

Company Name BYD
Industry Automotive (Own Operations and Supply Chain)
Overall Score 0.7 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.0	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.0	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.6	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
0.1	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations

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 2022 Methodology document for the sector concerned. 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 • Not Met: Universal Declaration of Human rights (UDHR) • Not Met: International Bill of Human Rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commitment to the UNGPs • Not Met: Commitment to the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises
A.1.2.a	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Company has a commitment to the ILO Core: The Company indicates: 'Based on the Labor Law, the Labor Contract Law, and standards such as ISO 9001, ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, and SA8000, we have developed the BYD Human Resource Management policy following the guideline of "equal opportunity, based on capability". Discrimination based on age, gender, geographic location, ethnic group, tradition, social caste, religion, physical disability, and political tendency are strictly prohibited in the recruitment process. Child and forced labor are prohibited'. However, no evidence found of commitment to ILO declaration, or each core labour standards, including freedom of association and collective bargaining. In addition, this document is no longer considered a suitable source for policy statements according to CHRB's revised approach. [2019 CSR Report, 2020: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Company has a explicit commitment to All four ILO Core • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to commit to ILO Core • Not Met: Company explicitly list All four ILO for suppliers

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.2.b	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: Health and safety and working hours	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Commitment to respect H&S of workers: The Company indicated in its 2016 CSR Report: 'Protecting the health and safety of employees all the times is a core value in the production safety of BYD. BYD implements the OHSAS18001 Occupational Health and Safety Management System and establishes safety standards, implements production safety accountability system, arranges various types of production safety training and nurtures employees' rule-observing operation and safe operation practice of prior awareness of danger.' However, this is not a suitable source for policy statement according to CHRB's revised approach. No policy documents where the Company commits to respect health and safety of workers were found. [2016 CSR Report, 2016: byd.com] Not Met: Respect ILO labour standards on working hours or Commits to 48 hours regular work week Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Expect suppliers to commit to H&S of their workers Not Met: Expect suppliers to commit to ILO labour standard or to 48 hours regular work week
A.1.3.a.MO	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – responsible sourcing of minerals (MO)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Responsible mineral sourcing Not Met: Based on OECD Guidance Not Met: Requires suppliers to commit to responsible mineral sourcing Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Commits to follow OECD Guidance for all minerals Not Met: Suppliers expected to make similar requirements of their suppliers
A.1.3.b.MO	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – vulnerable groups (MO)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Women's rights Not Met: Children's rights Not Met: Migrant worker's rights Not Met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles Not Met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles Not Met: Convention on migrant workers Not Met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	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: The Company commits to remedy Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives Not Met: Work with suppliers to remedy impact
A.1.5	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) Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Work with HRD to create safe and enabling environment

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: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Company states that it has formed a dedicated committee to formulate CSR management regulations and work plans. However, it is not clear whether it has Board level responsibility for human rights issues. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Not Met: Describe HR expertise of Board member Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board responsibility	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 HRs strategy Not Met: Examples/trends re HR discussion in the last reporting period

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: How affected stakeholders/HR experts informed discussions
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 HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria made public • Not Met: Review of other board performance criteria
A.2.4	Business model strategy and risks	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Board process to review business model and strategy • Not Met: Describe frequency and triggers for reviewing Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Example of actions decided

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: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Senior responsibility for HR implementation and decision making Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How it assigns Day-to-day responsibility • Not Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own ops • Not Met: Resources and expertise allocation in the 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 HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Performance criteria made public • Not Met: Review of other senior management performance
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The Company states in its Annual Report that the Board confirms its responsibility for risk management and internal control systems, and for reviewing their effectiveness through the Audit Committee at least annually. The Audit Committee assists the Board in performing its responsibilities for supervision and corporate governance, covering financial, operational, compliance, risk management and internal control, as well as internal audit functions of the Company. The Company also states in its CSR report that its risk management committee has a procurement taskforce to collect and review risk information from the supply chain, set risk thresholds, and devise corresponding countermeasures. However, it is not clear whether its risk management system include human rights risks. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] & [Annual Report 2020, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provides an example • Not Met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to workers and external stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Steps to communicate policy commitments to supply chain: The Company states that it always adopted strict environmental standards, labour

