

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2018 Company Scoresheet



Company Name Tapestry
Industry Apparel (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score (*) 9.3 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.2	10	A. Governance and Policies
1.4	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
3.3	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.0	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.9	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.6	10	F. Transparency

(*) Please note that any small differences between the Overall Score and the added total of Measurement Theme scores are due to rounding the numbers at different stages of the score calculation process.

Please note also that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2018 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

Detailed assessment

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: General HRs commitment: Although the Company indicates in the supply chain section of its sustainability report 2016 that 'Through strategic partnerships with manufacturing facilities that support our belief in human rights, labour rights, and workplace safety, we have operated a social compliance program for many years. We are proud of our continued commitment to international human rights, labour practices, and decent work standards.', its formal policies (Global Operation Principles, Supplier Code of Conduct, Code of Conduct) do not contain explicit commitments regarding human rights, the International Bill of Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the United Nations Global Compact principles 1 & 2, covering its operations. [Global Operation Principles: media.corporate-ir.net & Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2: See above • Not met: UDHR: See above • Not met: International Bill of Rights: See above <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGPs: See above • Not met: OECD: See above
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: ILO Core: The Company's code of conduct includes explicit commitment in relation to some ILO core areas: Discrimination, and Child Labour. However the

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Company has not disclosed specific commitments in relation to ILO core areas of forced labour, freedom of association and collective bargaining. [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net & Global Operation Principles: media.corporate-ir.net]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Not met: All four ILO for AP suppliers: Regarding suppliers, the supplier code of conduct contains clear requirements on some ILO Core areas: Child Labour, Forced Labour and Discrimination. However, the commitment included in the supplier code of conduct referred to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining is not sufficient: 'Suppliers must respect the legal rights of employees to freely and without harassment participate in worker organizations of their choice, and to refrain from joining organizations if that is their wish. Suppliers must not threaten or penalize employees for their efforts to organize or bargain collectively where permitted by the laws of the country of manufacture, nor may they discriminate against workers as a result of any such organization affiliation.' The commitment to fully respect freedom of association does not extend to collective bargaining, where the Company asked only to not threaten or penalize employees where bargain collectively is permitted by the laws of the country. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: All four ILO Core: See above [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] • Met: Respect H&S of workers: Its Code of Conduct also includes commitments on workplace safety which cover health and safety issues. [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] • Met: H&S applies to AP suppliers: The code for suppliers also contains requirements on health & safety. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net] • Met: working hours for employees: Its Code of Conduct states: 'Hours worked each day, and days worked each week, shall not exceed the legal limitations of the countries in which we operate.' [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] • Met: Working hours for AP suppliers: The Suppliers Code of Conduct indicates: 'The Company will not knowingly use suppliers who fail to comply with the legal maximum working hours as specified by each country's standards and laws.' [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net]
A.1.3.AP	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (AP)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Women's Rights • Not met: Children's Rights • Not met: Migrant worker's rights • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business principles • Not met: Convention on migrant workers • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<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: The 'Engaging our stakeholders' section of the Sustainability report 2016 identifies stakeholders as 'those groups or individuals who are impacted, and influenced by, or who can impact, our company'. It includes stakeholder groups, engagement topics and examples of engagement. Regarding 'suppliers', an example of engagement is: 'adherence to supplier selection guidelines and Global Operating Principles'. Regarding communities, however, topics of engagement relate to 'corporate giving; education; Coach Foundation mission' and examples of engagement include activities related to this topic and not human rights issues. The Company has not disclosed a commitment to engage with affected stakeholders and their legitimate representatives in the development or monitoring of its human rights approach. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to remedy: The Company has not disclosed a commitment to remedy the adverse impacts on individuals, workers and communities that it has caused or contributed to. Although it indicates in its Corporate Responsibility Report 2016 that 'at the end of the audit process, if required, our compliance team works diligently with factory managers to outline a corrective action plan which identifies strategies for improvement'. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies • Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives • Not met: Work with AP suppliers to remedy impacts
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects AP suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments

