

**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark
2019 Company Scoresheet**

Company Name Under Armour
Industry Apparel (Supply Chain only)
Overall Score (*) 33.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.9	10	A. Governance and Policies
11.6	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
3.3	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
8.9	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
6.8	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
2.3	10	F. Transparency

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

Please note also that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2019 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

Detailed assessment

A. Governance and Policies (10% of Total)

A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: General HRs commitment: No evidence found of formal commitment to respect human rights. Although the Company refers to different human rights issues and due diligence, this indicator looks for a general commitment to respect human rights. [Labour, Health & safety, 04/09/2019: about.underarmour.com] Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2 Not met: UDHR Not met: International Bill of Rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: UNGPs: The Modern slavery statement is prefaced by a letter from Under Armour UK director and states that 'we also see this disclosure as an opportunity to engage with our stakeholders by sharing where we are today in our efforts related to potential modern slavery issues and our efforts to fulfil our responsibility to respect human rights, as outlined in the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights'. However, no formal statement of commitment approved at the highest levels of the business found in relation to the UNGP. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] Not met: OECD
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not met: ILO Core: In relation to the Company's own activities, the Code of Conduct only refers to equal opportunities and harassment. On the other hand, all the detailed reference in the website to the ILO core elements refer to supply chain

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>or partners but not to its own operations. [Approach to labor practices on website: investor.underarmour.com & Labour, Health & safety, 04/09/2019: about.underarmour.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: UNGC principles 3-6 • Met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for AP suppliers: The Supplier code of conduct - that is aligned with the FLA Code- contains an explicit commitment to all ILO core standards. Specifically on freedom of association and collective bargaining, the code states that suppliers and subcontractors 'shall recognize and respect the right of employees to freedom of association and collective bargaining'. In relation to these last two it states the following: 'Under Armour suppliers and their subcontractors shall recognize and respect the right of employees to freedom of association and collective bargaining. Employers must develop and implement effective industrial relations systems and mechanisms to resolve internal disputes, including employee grievances and ensure effective communication with employees'. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Fair labour association 'board of directors accredited the social compliance program of Under Armour, Inc. In February 2019. The accreditation confirms the company has strong policies and practices in place to set goals, monitor, and remediate problems to improve conditions for the workers within its global supply chain'. However, this indicator looks for evidence of specific policy commitment that also covers Company's own employees. [Press Release UA accredited FLA, 14/03/2019: about.underarmour.com & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] • Not met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company refers to workplace safety in the context of workplace violence. [Supplier Code of conduct: uabiz.com] • Met: H&S applies to AP suppliers: The supplier code of conduct contains a statement on health and safety in the workplace [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com] • Not met: working hours for workers • Met: Working hours for AP suppliers: The supplier code of conduct contains a statement on hours of work including regular working hours, overtime, and time for rest: 'The regular work week shall not exceed 48 hours. Under Armour suppliers and their sub contractors shall allow workers at least 24 consecutive hours of rest in every seven-day period. All overtime work shall be consensual. Under Armour suppliers and their subcontractors shall not request overtime on a regular basis and shall compensate all overtime work at a premium rate. Other than in exceptional circumstances, the sum of regular and overtime hours in a week shall not exceed 60 hours.' [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com]
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: The Company's Code of Conduct has an equal employment opportunity statement that includes sex and gender discrimination. However, there is no reference to women's rights. There is no reference to this issue in the Modern Slavery Act Statement of the Company and the Codes referred in that statement are related to suppliers. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk & Code of Conduct: investor.underarmour.com] • Not met: Children's Rights: No reference found to this issue in the Company's Code of Conduct. In the Modern Slavery Act Statement of the Company all the references are related to suppliers. • Not met: Migrant worker's rights: No reference found to this issue in the Company's Code of Conduct. In the Modern Slavery Act Statement of the Company all the references are related to suppliers. • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights: The Company reports in the modern slavery statement work carried out with Verite to identify and prioritize sourcing locations where it should focus on migrant workers, and it indicates that 'this builds upon our prior requirement that suppliers comply with the Institute for Human Rights and Business' Dhaka Principles for Migration with Dignity (Dhaka Principles) and relevant provisions of the UA Supplier Code of Conduct and the FLA Workplace Code of Conduct and Compliance Benchmarks'. However, 'comply with' is not seem as a commitment by CHRB. [Fair Labour Association Workplace Code of Conduct and Compliance Benchmarks, 05/10/2011: fairlabor.org & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business principles