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	to business relationships		<p>practice standards and human rights standards for screening it suppliers. In 2020, it formulated the 'BYD Supplier Corporate Social Responsibility Notification Letter' to publicize BYD's corporate social responsibility requirements to all suppliers. However, it is not clear whether the requirements include human rights issues and how it is communicated to suppliers. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Requires suppliers to communicate policy requirements <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not Met: Company requires suppliers to cascade down to their suppliers
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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: How workers are trained on HR policy commitments: The Company provides job-specific skill training for employees. However, there is no evidence that the Company also provides training on human rights issues. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Trains suppliers to meet company's HR commitment • Not Met: Disclose % trained
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: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments across global ops and supply chain: The Company states that it always adopted strict environmental standards, labour practice standards and human rights standards for screening it suppliers. It regularly investigates and reviews its suppliers' corporate social responsibility performance and compare against CSR provisions of the BYD Suppliers Review Sheet on site. However, no evidence found of monitoring compliance with human rights. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Proportion of supply chain monitored • Not Met: Describe how workers are involved in monitoring <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Describes corrective action process • Not Met: Disclose findings and number of corrective action
B.1.7	Engaging and terminating 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: HR affects selection of suppliers: The Company states that it always adopted strict environmental standards, labour practice standards and human rights standards for screening it suppliers, required suppliers to establish a management system that meets the requirements of ISO 14001, promised to apply to promote a corporate social responsibility management system that meets the requirements of SA8000, and abided by BYD's Corporate Social Responsibility Clauses in the 'Supplier Access Agreement' and 'General Purchasing Rules'. It also states that new suppliers will be investigated by BYD for necessary credentials, and record of activities offending laws or regulations. It will require its suppliers to complete the BYD Supplier Review Sheet. The suppliers will not be selected if they do not meet the required standards. The BYD Supplier Review Sheet is the basis of the investigation, which includes sections such as rating suppliers and their downstream supply chains in terms of humanity, environment, safety, and compliance, etc. However, the details of human right standards for suppliers can not be found. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships: The Company states that it regularly investigates and reviews its suppliers' corporate social responsibility performance and compares against CSR provisions of the BYD Suppliers Review Sheet on site. Those failing the review will be provided with interviews, tutoring, and training from BYD to facilitate improvement. Suppliers failing to rectify to the standard within the given time may be severed from BYD's supplier network, depending on the actual situation. However, the details of human right standards for suppliers can not be found. It is not clear how human rights performance affects on-going supplier relationships. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe positive incentives offered to respect human rights • Not Met: Working with suppliers to meet HR requirements

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Stakeholder process or systems to identify and engage with workers/communities in the last two years • Not Met: Discloses stakeholders that HRs may be affected • Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Analysis of stakeholder views on company's HR issues • Not Met: Describe how views influenced company's HR approach

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identifying risks in own operations: The Company indicates: 'BYD has formed a dedicated committee to formulate CSR management regulations and work plans.' The Company also states in its Annual Report that the Audit Committee assists the Board in performing its responsibilities for supervision and corporate governance, covering financial, operational, compliance, risk management and internal control. However, no description found on the process to identify potential human rights risks and impacts. [Annual Report 2020, 2021: byd.com] & [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Identifying risks through relevant business relationships: The Company states that its risk management committee has a procurement taskforce to collect and review risk information from the supply chain, set risk thresholds, and devise corresponding countermeasures. It regularly reviews and analyse its existing risk management strategies for effectiveness and reasonability, and constantly amend or optimize according to actual situations. By the end of 2019, offline manual risk control procedures have been migrated to online platforms, to be monitored by computer systems to close the loop. In 2020, the Company formulated the 'MSP-16-021 BYD Company Procurement Risk Management Procedure' to clarify the risk management process of the procurement team and guide the risk work of the procurement team. During the Year, 17 risks were identified, the causes and effects of which were analysed, and risk strategies and countermeasures were formulated. However, it is not clear whether it includes processes for potential human rights risks identification. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe ongoing global risk identification in consultation with stakeholder/HR experts • Not Met: Triggered by new circumstances • Not Met: Describes risks identified
B.2.2	Assessing human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describe process for assessment of HR risks and discloses salient HR issues • Not Met: How process applies to supply chain • Not Met: Public disclosure of the results of HR assessment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: How it involved affected stakeholders in the assessment
B.2.3	Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impact assessments	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not Met: Description of how global system applies to supply chain • Not Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HR issues Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Involve stakeholders in decisions about actions
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: System for tracking or monitor if actions taken are effective • Not Met: Lessons learnt from checking system effectiveness Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Involve stakeholders in evaluation of actions taken