A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

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

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior responsibility fo HR (inc ILO): The Company indicates in its website section 'Global Business Integrity Program that 'In order to monitor the adherence to these principles, we created a Global Business Standards Committee comprised of senior executives'. According to the 'Global Business integrity program' section on the website, this programme consists of five documents including the code of conduct and the supplier code of conduct. However the Company's commitments do not include all ILO core areas, nor a commitment to the ILO Declaration or the UN Global Compact. [Global Business Integrity Program: tapestry.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility • Not met: Day-to-day responsibility in supply chain
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not met: At least one key AP HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	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 part of enterprise risk system: The Company indicates in its Responsibility Report 2016: 'We have an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) program that annually assesses risks – including fraud risk, corporate governance and social responsibility- to our business and the business of our partners'. As part of the annual risk evaluation, the Company develops and Internal Audit Plan. The goal for the risk assessment process is to create an 'audit plan that identifies risks and exposures and evaluates management's risk mitigation strategy'. Also, in the risk section of the Form 10-K 2017, the Company include human rights related risks as part of 'the risks inherent in global sourcing activities' such as: 'The violation of labor, environmental or other laws by an independent manufacturer or supplier, or divergence of an independent manufacturer's or supplier's labor practices from those generally accepted as ethical or appropriate in the U.S., could interrupt or otherwise disrupt the shipment of our products, harm our trademarks or damage our reputation'. The Company considers that these risks could lead to 'adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.' [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net & 2017 Form 10K, 2017: tapestry.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment: The Company has created a Global Business Standards Committee in order to monitor the adherence to the Company's principles (Code of Conducts, etc.), however this Committee does not evaluate the designed system to prevent the Human Rights related risks, but to manage the compliance to the created system. [Global Business Integrity Program: tapestry.com]
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company indicates on its website, global business integrity program section that 'The Code of Conduct is issued to our employees worldwide and outlines the significant legal and ethical issues that frequently arise in the course of business and describes the key responsibilities all employees, directors and officers are expected to uphold and comply with in conjunction with our values and policies'. However, the code does not contain a commitment to all ILO core labour standards, and the Company does not indicate whether it has been translated to any local languages. [Global Business Integrity Program: tapestry.com & Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder [Global Business Integrity Program: tapestry.com & Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience [Global Business Integrity Program: tapestry.com & Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net]
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to BRs: The Company indicates in its Responsibility Report 2016 that 'Before partnering with a vendor, we share Coach's Supplier Code of Conduct' (page 27) and require our independent manufacturing partners to contractually abide by these guidelines'. The Supplier Business Code however, do not include a clear commitment to all ILO core areas, specifically the area of collective bargaining. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] Not met: Including to AP suppliers: The communication include Suppliers according to the definition states in its Responsibility Report 2016: 'Suppliers include contractors, joint venture partners and suppliers of goods and services, including raw material suppliers and manufacturing partners'. The Supplier Business Code however, do not include a clear commitment to all ILO core areas, specifically the area of collective bargaining. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] Not met: Including on AP suppliers: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net]
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company states in its Responsibility Report 2016 that it 'conducts internal trainings of Coach employees to ensure that participants in supply chain management are knowledgeable and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>aware of the issues and concerns surrounding the supply chain, including human trafficking and slavery, with a particular focus on mitigating risks'. However, it is not clear whether it conducts training to all relevant managers and workers and whether this training includes all ILO core areas. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Trains relevant managers including procurement: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The Company indicates in its Responsibility Report 2016 15 that: 'To ensure our service providers and raw material suppliers are fulfilling their obligation, we conduct internal as well as external, independent third party audits. The auditors are experts in the local laws of the countries in which we operate and speak the local languages. An audit consists of: A factory walk-through to evaluate the physical working conditions as well as health and safety practices; confidential interviews with workers to provide freedom to speak on potential misconduct and a review of all relevant documentation. Currently, each factory receives at least one audit per year'. The Company's policy, however, do not include clear commitments to all ILO core areas. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: Monitoring AP suppliers: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes corrective action process: Concerning corrective action processes, the Responsibility Report 2016 states that 'if a factory visit reveals an issue that requires improvement we conduct a second audit, generally six months after the initial assessment. We maintain a full record of reports on the living and working conditions of people retained to work at factories where our products are manufactured'. However, there is no information on the number of incidents. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored: Regarding numbers of incidences, the Company indicates in its Responsibility Report 2016 that 'During fiscal 2016, 98% of Tapestry service providers received acceptable audit results. Issues found in the 2% that failed included concerns with record keeping deficiencies and a denied audit. Of the raw material suppliers audited, 94% received acceptable results. Issues found in the 6% were due to Hepatitis B testing and transparency issues. However the Company's policy does not include a clear commitment to all ILO core areas. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net]