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Convention on migrant workers: The Company has a commitment in its website with the Dhaka Principles for Migration with Dignity, however, there is no formal internal policy referred to this issue. [Labour, Health & safety, 04/09/2019: about.underarmour.com] • Not met: Respecting the right to water • Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	2	<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: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Fair Labour Accreditation Report details the Company's Civil Society Engagement Strategy including the civil society organizations and unions and worker representative structures engaged in the last period in China, Bangladesh, Malaysia, and Central America. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Regular stakeholder design engagement: The FLA accreditation report describes how the Company's strategy includes stakeholder engagement as part of social compliance practices, including meeting with local civil society organisations and/or unions prior to each audit. In the Modern Slavery statement the Company reports how assessors are required to consult with worker representatives, unions and federations, if available, in an effort to gain understanding/knowledge of factory conditions before the assessment starts on a site. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk]
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	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: Commits to remedy: The Company states that it formalised a Responsible Sourcing Policy. 'This policy supports our commitment, as a Fair Labor Association (FLA) Accredited Company, to the FLA Principles of Fair Labor And Responsible Sourcing (which states that Company Affiliate works with supplier to remediate in a timely way and preventative manner). However, this indicator looks for a Company's direct commitment to remedy adverse impacts that it has caused or contributed to. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk & Principles of Fair Labor and Responsible Sourcing and Production, 13/08/2019: fairlabor.org] <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 • Met: Work with AP suppliers to remedy impacts: The Company states that when problems are identified it works with" suppliers to support their corrective actions, ensure the supplier is committed to continuous improvement over time and to direct them to engage in related capacity building, as applicable." On the same statement the Company describes its Collaboration on Remediation Related to Migrant Labor in Malaysia. It also indicates that, when it receives worker grievances, 'we investigate them and take action, including asking suppliers to remedy issues. We will work directly with the manufacturer to find a solution, or we may engage third-parties, including the FLA, to conduct investigations or to support the factory in resolving them'. 'We also work with other brands that share our suppliers to identify issues and seek to implement jointly near-term corrective actions in addition to building more sustainable systems for the future'. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk]
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): CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Expects AP suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator.

