

Company Name Beijing Automotive Group (BAIC)
Industry Automotive (Own Operations and Supply Chain)
Overall Score 1.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.2	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
0.5	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.1	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
0.0	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: The Company states in its 2019 ESG Report that it 'has safeguarded the legitimate rights and interests of employees, and built harmonious labor relations' and 'The Group adheres to the people-oriented philosophy and firmly protects the legitimate rights and interests of employees. [...] We strive to build an equal workplace environment to ensure that employees' rights and interests are not infringed'. However, no evidence found of a publicly available statement of policy committing it to explicitly respect human rights. ESG reports are no longer considered a suitable source for policy statements according to CHRB revised methodology. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] 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 in its 2019 ESG Report: 'The Group has strictly complied with the Labor Law of the People's Republic of China, the Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China, the Provisions on the Prohibition of Using Child Labor' [...] 'It has prevented child and forced labour, in strict compliance with the requirements of labour standards'. It also states: 'It has adhered to the principle of equal employment, eradicating any discrimination, and strived to create an atmosphere of diversified employment'. However, no evidence of formal commitment to the ILO Declaration

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>found, or all ILO core areas including respecting freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining in a suitable source for policy statements (ESG reports are not considered a suitable source for policy statements according to CHRB revised methodology). [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Company has a explicit commitment to All four ILO Core <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to commit to ILO Core • Not Met: Company explicitly list All four ILO for suppliers
A.1.2.b	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: Health and safety and working hours	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: Commitment to respect H&S of workers: On its website section 'Integrity and Compliance', the Company discloses information of its Code of Conduct, that reads: 'We highly value [...] and the establishment of occupational health and safety system. We strictly abide by laws and regulations related to environment, safety and occupational health, protect the rights and interests of employees, and strive for the business development based on environmental protection, safety and health for employees'. [Integrity and Compliance - web, N/A: baicmotor.com] • Not Met: Respect ILO labour standards on working hours or Commits to 48 hours regular work week: With respect, working hours, the Company states in its 2019 ESG Report: '[...] adopting the 8-hour standard working hour system in general. For special posts, the Group has applied for a comprehensive working hour system in accordance with laws and regulations. [...] the number of overtime hours of all employees are controlled to be less than 36 hours per month in accordance with the Labor Law of the People's Republic of China, and an arrangement may be made for employees who work overtime to take compensatory time off or receive overtime pay, which shall be paid in accordance with national regulations.' However, this document is not considered a suitable source for policy statement according to CHRB's revised approach. In addition, it is not clear whether the Company upholds the ILO Convention on labour standards, including that all overtime work must be paid at a premium rate. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Responsible mineral sourcing • Not Met: Based on OECD Guidance • Not Met: Requires suppliers to commit to responsible mineral sourcing <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Women's rights • Not Met: Children's rights • Not Met: Migrant worker's rights • Not Met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles • Not Met: Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not Met: Convention on migrant workers • Not Met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights
A.1.4	Commitment to remedy	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: The Company commits to remedy • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment <p>Score 2</p> <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	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) • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	rights defenders		Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Company has set up the Integrity and Compliance Committee, as well as specialized committees with the centre as a unit. Under the Committee, there is the Office for Integrity and Compliance composed by the employees from the Compliance Department. The Company also appoints the heads of various departments as business compliance experts. However, it is not clear whether the Committee is also responsible for Human Rights issues. [Integrity and Compliance - web, N/A: baicmotor.com] • Not Met: Describe HR expertise of Board member Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Board/Committee review HRs strategy • Not Met: Examples/trends re HR discussion in the last reporting period Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Incentives for at least one board member • Not Met: At least one key HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Board process to review bussiness model and strategy • Not Met: Describe frequency and triggers for reviewing Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Senior responsibility for HR implementation and decision making Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Senior manager incentives for human rights • Not Met: At least one key HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The Company discloses its analysis of material issues. In the table presented, BAIC includes Protection of rights and interests of employees; Care for employees and Employee health and safety. However, no evidence found that general human rights issues are considered part of the enterprise risk system. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provides an example Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: The Group has strictly complied with the Labour Law of the People’s Republic of China, the Labour Contract Law of the People’s Republic of China, the Provisions on the Prohibition of Using Child Labour and other relevant laws and regulations. It also prevents forced labour. However, it is not clear how the requirements are communicated to its employees. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] 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) to business relationships	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 • Not Met: Requires suppliers to communicate policy requirements Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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 indicates hours of employee training and includes diverse training in its Stakeholder Communication table. Moreover, it states that 'All subsidiaries carried out training in basic safety knowledge in consideration of labor protection, occupational health and safety, first aid, traffic safety, and safety accident prevention, with 100% of employees trained'. However, no evidence found on specific human rights training for all its employees beyond safety. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <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 • Not Met: Proportion of supply chain monitored • Not Met: Describe how workers are involved in monitoring Score 2 <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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HR affects selection of suppliers: On its Life-cycle Management of Suppliers, under the Admission part, the Company indicates: 'The Group has further optimized the Measures of BAIC Motor for Management of Supplier Admission, further strengthening supplier risk assessment prior to admission, and adding detailed rules on the assessment of suppliers of “embedded software” components to make the supplier admission mechanism more objective and comprehensive'. However, no evidence found of human rights aspects impacts being considered in supplier selection. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships Score 2 <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Stakeholder process or systems to identify and engage with workers/communities in the last two years: In its 'Stakeholder Communication' section, the Company discloses all its stakeholders, the Communication Mechanism, Stakeholders' Appeals and Response of the Group <p>. However, no explanation was found regarding the process of how stakeholders are identified and selected to engage on human rights during the last two years. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses stakeholders that HRs may be affected • Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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 states that the Board is responsible for supervising the design, implementation and monitoring of risk management system. The Audit Committee under the Board is responsible for conducting regular or irregular reviews to the operation of the risk management and internal control systems of the Company in order to ensure the effectiveness of their operation. The Company's operation planning department and the audit department are responsible for the risk management, internal control, operation maintenance and evaluation functions. However, there is no evidence regarding the description of the process of identifying human rights risks. [2020 Annual Report, 2021: baicmotor.com] • Not Met: Identifying risks through relevant business relationships: BAIC states that 'The Group has comprehensively promoted the construction of a responsible supply chain and incorporated environmental and social risks into its supplier management system. We have formulated and implemented the Measures for Management and Control of Green Supply Chain of BAIC Motor'. However, no evidence found regarding how human rights risks and impacts in supply chain were identified. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Describe process for assessment of HR risks and discloses salient HR issues: The Company presents a graphic containing its analysis of material issues. However, no evidence regarding salient human rights risks was found. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] • Not Met: How process applies to supply chain • Not Met: Public disclosure of the results of HR assessment <p>Score 2</p> <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	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks • Not Met: Description of how global system applies to supply chain • Not Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HR issues <p>Score 2</p> <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	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 for tracking or monitor if actions taken are effective • Not Met: Lessons learnt from checking system effectiveness <p>Score 2</p> <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
	risks and impacts		
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 discloses in its ESG Report a table containing all stakeholders and communication mechanisms. The Company also states: 'There are many reporting channels, such as complaint mailbox, tip-off hotline, complaint box, visit via letter, telephone number and mailbox of discipline inspection commission leaders, etc'. On its Integrity & Compliance website, the Company states that it also sets up a reporting hotline and an e-mail to receive reports of violations of the Code of Conduct of the Company or other policies, processes and applicable laws and regulations. However, it is not clear that this includes a channel where employees are able to raise complaints, including human rights, as they seem to cover specific topics related to investors, accounting. [2021 Annual Report, 2022: baicmotor.com] & [Integrity and Compliance - web, N/A: baicmotor.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: The Company indicates in its 2019 ESG Report that: 'During the investigation and handling of reported cases, the Interim Measures of BAIC Motor Corporation Limited on Real-name Whistle-blowing and other relevant regulations will be strictly implemented to protect the rights, interests and safety of whistleblowers'. No further evidence found on latest reports. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] & [2020 Annual Report, 2021: baicmotor.com] 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Complainants not asked to waive rights • Not Met: Company does not require confidentiality provisions Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Will work with state based non judicial mechanisms • Not Met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)
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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcome achieved: The company states that: "As of the end of 2021, the total number of employees of the Group was 18,694, with 100% of the employees signing employment contracts, 18 labor complaints were submitted, processed and resolved through the official grievance mechanism." [2021 Annual Report, 2022: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How lessons from mechanism improve management system • 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 discloses its 'employee benefits': Wages and salaries, pension scheme and other social security costs, welfare, medical and other expenses. Housing benefits. The Company also states that it has established an annual remuneration adjustment mechanism, and has made differentiated adjustment to the remuneration standard of employees in full consideration of corporate development, and the ability and performance of employees, so as to ensure the competitiveness of remuneration for key talents. However, no evidence about setting a living wage was found. [2020 Annual Report, 2021: baicmotor.com] & [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Describes how living wage determined • 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.3	Mapping and disclosing 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: Identifies direct and indirect suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields): The Company states in its 2019 ESG Report that it has established a procurement and supplier management system. Its management practices are being implemented in 406 suppliers. The Company discloses the number of suppliers per region in China. However, no further details found on whether it maps suppliers, including indirect suppliers. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses names and locations of significant parts of SP and why: The company states that: "The transaction amount of the top five suppliers of the Group in 2021 accounted for approximately 65.7% of the Group's cost of raw materials used in the cost of sales in the year. The transaction amount of the single largest supplier of the Group accounted for approximately 44.5% of the Group's cost of raw materials used in the cost of sales in the year. In 2021, Mercedes-Benz Group (the largest supplier of the Group), Beijing Hainachuan Lear Automotive System Co., Ltd. (the fourth largest supplier of the Group), and Beijing Electric Vehicle Co., Ltd. (the fifth largest supplier of the Group) are the Connected Persons of the Group." However, it does not disclose specific locations. [2021 Annual Report, 2022: baicmotor.com] • Not Met: Discloses which direct or indirect suppliers is involved in higher-risk activities
D.5.4.a	Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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: Does not use child labour: The Company states that it has strictly complied with the Labour Law of the People's Republic of China, the Labour Contract Law of the People's Republic of China, the Provisions on the Prohibition of Using Child Labour and other relevant laws and regulations. It has prevented child and forced labour, in strict compliance with the requirements of labour standards. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] • Met: Age verification of workers recruited: The Company states that it requires applicants to provide identification certificates during the recruitment process to prevent the use of child and forced labour. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: 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	<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: Job seekers and workers do not pay recruitment fee: The Company states that it has prevented child and forced labour. However, there is no information on prohibiting recruitment feeds or related costs. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] • Not Met: Commits to fully reimbursing if they have paid <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees <p>Score 2</p> <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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • 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
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"> • Not Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts: The Group has adhered to the policy of 'safety and prevention first, comprehensive management' and has continuously improved the effectiveness of safety management system and strengthened the systematically safety management according to the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) principle. However, there is no information on the process to identify its health and safety risks and impacts. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] • Met: Injury Rate or Lost days or Near Miss disclosures for last reporting period: The Company reports that the lost days due to work injury was 1371 days in 2021. [2021 Annual Report, 2022: baicmotor.com] • Met: Discloses Fatalities for last reporting period: The Company reports that no work-related deaths occurred in 2021. [2021 Annual Report, 2022: baicmotor.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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • 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: The Company states that it protects the legitimate rights and interests of female employees, and has carried out self-inspections in strict compliance with the Special Provisions on Labour Protection of Female Employees and the 'Special Section for Female Employees' in the Collective Contract. The Company has organized and carried out special inspection of work according to requirements on promoting gender equality in the workplace. However, no evidence found that the Company has taken into account differential impacts on women and men of working conditions. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of employment <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
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)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations: The Company indicates that ' We have continuously improved the salary and benefit system, carried out production and business activities according to the working hours specified by law, and provided sound social security for employees [...] The Group has formulated and implemented the Measures of BAIC Motor for Attendance and Vacation Management, adopting the 8-hour standard working hour system in general. For special posts, the Group has applied for a comprehensive working hour system in accordance with laws and regulations'. [2019 ESG Report, 2019: baicmotor.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Assesses ability to comply with its commitments when allocating work/targets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • Not Met: Works with smelters/refiners and suppliers to build capacity Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Not Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD Guidance Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
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 • Headline: BAIC Motor 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 BAIC Motor 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 Uighurs 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Public response: A response by the company is not publicly available. BAIC has also not responded to the letter sent by the UN Working Group on

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	publicly to the allegation		Business and Human Rights on March 12, 2021 on the allegation of forced Uyghur labour in BAIC's supply chain. [Letter of the Working Group on Business and Human Rights (OTH 60/2021): spcommreports.ohchr.org] Score 2 • Not Met: Detailed response
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 • Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders • Not Met: Identified cause Score 2 • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken
E(1).3	The company has engaged with affected stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Provided remedy • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link Score 2 • 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