CHRB
Corporate Human Rights Benchmark

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2022 Company Scoresheet

World Benchmarking Alliance
The CHRB is part of the WBA

Company Name	Dongfeng Motor Group
Industry	Automotive (Own Operations and Supply Chain)
Overall Score	0.0 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
0.0	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 • Not Met: General HRs commitment: The Company indicated in its 2017 ESG Report: 'In business operation, the Group persists in respecting human rights, ensuring equal treatment of all employees, and striving to create a safe and comfortable working environment'. However, ESG Reports are no longer considered a suitable source for policy statements under CHRB's revised approach. • Not Met: Universal Declaration of Human rights (UDHR) • Not Met: International Bill of Human Rights Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Company has a commitment to the ILO Core • Not Met: Company has a explicit commitment to All four ILO Core Score 2 • 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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Commitment to respect H&S of workers: The Company indicated in its ESG Report 2017: 'In terms of occupational health, the Group attaches importance to the health status of each employee, commits itself to providing a safe and

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	and safety and working hours		healthy work environment for its employees, and regularly carries out diagnostics and improvement on important occupational health issues such as ergonomics, working environment, occupational hazards, and occupational health examinations and implements employee occupational health check-ups and health surveillance files'. However, ESG Reports are no longer considered a suitable source for policy statements under CHRB's revised approach. • Not Met: Respect ILO labour standards on working hours or Commits to 48 hours regular work week Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Responsible mineral sourcing • Not Met: Based on OECD Guidance • Not Met: Requires suppliers to commit to responsible mineral sourcing Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Women's rights: The Company indicated in its ESG Report 2017: 'In 2017, in order to further safeguard the interests and rights of female employees, all the labor unions of the subsidiaries, led by the labor union of the Group, proactively carried out various forms of self enhancement contests to provide a platform for female employees to achieve accomplishments at their posts. Meanwhile, the Group continued to carry out activities to show care for female employees, and strengthened to safeguard the special rights and interests of female employees'. However, ESG Reports are no longer considered a suitable source for policy statements under CHRB's revised approach. • Not Met: Children's rights • Not Met: Migrant worker's rights • Not Met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: The Company commits to remedy • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs) • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment 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 • 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			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 • Not Met: Provides an example Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations Score 2 • 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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: How workers are trained on HR policy commitments • Not Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement Score 2 • Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			• 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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: HR affects selection of suppliers • Not Met: HR affects on-going supplier relationships Score 2 • Not Met: Describe positive incentives offered to respect human rights • Not Met: Working with suppliers to meet HR requirements
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Identifying risks in own operations • Not Met: Identifying risks through relevant business relationships Score 2 • 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 • 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 • 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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: System for tracking or monitor if actions taken are effective • Not Met: Lessons learnt from checking system effectiveness Score 2 • 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 has a section on its website, called "Contact Us", however, it does not specify whether it is open to employees, suppliers and the community at large. Furthermore, it is unclear whether human rights issues can be raised via this channel. [Contact Us, N/A: dfm-global.com] Score 2 • Not Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages and workers aware [Contact Us, N/A: dfm-global.com] • 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: In the "Contact Us" section of the company's website, it is only possible to make complaints and/or send messages about the company's products itself. [Contact Us, N/A: dfm-global.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
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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcome achieved • Not Met: How lessons from mechanism improve management system Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Pays living wage or sets target date • Not Met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Discloses living wage requirements in supplier code or contracts • Not Met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers Score 2 • 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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Identifies direct and indirect suppliers back to manufacturing sites (factories or fields) Score 2 • 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
D.5.4.a	Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Does not use child labour: No updated information found. • Not Met: Age verification of workers recruited: See above Score 2 • Not Met: Remediation if children identified

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • Not Met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on child labour Score 2 • Not Met: Assessement 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 • Not Met: Job seekers and workers do not pay recruitment fee • Not Met: Commits to fully reimbursing if they have paid Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Pays workers in full and on time • Not Met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions Score 2 • 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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on free movement Score 2 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • Not Met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 • 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	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts • Not Met: Injury Rate or Lost days or Near Miss disclosures for last reporting period • Not Met: Discloses Fatalities for last reporting period • Not Met: Occupational disease rate for last reporting period Score 2 • 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 • 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 • 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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on women's rights Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations • Not Met: Assesses ability to comply with its commitments when allocating work/targets Score 2 • 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 • Not Met: Working hours in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on working hours Score 2 • 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 • 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 • 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 • Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance • Not Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD Guidance Score 2 • 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 • 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 • 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 • 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 • 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		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 0.00 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D has been applied to produce a score of 0.00 out of 20 points for theme E.

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.