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: Modern Slavery Statement signed by Director of Under Armour UK. This indicator looks for Global Board level or CEO approval of policies and/or commitments. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO: The Company states that by a letter from its CEO, Kevin Plank, to the FLA's CEO/President and the FLA's Board of Directors, has committed formally to uphold the FLA's Workplace Code of Conduct and compliance benchmarks that expects the Company's suppliers to follow employment practices under this section. Also, the President and Chief Operating Officer made comments in the press release of the FLA Accreditation to the Company. However, this indicator looks for actual text from the CEO or a board member setting out the Company's approach to human rights, or discussing its business importance. [Approach to labor practices on website: investor.underarmour.com & Press Release UA accredited FLA, 14/03/2019: about.underarmour.com]
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: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. • Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. 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: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. • 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company's Sustainability team 'is primarily responsible for creating, implementing, and operationalizing policies, standards, procedures, and structures related to labor, health and safety, environment, and transparency. The team is led by the Vice President of Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility, who reports directly to Under Armour's General Counsel and the Executive Vice President of Legal Affairs'. [Sustainability, 13/08/2019: about.underarmour.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: In addition to the role of the VP of Sustainability, the Company indicates that "it has a Sustainability Council that meets regularly. This cross-functional committee comprises senior and operationally responsible leaders, including our Chief Supply Chain Officer and leaders from Sourcing, Supply Chain, Materials Innovation, Digital, Licensing, and Legal. The Council's responsibilities include striving to incorporate the results of Under Armour's Sustainability program and related due diligence efforts into business processes, and helping to drive operational improvements. The Council is also charged with periodic reviews of issues, risks, findings, and trends related to assessments of manufacturers for compliance with laws and labor-related codes and benchmarks." "The Sustainability team serves the regions in which our supply chain operates, with teammates in Central America and Southeast Asia, as well as the United States. Our headquarters team in Baltimore is strategically located on the same floor as Sourcing, Supply Chain, Planning, and Manufacturing Excellence." <p>Moreover, in the Fair Labour Association accreditation report it is explained that 'The VP, Sustainability & CSR, manages the UA Sustainability Team and reports to the Executive Vice President (EVP), General Counsel & Corporate Secretary, who reports to the CEO. The VP, Sustainability & CSR, provides periodic Sustainability Program updates to the UA Board of Directors. Since 2014, the Sustainability Team has grown to seven full-time members: the VP, Sustainability & CSR, two managers and two analysts at its headquarters, and its Western Hemisphere Sustainability Manager, an independent contractor based in El Salvador. The Sustainability Team is backfilling an Asia-based Eastern Hemisphere Sustainability Manager role and is approved to add two analyst-level positions in 2019'. [Sustainability, 13/08/2019: about.underarmour.com & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Day-to-day responsibility for AP in supply chain: As explained above, the Sustainability council and Sustainability team's duties include supply chain. [Sustainability, 13/08/2019: about.underarmour.com & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org]
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: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. • Not met: At least one key AP HR risk, beyond employee H&S: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Performance criteria made public
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions • Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions • Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder • Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience
B.1.4.b	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships	1.5	<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: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers: See indicator A.1.2 [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Met: Communicating policy down the whole AP supply chain: The Company requires 'assessors to assess whether, and to confirm to Under Armour's Sustainability team that, the FLA and Under Armour codes are posted. The Company also has an assessment program to measure and track business partners' employment practices, working conditions, and performance over time against the Under Armour Supplier Code and the Fair Labor Association's Workplace Code and Compliance Benchmarks. No evidence found, however, of the Company communicating its policies and requirements down its supply chain, or requiring its suppliers to do so. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org & Labour, Health & safety, 04/09/2019: about.underarmour.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Requiring AP suppliers to communicate policy down the chain: See above. In addition, the Company states that it expects its suppliers to have due diligence processes in place and our current manufacturing agreement requires its signatories to certify that materials incorporated into our products comply with laws regarding slavery and human trafficking of the country or countries in which they are doing business, and other laws and standards regarding slavery and human trafficking'. However, there is no information about the communication down the supply chain. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: The Company states in the 'know the chain' questionnaire that: 'Under Armour contractually requires suppliers to abide by the FLA and Under Armour Codes of Conduct and the FLA's benchmarks'. In the FLA assessment we can read that the Company "requires all facilities to sign a manufacturing agreement annually that includes a written commitment to uphold standards, remediate noncompliance, and facilitate periodic assessments, including those by the FLA. The FLA reviewed the manufacturing agreement, which includes the UA Supplier Code of Conduct and the FLA Workplace Code of Conduct, for the supplier to acknowledge." [Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] • Not met: Including on AP suppliers
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The FLA report indicates that the Sustainability Team regularly participates in industry- and non-government organization (NGO)- led trainings on a range of topics related to social compliance, and tracks training details and quality in a staff training tracker. Moreover, the Company works mostly with FLA-accredited third-party service providers and provides all auditors periodic training on the Company's audit tool and Company's standards and methodology, to ensure auditor consistency. Finally, the VP, Sustainability & CSR, has trained 304 Company's employees on the UA Supplier Code of Conduct by outlining its formation, importance, and any pertinent updates through case studies for each element'. However, it is not clear if the Company trains all employees in its human rights policies. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] • Met: Trains relevant AP managers including procurement: The Company states in the MSA Statement that 'the Sustainability team participated in third-party trainings related to forced labor at least once a quarter. The team also led in person Supplier Code of Conduct and Responsible Sourcing Policy trainings with approximately 475 Supply Chain colleagues in strategic sourcing units and locations including Baltimore, Amsterdam, Panama, China (including Guangzhou, Hong Kong, Taiwan (Taichung and Taipei), Vietnam and Indonesia. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met [Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org]
B.1.6	Monitoring and corrective actions	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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: The Company follows Human Rights Due Diligence model and the SCI methodology to evaluate the "worker life cycle." However, all these procedures as those explained in the next section applies to suppliers and there is no evidence in relation to monitoring own operations, and the code for own operations covering all ILO core areas. [Labour, Health & safety, 04/09/2019: about.underarmour.com & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Met: Monitoring AP suppliers: The Company indicates that 'As part of our social compliance process, UA strives to audit all Tier One suppliers on an annual basis and uses third-party auditors that are accredited by the Fair Labor Association when they are available in region. After UA receives a copy of the annual report from our third-party auditors, we engage with the factory and send them a plan that includes both immediate corrective actions and longer-term improvements