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.5	Communicating on human rights impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders Score 2 • Not Met: Describe challenges to effective comms and how it is working to address them

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states that it has zero tolerance for corruption by establishing a dedicated anti-corruption department. It has reporting and complaint mechanism in place to encourage participation from BYD employees, external personnel, and any other knowing party to actively report embezzlement corruption, fraud and any other activities against laws, regulations and BYD policies, and damaging BYD's interests. It provides email, WeChat account, and hotline in its CSR report. However, it is not clear whether the complaint mechanism is also available for reporting human rights violations. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 • Not Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages and workers aware • Not Met: Describe how workers in the supply chain have access to grievance mechanism • Not Met: Expect Suppliers to convey expectation to their own suppliers
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Grievance mechanism for community Score 2 • Not Met: Describes accessibility and local languages and stakeholder awareness • Not Met: Communities access mechanism direct or through suppliers • Not Met: Expect supplier to convey expectation to their own suppliers
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 • Not Met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not Met: Examples (at least two) of how they do this Score 2 • Not Met: Engages with potential or actual users on the improvement of the mechanism • Not Met: Provides user engagement example (at least two) on improvement
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are equitable, publicly available and explained	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Response timescales and how complainants will be informed • Not Met: Describe support (technical, financial, etc) available for equal access by complainants Score 2 • Not Met: Describe types of outcome to complainant through use of mechanism • Not Met: Escalation to senior/independent level
C.5	Prohibition of retaliation for raising complaints or concerns	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation • Not Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 • Not Met: Company indicate it will not retaliate against workers/stakeholders • Not Met: Expects suppliers to prohibit retaliation against workers/stakeholders
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Complainants not asked to waive rights • Not Met: Company does not require confidentiality provisions Score 2 • Not Met: Will work with state based 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	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 provide remedy for victims if no adverse impact identified Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Changes to systems, processes and practices to stop similar impact • Not Met: Describe approach to monitoring implementation of agreed remedy • Not Met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts
C.8	Communication on the effectiveness of grievance mechanism(s) 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: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcome achieved • Not Met: How lessons from mechanism improve management system Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism and changes made as result • Not Met: Describes procedures to address delays of outcomes agreed with stakeholders

D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (25% of Total)

D.5 Automotive Manufacturing

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.1.a	Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Pays living wage or sets target date: The Company states that abiding by relevant laws and regulations such as the Labour Law, it encourages employees to exercise their talents and pursue their dreams. Incentives, monetary and otherwise, are provided to elevate employee happiness. However, it has not mentioned employees' living wage. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Paying living wage • Not Met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions
D.5.1.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: Discloses living wage requirements in supplier code or contracts • Not Met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of number affected by payment below living wage • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.5.2	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 (purchasing practices) • Not Met: Practices adopted to pay suppliers in line with agreed timeframes • Not Met: Review own operations to mitigate negative impact Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Examples of how it assessed, addressed and change purchasing practices
D.5.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identifies direct and indirect suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields): The Company states that it implements procurement localization and selects nearby suppliers. It currently has 12,000 suppliers until the end of 2020. It also reports the location of suppliers in China. However, it has not identified its suppliers, including direct and indirect suppliers. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses names and locations of significant parts of SP and why • Not Met: Discloses which direct or indirect suppliers is involved in higher-risk activities