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	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"> • Not met: HR affects selection of suppliers: The Company indicates in its Responsibility Report 2016 that: 'Before partnering with a vendor, we share Coach's Supplier Code of Conduct" (page 27) and require our independent manufacturing partners to contractually abide by these guidelines'. The Company, however, does not indicate how these practices are taken into account in the selection of potential business relationships and how it can affect decisions to enter into, or select business relationships. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships: Additionally, the Company states that it evaluates 'each manufacturing facility by conducting a quality and business practice standards audit'. Moreover it also indicates that 'If a service provider or raw material supplier makes no meaningful attempt to improve their practices and/or disregards our human rights requirements, Coach will not hesitate to terminate the business relationship with that supplier.' [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Not met: Working with suppliers to improve performance: Although the Company reports on collaboration and remediation in corrective action plans, it does not describe how it works with suppliers to improve human rights performance nor provides examples.' [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected 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: Stakeholder process or systems: In its Responsibility Report 2016 the Company present its Stakeholders and examples of the engagement with each group. However, there is no information about a system to identify and update this list and guides the frequency and triggers for engagement. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: See above [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: workers in the SP engaged: The Stakeholders list presented in its Responsibility Report 2016 includes the group 'Employees' but it do not include supplier workers. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: communities in the SC engaged: The Stakeholders list presented in its Responsibility Report 2016 includes the group 'Communities' but the engagement strategies are mainly unidirectional, from the Company to the related agents, and the topics do not cover human rights issues related with the Company activities which could affect the Communities. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Identifying risks in own operations: In the risk section of the Form 10-K 2017, the Company indicates: 'Our business is subject to the risks inherent in global sourcing activities [...] The violation of labour, environmental or other laws by an independent manufacturer or supplier [...], could interrupt or otherwise disrupt the shipment of our products, harm our trademarks or damage our reputation. The occurrence of any of these events could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations'. However, the Company does not describe the processes to identify these risks and impacts in specific locations or activities [2017 Form 10K, 2017: tapestry.com] • Not met: Identifying risks in AP suppliers: See above [2017 Form 10K, 2017: tapestry.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Salient risk assessment (and context): Although the Company has identified some human rights risks in the Form 10-K (see indicator above), it does not describe the processes for assessing these risks, including how geographical, economic, social and other relevant factors are taken into account. [2017 Form 10K, 2017: tapestry.com] • Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not met: Example of Actions decided • Not met: Including in AP supply chain <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to	0	<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: System to check if Actions are effective • Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	human rights risks and impacts		
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks • Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including AP 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	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company's code of conduct states that: ' You may also report a matter (anonymously, if desired) by contacting the Tapestry, Inc. Ethics and Compliance Reporting System online at tapestry.ethicspoint.com, or call a representative, at 1.800.396.1807 (for matters in the United States) or the international phone numbers available at tapestry.com under 'Contacting the Board'. The Code of conduct contains commitments on some ILO core areas. Ethics and Compliance Reporting System is available for all employees, business partners, and members of the general public. [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: Tapestry Ethics and Compliance Reporting System is available online in 10 different languages including Hindi, Thai, Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean and Chinese. [Ethics Point Hotline: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Not met: Expect AP supplier to have equivalent grievance systems [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net] • Met: Opens own system to AP supplier workers: The Supplier code of conduct provides channels to contact directly to the Company. Specifically, this code states that: ' If you have questions, need to make disclosures, or are concerned about conduct that you believe violates the Company's standards or the law, contact the Law Department at 212-615-2436. You may also report a matter (anonymously, if desired) by contacting the Tapestry Ethics and Compliance Reporting System online at tapestry.ethicspoint.com, or call a representative, at 1-800-396-1807 (for matters in the United States) or the international phone numbers available at tapestry.com under the Contacting the Board section. ' [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net & Ethics Point Hotline: secure.ethicspoint.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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: In its Ethics Point Hotline website the Company indicates: 'Through this site, employees, business partners and members of the general public may report their concerns confidentially and, if desired, anonymously.' [Ethics Point Hotline: secure.ethicspoint.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The Ethics Point Hotline website is available in 10 languages including Hindi, Thai, Korean, Chinese, Vietnamese, Spanish and English. [Ethics Point Hotline: secure.ethicspoint.com] • Not met: Expects AP supplier to have community grievance systems • Met: AP supplier communities use global system: See above [Ethics Point Hotline: secure.ethicspoint.com]
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not met: Description of how they do this Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: AP suppliers consult users in creation or assessment