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>based on best practices. With all of our suppliers we aim for a sustained improvement effort over time. The third-party assessors who conduct assessments of our suppliers are required to determine whether the suppliers' employment practices comply with our Supplier Code, the FLA Benchmarks and the Dhaka Principles'. The Company states that it aims to audit 100% of our Tier One suppliers on an annual basis and are looking to develop a sustainable approach to auditing our other tiers. Moreover, the FLA Report for Accreditation devotes a section to explain how the company monitors its suppliers: Pre-Sourcing Factory Assessments; Assessing Factory Conditions and Under Armour Audit Observations- providing some examples followed by FLA observers. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process: The Company indicates that 'after assessors complete their assessments, they give Initial Management Action Plans (IMAP) to factory management'. 'After we receive the assessment reports, our Sustainability team subsequently prepares Management Action Plans (IMP) to fine-tune and, in some cases, to broaden, the steps and/or measures that we expect suppliers to take to address issues raised by the assessments or to improve their sustainability performance. The MAP also may include country-specific requirements based upon human rights due diligence work as well as requests for actions aimed at building UA Supplier and FLA Code awareness'. Although the Company reports number of grievances received, no details found in relation the number of incidences detected as part of the monitoring process. [Labour, Health & safety, 04/09/2019: about.underarmour.com & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Met: Example of corrective action: The Company describes examples of corrective actions. In relation to one Malaysian facility, audits identified that not all workers had access to personal documents at all times, and later, also had cases of potential harassment and legal abuse'. In response to the first case, the Company required to provide individual lockers to each migrant worker, and worked with the supplier to 'systematize its harassment and abuse training strategy and to ensure that it made improvements to its grievance management procedures'. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Not met: Discloses % of AP supply chain monitored: The Company states that audits all tier 1 facilities and certain tier 2 suppliers. However, no evidence found on the percentage of the supply chain that these factories and suppliers represent. [Monitoring assessment on website: files.shareholder.com]
B.1.7	Engaging business relationships	2	<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 affects AP selection of suppliers: The Company carries out Pre-Sourcing Factory Assessments where UA due diligence procedures require the facility to complete the UA Global Ethics and Compliance Questionnaire and receive a social compliance audit. UA selects the auditor and requires the auditor give the factory action plans; any findings must be remediated by the facility within two weeks of the audit. If the facility has substantially remediated, and has plans to remediate, all findings then the Sustainability Team may conditionally approve the facility for production, and the UA on-boarding process begins, and the Sustainability Team informs relevant business units. Egregious audit findings can disqualify a prospective vendor from becoming a UA supplier, and according to Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment in one instance UA did not approve a factory that failed the social compliance assessment. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Met: HR affects on-going AP supplier relationships: The Code for suppliers states that 'Any violation of these laws or the Code may be viewed as a breach of the Manufacturing Agreement and could lead to the termination of the business relationship between Under Armour and the supplier'. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirement under score 1 met • Met: Working with AP suppliers to improve performance: The Company indicates that it uses the 'FLA's Sustainable Compliance Initiative (SCI) methodology in its Sustainability program as part of our efforts to advance worker' right through a continuous improvement model that applies to employment practices and working conditions'. It also indicates that after it receives assessment report it prepares a

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>management action plans to address issues raised 'or to improve their sustainability performance'. The FLA Accreditation report indicates that in relation to health and safety, the Company's sustainability team 'collaborated with TAOS Network, a service provider in China, to facilitate training for 39 UA suppliers in China on the importance of social insurance and the Housing Provident Fund'. In Indonesia, the Company partnered with a local organization 'to train supplier on the importance of Freedom of Association'. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk]</p>
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders	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: Stakeholder process or systems: According to the Fair Labour Association Report Assessment, the Company developed a comprehensive civil society outreach and engagement strategy focused on engagement in their key sourcing areas, including the Americas, East and South East Asia—China and Vietnam—and the Middle East. The CSO [Civil Society Organisation] engagement strategy notes the importance of engaging with civil society to better understand the labor conditions in areas where they operate. Moreover, UA has mapped CSOs and labor unions in key sourcing countries. This mapping includes contact information, a description of the CSO, the nature and the frequency of any interaction, and with which factories the CSO/union might interact. The Operations, Reporting and Engagement Manager is responsible for periodic review of the document to reflect new CSO consultation opportunities and engagements. Finally, UA auditors must meet with local CSOs and/or unions prior to each audit. These reports outline the general country issues, the topics covered during the meeting, the role that local NGOs play in the labor market, any recent labor law changes, any specific grievances against the factory, and any specific labor or health & safety issues related to the factory. These reports addressed key local issues, including social insurance and the housing provident fund in China, female worker rights, and the payment of at least the minimum wage in Pakistan. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] • Met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: See above. In addition, the CSO engagement strategy also identifies the ways in which UA will systematically engage CSOs as part of their routine social compliance practices: preassessment consultation, violation/complaint resolution, and strategic partnerships and projects. Examples for each of these instances are listed in the report. Frequency is ongoing, as its part of the Company's routine social compliance practices. Groups include local civil society organizations, unions and worker representatives, among others. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] • Met: Workers in AP SC engaged: See above <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company's actions on them: The Fair Labour Association Report Assessment provides thorough information about the Company's Civil Society Engagement in China, Bangladesh, Malaysia, Central America, Mexico and also its International Civil Society Engagement and its relation with Unions & Worker Representative Structures. The report also includes a summary of key strengths and suggestions for strengthening. However, in order to award this indicator, evidence is needed in relation to how the Company takes these (stakeholders) views into account. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org]

