.4.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Company states in its supplier code that Suppliers are requested to apply appropriate safety measures for equipment and instruments used in their company. In addition the Company gives examples of requirements that suppliers must apply such as the adoption of safety mechanisms such as called fail-safe, fool proof, and inter-lock, periodical inspection and maintenance of machinery, appropriate education on hygiene for workers and provision of protective devices to workers. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] Not met: Injury rate disclosures Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures Not met: Fatalities disclosures Not met: Occupational disease rates <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.8.a	Women's rights (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Process to stop harassment and violence: Although the Company states that works to prevent power harassment and sexual harassment in the workplace, there is no description about its process to prohibit harassment, intimidation and violence against women. [Corporate Social Responsibility, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] Not met: Working conditions take account of gender Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Meets all of the requirements under score 1
D.4.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.9.a	Working hours (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations: The Company discloses that the human resource departments undertake independent checks for legal violations of working hour management according to labor-related laws and regulations, in-house rules, and labor agreements with unions. However, there is no description about the maximum hours and minimum breaks that the Company is committed to respect. [Promotion of diversion and inclusion - Human Rights, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: How it implements and checks this [Promotion of diversion and inclusion - Human Rights, 5/6/2019: global.kyocera.com]
D.4.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Working hours in codes or contracts: In its supplier code the Company states that: "Suppliers are requested to regulate employee's working hours/holidays/vacations not to exceed the legal ceiling". However, the Company does not describe what are the maximum working hours and minimum resting periods. [Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing due diligence in supplier contracts: The Company discloses in its supplier code that Suppliers are requested not to purchase conflict minerals which would cause social problems such as violation of human rights. However, there is no evidence that the Company incorporates into commercial contracts with suppliers requirements to conduct due diligence in accordance with the OECD Guidance. [Conflict Minerals Report, May 30, 2018: global.kyocera.com & Supply-Chain CSR DeploymentGuidebook, October 2016: kyoceradocumentsolutions.com] Not met: Builds capacity with smelters/refiners Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Disclosure of smelter information in supplier requirements: The Company provides a list of smelters/refiners within Kyocera's supply. However, there is no evidence that into commercial contracts is incorporated agreements with suppliers requirements to disclose to the Company updated smelter/refiner information for any mineral. [Conflict Minerals Report, May 30, 2018: global.kyocera.com] Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals
D.4.10.b	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Identification in Mineral Supply Chain	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance: For the process for identifying and prioritizing risks and impacts in its supply "Kyocera examined and confirmed instances of non-conformity and contradiction in content by using a statistical tool released by the Japan Auto Parts Industries Association (JAPIA) on its website. Subsequently, Kyocera compared smelters or refiners identified through the survey against the Compliant Smelters and Refiners Lists published by the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) to determine whether the identified smelters/refiners have obtained CFS validation. Kyocera participated in the process of identifying smelters/refiners by submitting data on smelters/refiners that cannot be identified to the "Conflict Free Sourcing (CFS) Working Group." The CFS Working Group was established by the industry organizations Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association (JAMA), JAPIA and JEITA to collaborate in dealing with conflict minerals issues". However, there is no description about the risks identified. [Conflict Minerals Report, May 30, 2018: global.kyocera.com] Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD due diligence: The Company describes how it surveys suppliers to identify smelters. It also discloses that compares smelters or refiners identified through the survey against the Compliant Smelters and Refiners Lists published by the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) to determine whether the identified smelters/refiners have obtained CFS validation. [Conflict Minerals Report, May 30, 2018: global.kyocera.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD due diligence: The Company discloses lists of smelters that obtained CFS (Conflict free sourcing) validation. [Conflict Minerals Report, May 30, 2018: global.kyocera.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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain Not met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Supplier and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 6.14 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.53 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	0.77 out of 4	Out of a total of 52 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Kyocera made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 10 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.77 out of 4 points.

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met: Company reports on GRI: The Kyocera Group reports its core subjects on GRI (Global Reporting Initiative). [GRI and ISO26000 Comparison Tables, 5/7/2019: global.kyocera.com]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Kyocera met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management Not met: Score 1 for D.4.1.a: Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations) Not met: Score 2 for D.4.7.a: Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)

Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2019 Key Findings report and technical annex for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice. The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither CHRB Ltd nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB Ltd's appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and construed in accordance with English law and submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of England and Wales.

As CHRB Ltd, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise

score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.