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.4.a	Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Does not use child labour: The Company states that child and forced labour are prohibited. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Age verification of workers recruited Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remediation if children identified
D.5.4.b	Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on child labour Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of number affected by child labour in supply chain • Not Met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.5.a	Prohibition of forced labour: Recruitment fees and costs (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Job seekers and workers do not pay recruitment fee: The Company states that Child and forced labour are prohibited. However, no further information can be found. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Commits to fully reimbursing if they have paid Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.5.5.b	Prohibition of forced labour: Recruitment fees and costs (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by payment of recruitment fees • Not Met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.5.c	Prohibition of forced labour: Wage practices (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Pays workers in full and on time: The Company states that to maximize each employee's interests and benefits, it reviews and revises its salary regulations on a yearly basis. However, it does not have a requirement to pay workers regularly, in full and on time. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.5.5.d	Prohibition of forced labour: Wage practices (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: Requirement for suppliers to pay workers in full and on time in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with supply chain to pay workers regularly and on time Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by failure to pay directly • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.5.5.e	Prohibition of forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.5.5.f	Prohibition of forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on free movement Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by retaining docs or restricting movement • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Commits not to interfere with union rights / Steps to avoid intimidation or retaliation • Not Met: Discloses % total direct operations covered by collective CB agreements Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
D.5.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by restrictions to FoA and CB in the SP • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.5.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts: The Company has established an occupational health and safety management system, establishing the EHS safety production management committee. The safety and environmental office is set up under it, to establish a safety production responsibility system, a safety and environmental management systems. The Company states that it aims to reduce safety management 'blind spots' in campuses through systemic enhancement and effectiveness audits. The approval and monitoring for high risk tasks are constantly honed toward perfection, in order to contain the safety risk of risky/temporary/scattered tasks and to prevent accidents. It has established resident taskforces to guide and support new plants and those with vulnerable risk management, rapidly optimizing safety management from the bottom up. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Injury Rate or Lost days or Near Miss disclosures for last reporting period • Not Met: Discloses Fatalities for last reporting period: The Company reports that 1 workplace death occurred in 2020. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] • Not Met: Occupational disease rate for last reporting period Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Set targets for H&S performance • Not Met: Met targets or explain why not or what is doing to improve management systems
D.5.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Company indicates: 'our supplier management policy clear laid out social responsibility requirement for our supply chain partners in terms of labor standard, occupational health and safety, environment protection, trade safety, anti-corruption and bribery. BYD's risk management committee has a procurement taskforce to collect and review risk information from the supply chain, set risk thresholds, and devise corresponding countermeasures'. However, the documents mentioned were not found, including health and safety requirements for suppliers. [2019 CSR Report, 2020: byd.com] • Not Met: Injury rate disclosures and lost days (or near miss disclosures) for the last reporting period • Not Met: Fatalities disclosures for lasting reporting period • Not Met: Occupational disease rates for the last reporting period Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How working with suppliers on H&S • Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by H&S issues in the SP • Not Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.8.a	Women's rights (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Process to stop harassment and violence against women • Not Met: Working conditions take account of gender • Not Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of employment Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meet all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating closing gender pay gap

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment on the number affected by discrimination or unsafe working conditions • Not Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.9.a	Working hours (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations: The Company states that in every region it operates in, it strictly adheres to local laws and regulations regarding work hours and holidays. Employees are entitled to annual paid leave, maternity leave, and other leaves as part of its benefit package. However, it does not have a description of policy on maximum hours and minimum breaks and rest periods. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assesses ability to comply with its commitments when allocating work/targets • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 • Not Met: How it implements and checks this in its operations
D.5.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Working hours in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on working hours Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assessment of number affected by excessive working hours • Not Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.10.a	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Arrangements with suppliers and smelters/refiners in the mineral resource supply chains	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Due diligence in accordance with OECD Guidance in supplier contracts: The Company states that in 2020, it formulated the 'BYD Supplier Corporate Social Responsibility Notification Letter' to publicise its corporate social responsibility requirements to all suppliers. Now these documents explicitly prohibit suppliers from purchasing conflict minerals. The same prohibition extends to downstream suppliers. It also reports that a conflict mineral survey was conducted on all suppliers that used tantalum, tin, tungsten, and gold materials. The survey results showed that the 3TG used in the supply chain came from a conflict-free mineral smelters recognized by CFSI. However, it is not clear whether its requirements are included in commercial contracts/written agreements with suppliers and how due diligence is conducted. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Works with smelters/refiners and suppliers to build capacity • Not Met: Contractual requirement to disclosure smelter/refiner information • Not Met: Contractual requirement covers all minerals
D.5.10.b	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk identification in mineral supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance: The Company reports that a conflict mineral survey was conducted on all suppliers that used tantalum, tin, tungsten, and gold materials. The survey results showed that the 3TG used in the supply chain came from a conflict-free mineral smelters recognized by CFSI. However, there is no description of the processes for identifying risks and impacts in supply chains. [2020 CSR Report, 2021: byd.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD Guidance • Not Met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD Guidance • Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure covers all minerals
D.5.10.c	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk management in the mineral supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain • Not Met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time • Not Met: Disclose better risk prevention/mitigation over time Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Suppliers and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy • Not Met: Risk management and response processes cover all minerals