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	0.5	<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: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company indicates that it has a 'Human Rights Due Diligence model to identify conditions within countries that may expose Under Armour to greater risk of violating human rights. It is part of the impact assessment portion of the Human Rights Due Diligence process, as outlined in the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs). [...] Based on this assessment we engage with suppliers, civil society organizations, and other third party stakeholders to focus on specific issues and risks to ensure FLA and Under Armour Codes are met and embody core labor standards, and related conventions, of the ILO. Only after these requirements are met do we approve our suppliers to start production for Under Armour in that specific country.' It is not clear, however, whether this identification and assessment process applies to the Company's own operations and employees (potential human rights issues for the Company itself). [Labour, Health & safety, 04/09/2019: about.underarmour.com & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Met: Identifying risks in AP suppliers: The Company indicates that its 'supplier assessment approach has also created a significant data set, which the Sustainability team periodically analyses to identify and address trends for particular issues, regions, countries, and types of suppliers. This analysis can help us to enhance and adapt our approach to the issues we have seen over time. Through this analysis, we are also proactively able to identify new and emerging areas risks across our supply chain, with particular emphasis on assessed facilities. As prior internal analysis suggested that, in some cases, risk may relate as much, if not more, to a factory's location than to the type of manufacturing process it performs, the Sustainability team has also developed a Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) tool to assess country-level risks and issues, including those related to ILO Core Conventions. Having an understanding of the geographies that may represent an increased risk, provides the team with valuable information about where additional attention or resources may be required. UA has also conducted risk assessments related to forced labor, and in particular related to foreign migrant workers. We require these assessments to be conducted by independent third-party assessment firms that conduct direct supplier inspections, which include worker interviews'. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Ongoing global risk identification: See above • Met: In consultation with stakeholders: See above • Not met: In consultation with HR experts • Met: Triggered by new circumstances: As indicated above, the Company's Sustainability team uses this analysis when Under Armour considers sourcing from new countries.
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	2	<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: Salient risk assessment (and context): Following the identification work mentioned, the Company indicates that 'we worked to understand better how different audit findings for these five issues may suggest, or contribute to, risk – along the country or region where the factory is located. At a high-level, there were some indications [...] that in some cases, risk may relate as much, if not more, to a factory's location than to the type of manufacturing process it performs. Our team also considered whether historical or other information could clarify whether certain locations have heightened risk profiles for non-compliance with other FLA benchmarks. We have also analysed history risk by country, with the goal of devoting additional attention in ongoing Sustainability team work and engagement to potentially higher risk areas'. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk & Remediation and capacity building on website: investor.underarmour.com] • Met: Public disclosure of salient risks: The Company discloses in its latest UK MSA its Areas of Risks: Forced or Compulsory Labor, Child Labor, Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining, Occupational Health and Safety, Fair Compensation, Non-Discrimination, Diversity and Equal Opportunity'. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	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: Action Plans to mitigate risks: In its MSA 2019 the Company presents its Annual Highlights where it summarizes key steps it has taken in 2018 to try and further protect workers in our supply chains from human rights impacts related to its business activities. However, no evidence found of a description of the Company's global system to take action systematically against all the human rights risks identified and assessed, or how the company addresses specifically each salient issue. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Not met: Including in AP supply chain: Most of the actions reported in the Company's MSA 2019 are focused on the supply chain, however CHRB could not find a description of the Company's global system and how it applies in its supply chain. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Met: Example of Actions decided: In relation to migrant labour, the Company states that 'we engaged with Verité to advise us on opportunities to clarify and/or strengthen our expectations of suppliers and capacity building efforts related to modern slavery, with a special focus on foreign migrant workers. We also worked with Verité to identify and prioritize sourcing locations where we should consider focused assessments on risks posed by suppliers' recruitment, hiring and employment of foreign migrant workers'. Additionally, 'UA successfully encouraged our Malaysian suppliers to engage directly with Verité on capacity building opportunities to address risks of modern slavery and to enhance sustainably related systems and processes'. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] <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 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: 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
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	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: Comms plan re identifying risks: See B.2.1 • Met: Comms plan re assessing risks: See B.2.2 • Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks: See B.2.3 • Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans • Not met: Including AP suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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 code of conduct describes how to report concerns for all workers in the code of conduct [Code of Conduct: investor.underarmour.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company reports in its MSA 2019: 'In 2018, we received eight complaints through our grievance channels. Of these complaints, one turned out to be associated with a factory that was not an active supplier of UA products. Of the remaining complaints, three related to foreign migrant worker issues and four to potential freedom of association violations. Follow-up investigations have been carried out for all of these cases and remediation plan developed. Two of the seven cases have now been formally closed based on progress against the remediation plan and five remediation cases are ongoing'. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] • Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expect AP supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: In the Supplier Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: 'Under Armour suppliers and subcontractors must effectively implement a non-retaliation policy, procedures and reporting channels that enable workers to express anonymously and safely their concerns about workplace conditions directly to factory management and to other parties without fear of retribution, retaliation or any other adverse action.' In addition, the Company's Fair Labor Association Report 2019 - Assessment for Accreditation says: 'UA assesses grievance mechanisms in its factory assessment process through the UA audit tool. The assessment tool verifies the presence of a confidential reporting channel or grievance system, a nonretaliation policy, regular investigation of submitted grievances, responses provided by management, and communication on the grievance procedures. [...] assessors must review grievance logs and verify through worker interviews that workers know how to use the channel'. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org & Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com] • Met: Opens own system to AP supplier workers: The Code of conduct for suppliers indicates that 'suppliers and subcontractors and their employees may report violations of this code to Under Armour's Hotline electronically and/or suppliercode@underarmour.com. The hotline is monitored 24 hours a day, seven days a week'. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com]
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: Regarding operation of its manufacturing suppliers, the Company indicates in the 'know the chain' questionnaire 'we periodically receive grievances directly from workers and/or groups that work with and/or represent them including labour rights organizations and trade unions and/or through the Fair Labour Association and/or other brands with which we collaborate to address issues raised'. However, it has not disclosed any public documents with further details on mechanisms to receive complaints from external individuals and communities. [Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages • Not met: Expects AP supplier to have community grievance systems: Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: 'Under Armour suppliers and subcontractors must effectively implement a non-retaliation policy, procedures and reporting channels that enable workers to express anonymously and safely their concerns about workplace conditions directly to factory management and to other parties without fear of retribution, retaliation or any other adverse action'. However, the provision is focused on grievance mechanism for suppliers' workers, there is no reference to external stakeholders, including local communities. Moreover, the Fair Labor Association Report also indicates that: 'UA assesses grievance mechanisms in its factory assessment process through the UA audit tool. The assessment tool verifies the presence of a confidential reporting channel or grievance system, a nonretaliation policy, regular investigation of submitted grievances, responses provided by management, and communication on the grievance procedures. For every audit, UA includes a MAP on grievance systems, regardless of violations found. The MAP requires the factory to identify the person responsible for handling grievances and encourages the factory to have multiple channels for grievance mechanisms for the workers.' CHRB could not find a reference to a grievance mechanism available for external stakeholders, including local communities. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] • Not met: AP supplier communities use global system
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	<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: AP suppliers consult users in creation or assessment
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly	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: The Company indicates that 'Under Armour's Sustainability team receives workers' grievances directly from workers, through assessment firms and, sometimes, through the FLA or other factory customer with which we collaborate. In certain cases, we have required factories to engage a