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The company's code of conduct has a statement on no retaliation that states: 'It is unlawful and expressly against Tapestry policy for anyone to retaliate against any employee either for reporting violations of the Code or for cooperating with an investigation. Anyone who engages in retaliatory conduct against an employee will be terminated. It does not indicate however if this commitment is extensive to other stakeholders and those that represent them. [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: In the F.A.Q. from the Company's Ethic Point website there is a specific section related to 'Reporting Security & Confidentiality', where the Company shows its commitment to assure anonymity, for example: 'A report from home, a neighbour's computer, or any Internet portal will remain secure and anonymous. An Internet portal never identifies a visitor by screen name and the EthicsPoint system strips away Internet addresses so that anonymity is totally maintained. Plus, EthicsPoint is contractually committed not to pursue a reporter's identity.' EthicsPoint is also hosted independently to the Tapestry Inc. website or intranet. [Ethics Point Hotline: secure.ethicspoint.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects AG suppliers to prohibit retaliation
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.2.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts: The Company indicates regarding wages & benefits in the Supplier code of conduct that: 'Suppliers must meet all legal requirements to ensure that minimum wages are adhered to, any and all overtime is paid for, and any benefits due to the employees are satisfied'. No information disclosed in public documents references to living wage, nor how it is negotiated. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs • Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.2.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Identifies suppliers back to product source (farm, ranch etc) Score 2 • Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why
D.2.4.b	Child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: On child labour, the Supplier code of conduct states that: 'While the legal definition of "children" may vary from country to country, Coach, Inc. will not knowingly do business with suppliers who employ individuals who are under 15 years of age'. However, it does not include guidelines on verification the age of job applicants and workers nor remediation programmes. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 2018: media.corporate-ir.net] • 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 in progress made
D.2.5.b	Forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.5.d	Forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: In its Supplier Code of Conduct the Company states: 'Suppliers must respect the legal rights of employees to freely and without harassment participate in worker organizations of their choice, and to refrain from joining organizations if that is their wish.' This is insufficient because it is limited to situations where employees have the rights under law. With respect Collective Bargaining the commitment is not clear: 'Suppliers must not threaten or penalize employees for their efforts to organize or bargain collectively where permitted by the laws of the country of manufacture, nor may they discriminate against workers as a result of any such organization affiliation'. [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: In its Supplier Code of Conduct the Company indicates: 'The Company believes in doing business with those suppliers who have demonstrated concern for and commitment to the health and safety of their employees.' However it does not include clear requirement referred with these areas. [Code of Conduct, 2017: media.corporate-ir.net] • Not met: Injury rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosures Score 2 • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.2.9.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: On working hours, the Supplier code of conduct states that: 'The Company will not knowingly use suppliers who fail to comply with the legal maximum working hours as specified by each country's standards and laws'. However, it does not indicate whether practices related to working hours are taken into account positively in the selection of suppliers. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net] • 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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity thresholds were found, and so the score of 7.45 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 1.86 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	0.6 out of 4	Out of a total of 40 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Tapestry made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 6 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.6 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	2 out of 2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Company reports on GRI: In its Responsibility Report, the Company indicates: 'We have prepared this report using the G4 guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) In Accordance, Core, a recognized global standard for such reporting'. [Responsibility Report 2016, 2016: media.corporate-ir.net]
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	<p>Tapestry met 0 of the 8 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator.</p> <p>Specificity and use of concrete examples</p> <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) <p>Discussing challenges openly</p> <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 <p>Demonstrating a forward focus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management

Disclaimer

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

See the 2018 Key Findings report for more details of the research process.

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

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions,

conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

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

As CHRB Ltd, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.