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.11	Responsible Materials Sourcing	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Due diligence for raw materials in supplier code/contracts • Not Met: Works with suppliers to build capacity in risk assessment and due diligence Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Identify the sources of high-risk raw materials in its supply chain

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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area: Forced labour; discrimination • Headline: BYD among companies accused of using suppliers linked to forced labour in China • Story: On March 1, 2020, the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) released a report that named BYD among 83 other companies benefiting from the use of potentially abuse labour transfer programs. According to the report, more than 80,000 Uighur residents and former detainees from the north-western region of Xinjiang, China have been transferred to factories to work under conditions that strongly suggest forced labour for suppliers of several multinational's supply chains. ASPIC used open-source public documents, satellite imagery, and media reports and identified 27 factories in nine Chinese provinces that have used transferred labourers. It is also alleged that Muslim minorities are thought to be working in forced labour conditions across the country. The ASPI report said that workers live in segregated dormitories, are required to study Mandarin and undergo ideological training. The workers were transferred out of Xinjiang between 2017 and 2019, claiming that people are being effectively "bought" and "sold" by local governments and commercial brokers. [ABC, 01/03/2020, "Apple, Nike and other major companies implicated in Muslim forced labour in China": abc.net.au] [Australian Strategic Policy Institute, 01/03/2020, "Uyghurs for sale": aspi.org.au] [The Guardian, 01/03/2020, "China transferred detained Uyghurs to factories used by global brands – report": theguardian.com] [Financial Times, 01/03/2020, "Xinjiang forced labour reported in multinational supply chains": ft.com]
E(1).1	The company has responded publicly to the allegation	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public response: After ASPI's allegations, BYD denied using forced labour and provided a document as evidence that the products it sources through Dongguan Yidong are not sourced from Hubei Yihong (allegedly involved in Uyghur workers transferral). The document states: "Hubei Yihong does not involve in all products provided to your company by Yidong Electronics, which are assembled and/or produced by Yidong Electronics without any involvement of Hubei Yihong in product assembling and/or manufacturing or any semi-product and/or raw material provision. This is to certify that Hubei Yihong (as the holding subsidiary of Yidong Electronics) has never engaged in any transaction with Shenzhen BYD Supply Chain Management Co., Ltd. or its affiliated company." [Yidong Electronics Technology Co., 13/11/2020, Ltd's Declaration to Shenzhen BYD Supply Chain Management Co., Ltd.: s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Detailed response: The company responded in very general terms and did not address the allegation in detail. BYD did not even respond to the letter sent on 12 March 2021 by the Working Group on Business and Human Rights on the allegation of Forced Uyghur Labour in its supply chain (AL OTH 68/2021). [Letter of the Working Group on Business and Human Rights on the allegation of Forced Uyghur Labour in BYD's supply chain (OTH 68/2021): spcommreports.ohchr.org]
E(1).2	The company has investigated and taken appropriate action	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders • Not Met: Identified cause Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken
E(1).3	The company has engaged with affected	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provided remedy

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link: The company provided a declaration from Yidong Electronics Technology Co., Ltd stating that: "Hubei Yihong (as the holding subsidiary of Yidong Electronics) has never engaged in any transaction with Shenzhen BYD Supply Chain Management Co., Ltd. or its affiliated company". However, the company did not provide sufficient evidence to prove it is not linked to the impact. Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used

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 2020 Key Findings report and the 2019 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 CHRB is part of the World Benchmarking Alliance ('WBA'). 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 WBA, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither WBA 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 WBA 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 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 Dutch law and shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of Amsterdam.

As WBA, 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.

COPYRIGHT

Our publications and benchmarks are the product of the World Benchmarking Alliance. Our work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit [creativecommons.org](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