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	available and explained		<p>third-party hotline/survey provider to receive grievances and obtain anonymous survey data about workplace conditions'. 'When Under Armour receives worker grievances, we investigate them and take action, including asking suppliers to remedy issues. We work directly with the manufacturer to find a solution, or we may engage 3rd parties, including the FLA, to conduct investigations or to support the factory in resolving them. We have sometimes serves as intermediary between workers and management when they are in conflict'. On the other hand, in the Fair Labor Association Report it is been said that the Company 'provided the FLA with procedures to address external grievances submitted through the confidential channel, which include defining the type of grievance submitted, the timeline for reviewing the grievance, assigning responsibility, developing a remediation plan, discussing with relevant sourcing agents and members of other UA departments, and reviewing and receiving updates until resolution', however, CHRB could not find those procedures in a public domain document. [Monitoring assessment on website: files.shareholder.com & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How complainants will be informed <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level: When the Company receives worker grievances, 'We work directly with the manufacturer to find a solution, or we may engage 3rd parties, including the FLA, to conduct investigations or to support the factory in resolving them. We have sometimes serves as intermediary between workers and management when they are in conflict'. However, this indicator looks for evidence of how complaints from workers and all external stakeholders may be escalated to more senior levels or independent for resolution. [Monitoring assessment on website: files.shareholder.com]
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	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: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: Both in the code of conduct for employees and the code of conduct for suppliers the Company includes non-retaliation commitments. However, although the Company indicates in the know the Chain response that it also receives grievances from other third-parties, it is not clear through which channels they come, and whether there's a commitment to non-retaliation. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com & Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company's code [company's mechanisms are open to suppliers] that 'the hotline and website allow you the option to report anonymously'. [Code of Conduct: investor.underarmour.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects AP suppliers to prohibit retaliation: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: 'Under Armour suppliers and subcontractors must effectively implement a non-retaliation policy, procedures and reporting channels that enable workers to express anonymously and safely their concerns about workplace conditions directly to factory management and to other parties without fear of retribution, retaliation or any other adverse action.' In addition, the Fair Labor Association Report, also indicates that the Company assesses its suppliers' grievance mechanism verifying 'the presence of a confidential reporting channel or grievance system, a nonretaliation policy, regular investigation of submitted grievances, responses provided by management, and communication on the grievance procedures.' However, the grievance mechanism requirements are focused in workers' grievances, there is no evidence of a grievance channel opened to external stakeholders including local communities. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org]
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: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. <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)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	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: Describes how remedy has been provided: The Fair Labor Association Report indicates: 'In 2018, UA and Nike, an accredited Participating Company, notified the FLA about engagement with an investigative non-profit organization that had provided a report related to working conditions at an apparel manufacturer in Malaysia, a supplier for both companies. This report included recruitment fee and other workplace violations at the facility. Prior to receiving the report, UA and Nike had already been working, since 2017, to remediate the violations surfaced during their respective audits around the payment of recruitment fees and working conditions. Upon receiving the report, UA and Nike had verified the supplier had already started a pay-out process to reimburse foreign migrant workers for the recruitment fees. The supplier provided one pay-out in 2018 and is scheduled to make another payment in February 2019 to reimburse the workers for the fees they had paid. [...] UA, Nike, and the suppliers' other customers then worked with the supplier to enhance its systems for recruitment, hiring, and employment of workers and enhance the system to provide pay-outs to the workers in 2018 and in 2019. Both pay-outs averaged \$350-\$400 per worker, with about 950 workers receiving both pay-outs in 2018 and 2019.' [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] <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: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism: CHRB has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator.

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	<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: Living wage in supplier code or contracts: The Supplier Code of Conduct states: 'Every worker has a right to compensation for a regular work week that is sufficient to meet the worker's basic needs and provide some discretionary income. Employers shall pay at least the minimum wage or the appropriate prevailing wage, whichever is higher, comply with all legal requirements on wages, and provide any fringe benefits required by law or contract. Where compensation does not meet workers' basic needs and provide some discretionary income, each employer shall work with the FLA to take appropriate actions that seek to progressively realize a level of compensation that does'. However, in order to be awarded, evidence is needed that wage is also sufficient to cover for family/dependents. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com] • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers: However, the FLA report states that the Company has piloted the FLA's Compensation Data Tool at two factories and is planning to use it in other countries. [Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.2.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	2	<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: Avoids business model pressure on HRs: The Company indicates in the 'know the chain' response that 'Under Armour's Sustainability department's headquarter team members are deliberately located on, and within, the same floor and same area, as key supply chain sourcing team leaders and members. The Sustainability team provides up-to-date information about suppliers' social and environmental compliance to corresponding sourcing personnel and seeks to work with them and new facility onboarding personnel as part of an integrated and cross-functional effort to avoid purchasing practices that increase the risk of human trafficking and forced labour in the supply chain (e.g. short-term contracts, excessive downward pressure on pricing, sudden changes of workload). Among other instances, these issues are addressed in the Sustainability Council meetings and meetings with other internal and external Under Armour Employees, manufacturers and licensees, among others. This enables the Sustainability and Sourcing teams to collaborate and to seek to work with manufacturing business partners that over time strive to perform better on key labour and other rights performance indicators'. [Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org] • Met: Positive incentives to respect human rights: The FLA Accreditation Report states 'Incentivizing Suppliers to Improve Conditions for Workers: UA has a comprehensive vendor scorecard that measures performance of on-time and complete delivery and execution, accuracy of confirming and production POs, target margin completion, development, and sustainability. This scorecard was developed throughout 2017 and was implemented in 2018. The scorecard can impact sourcing decisions based on vendor ratings. Currently, UA's main incentive for vendors who perform well against the vendor scorecard is continued or increased business.' Themes such as human trafficking and forced labor are part of sustainability. [Fair Labour Association Workplace Code of Conduct and Compliance Benchmarks, 05/10/2011: fairlabor.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Both requirements under score 1 met
D.2.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	2	<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: Identifies suppliers back to product source: The company indicates that 'we have committed to disclose, over time, and on our website, suppliers who form the essential links in our supply chain, starting in March 2017 with Strategic Supplier Tier 1 (assembly locations) and specialty vendors that are estimated to account for 70% of our business). [Approach to labor practices on website: investor.underarmour.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why: 'This list includes suppliers that are estimated to account for over 90% of our business. We are committed to evaluating, and are considering expanding, this disclosure over time.' [Supply Chain List 2018, 07/2018: about.underarmour.com]
D.2.4.b	Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (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: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.2.5.b	Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain)	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: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: The Company indicates in the Know the chain response that 'every Under Armour social and environmental assessment requires assessment firms to review whether, and how, suppliers work with recruitment agencies. If the use of recruitment agencies is found, Under Armour's assessment firms are directed to report on the nature and type of recruitment fees. All violations of the Under Armour and the FLA code and benchmarks are expected to be documented in order that Under Armour can address them directly with the supplier and to work with it, so that it may improve and remediate conditions, as needed, and over time'. It also indicates in this questionnaire that 'the assessment tools and reports address risks related to the employment of migrant workers including passport retention, wage payment, recruitment fees, deductions from pay, expenses, etc.'. [Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees: While in both, the Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019 and the FLA Accreditation Report, there is an example of a case study about collaborating on remediation related to migrant labor in Malaysia at a suppliers, no evidence could be found of a general description how the Company works with suppliers to eliminate imposing any financial burdens on workers. [Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk & Fair Labour Association Report- UA Assessment for accreditation, 02/2019: fairlabor.org] <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
D.2.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	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: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: Although the Supplier code contains a general provision on forced labour, the Company states in the Modern Slavery Statement the following: 'Since the UA questionnaire-based assessment tool is based on the FLA Code and Benchmarks and the FLA's own Foundational SCI Assessment tool it is inherently designed to help us identify and manage risks that are salient to the apparel industry. Within the area of Forced and Compulsory Labor, the tool has questions related to the Dhaka Principles including those regarding the recruitment and employment of migrant workers, possession and control of workers' personal documents such as their passports, wage payment, recruitment fees, deductions from pay and other expenses [...]. If the use of recruitment agencies, employment brokers and intermediaries is found, UA assessment firms are directed to report on the nature and type of recruitment fees. All violations, including of the UA and the FLA Code and Benchmarks and applicable laws are expected to be documented in order that UA can directly address them'. [Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org & Modern Slavery Act Statement 2019, 30/04/2019: underarmour.co.uk] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters <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
D.2.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	1.5	<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: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: The Company's code of conduct for suppliers states that 'Under Armour suppliers and their subcontractors shall recognize and respect the right of employees to freedom of association and collective bargaining'. The Supplier Code of Conduct states 'Armour suppliers and their subcontractors shall recognize and respect the right of employees to freedom of association and collective bargaining.' The Company also expects its suppliers to adhere to the FLA Workplace Code of Conduct and Compliance Benchmarks and assesses its suppliers against it. The FLA Benchmark states under 'Freedom of Association and Collective bargaining, Anti-Union Violence/Harassment or Abuse: 'Employers shall not use any form of physical or psychological violence, threats, intimidation, retaliation, harassment or abuse against union representatives and workers seeking to form or join an organization of their own choosing. Such practices shall not be used against workers' organizations or workers participating or intending to participate in union activities, including strikes'. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com & Fair Labour Association Workplace Code of Conduct and Compliance Benchmarks, 05/10/2011: fairlabor.org]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB: The Company indicates in the Know the Chain response that ‘in Management Action Plans, we require manufacture to develop and improve, as needed, and over time, Industrial Relations policies and procedures and systems that are aimed at ensuring compliance with applicable laws, code provisions and benchmarks. Within and/or in connection with our Management Action Plans for assessments, we encourage manufacturers to ensure workplace free of interference and retaliation. We also contractually require manufactures to abide by the Under Armour Code and the FLA Code and related benchmarks that require the recognition and respect of workers’ legal rights to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining. We require manufacturers to post versions of the FLA and Under Armour Codes of conduct in the languages understood by their employees and managers. We encourage manufacturers to ensure a workplace free of interference and retaliation of any form. In certain cases, manufacturers may benefit from additional expertise, resources, or structure, so we may require a factory’s management to hire a third-party firm to conduct focused, short-term training and capacity building. Finally, we have engaged in a pilot project involving specific and focused procedures, mechanisms and structures aimed at supporting worker feedback to, and participation with, factory management to address possible/reported structure or local issues or challenges’. [Know the Chain 2016, 2016: business-humanrights.org] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	0.5	<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 code for suppliers includes explicit guidelines on health and safety. These include complying with rules and laws, to have policies and procedures, train employees, residential housing, etc. [Supplier code of conduct: investor.underarmour.com] • Not met: Injury rate disclosures • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures • Not met: Fatalities disclosures <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<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: CHR B has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. • Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights: CHR B has not identified any documents in the public domain which provide all the information required to meet this indicator. <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.2.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	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: Working hours in codes or contracts: The Company states in the code of conduct for suppliers that ‘suppliers and their subcontractors shall not require workers to work more than the regular and overtime hours allowed by the law of the country where the workers are employed. The regular work week shall not exceed 48 hours. Under armour suppliers and their subcontractors shall allow workers at least 24 consecutive hours of rest in every seven-day period’. [Code of Conduct: investor.underarmour.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

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 CHR B severity threshold were found, and so the score of 27.05 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 6.76 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	2.3 out of 4	Out of a total of 40 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Under Armour made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 23 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 2.3 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Company reports on GRI • Not met: Company reports on SASB • Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	Under Armour met 0 of the 8 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus <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 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.