

Company Name Microchip Technology
Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)
Overall Score 7.5 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.3	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.0	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
3.0	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.8	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.5	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	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: General HRs commitment: According to the webpage section 'Ethics and Conduct': 'We have also adopted the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct standards for Labor, Health and Safety, the Environment and Ethics for all our operations'. The RBA indicates that 'Participants are committed to uphold the human rights of workers, and to treat them with dignity and respect as understood by the international community'. [RBA v.7.0, 2021: responsiblebusiness.org] & [Ethics and Conduct web, N/A: microchip.com] <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Company has a commitment to the ILO Core: According to the webpage section 'Ethics and Conduct': 'We have also adopted the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct standards for Labor, Health and Safety, the Environment and Ethics for all our operations'. The RBA Code indicates: 'in alignment with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the provisions in this Code are derived from and respect internationally recognized standards including the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles'. However, as indicated below, it is not clear whether all ILO core areas are respected in all contexts and locations. [RBA v.7.0, 2021: responsiblebusiness.org] & [Ethics and Conduct web, N/A: microchip.com] Not Met: Company has a explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: According to the webpage section 'Ethics and Conduct': 'We have also adopted the Responsible

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct standards for Labor, Health and Safety, the Environment and Ethics for all our operations'. The RBA code forbids discrimination, forced and child labour. Regarding Freedom of Association, it indicates 'In conformance with local law, participants shall respect the right of all workers to form and join trade unions of their own choosing, to bargain collectively, and to engage in peaceful assembly as well as respect the right of workers to refrain from such activities'. However, it is not clear whether it is committed to respect these rights in all contexts and locations (i.e. alternative mechanisms for those countries where there are legal restrictions to the exercise of these rights), as the Company indicates that it respects these rights 'in conformance with local laws'. [RBA v.7.0, 2021: responsiblebusiness.org] & [Ethics and Conduct web, N/A: microchip.com]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Company expect suppliers to commit to ILO Core: The RBA code is used as Supplier code of conduct. It indicates: 'in alignment with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the provisions in this Code are derived from and respect internationally recognized standards including the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles'. However, as indicated below, it is not clear whether all ILO core areas are respected in all contexts and locations.. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] • Not Met: Company explicitly list All four ILO for suppliers: The Supplier Code of Conduct forbids discrimination, forced and child labour. Regarding Freedom of Association, it indicates 'In conformance with local law, participants shall respect the right of all workers to form and join trade unions of their own choosing, to bargain collectively, and to engage in peaceful assembly as well as respect the right of workers to refrain from such activities'. However, it is not clear whether the Company requires suppliers to respect those rights in all contexts, as it indicates 'in conformance with local law'. In these cases (companies referring to local laws in freedom of association and collective bargaining), companies are expected to require alternative mechanisms or equivalent workers bodies where the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is restricted under law. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com]
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: It indicates that 'Microchip Technology Incorporated is committed to protecting (...) health and safety of its employees'. [Environmental, Safety and Health Policy, 23/07/2019: microchip.com] • Not Met: Respect ILO labour standards on working hours or Commits to 48 hours regular work week: According to the webpage section 'Ethics and Conduct': 'We have also adopted the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct standards for Labor, Health and Safety, the Environment and Ethics for all our operations'. The RBA Code indicates that 'Working hours are not to exceed the maximum set by local law. Further, a workweek should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. All overtime must be voluntary'. However, no evidence found of the Company explicitly committing to respect ILO conventions on working hours or that publicly states that workers are not required to work more than 48 hours as regular working week, and that overtime is consensual and paid at a premium rate. [RBA v.7.0, 2021: responsiblebusiness.org] & [Ethics and Conduct web, N/A: microchip.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Expect suppliers to commit to H&S of their workers: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: 'Participants recognize that in addition to minimizing the incidence of work-related injury and illness, a safe and healthy work environment enhances the quality of products and services, consistency of production and worker retention and morale. Participants also recognize that ongoing worker input and education are essential to identifying and solving health and safety issues in the workplace. Recognized management systems such as ISO 45001 and ILO Guidelines on Occupational Safety and Health were used as references in preparing the Code and may be useful sources of additional information'. It then lists is health and safety standards, that include: Occupational Safety, Emergency Preparedness, Occupational Injury and Illness, Industrial Hygiene, Physically Demanding Work, Machine Safeguarding, Sanitation, Food, and Housing, Health and Safety Communication. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] • Not Met: Expect suppliers to commit to ILO labour standard or to 48 hours regular work week: The Supplier Code of Conduct indicates: 'Working hours are not to exceed the maximum set by local law. Further, a workweek should not be more

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. All overtime must be voluntary'. However, no formal commitment about respecting the ILO conventions on working hours was found. Alternatively, the Company would achieve this by committing to a 48 hours regular working week, and consensual overtime paid at a premium rate. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com]
A.1.3.a.ICT	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – responsible sourcing of minerals (ICT)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Responsible mineral sourcing: It indicates that 'Microchip supports responsible minerals sourcing within the Covered Countries to encourage viable and ethical revenue streams for the local communities'. However, 'support' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. The previous assessment was based on the Company's Sustainability Report, which CHRB no longer considers a suitable source for policy statements. [Conflict Minerals Sourcing Policy_2, 05/04/2019: microchip.com] • Not Met: Based on OECD Guidance: According to the webpage section 'Ethics and Conduct': 'We have also adopted the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct standards for Labor, Health and Safety, the Environment and Ethics for all our operations'. The RBA indicates that 'Participants shall adopt a policy and exercise due diligence on the source and chain of custody of the tantalum, tin, tungsten, and gold in the products they manufacture to reasonably assure that they are sourced in a way consistent with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas or an equivalent and recognized due diligence framework'. However, 'consistent with' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [RBA v.7.0, 2021: responsiblebusiness.org] & [Ethics and Conduct web, N/A: microchip.com] • Met: Requires suppliers to commit to responsible mineral sourcing: Its Supplier Code of Conduct indicates that 'Participants shall adopt a policy and exercise due diligence on the source and chain of custody of the tantalum, tin, tungsten, and gold in the products they manufacture to reasonably assure that they are sourced in a way consistent with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas or an equivalent and recognized due diligence framework'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] & [Conflict Minerals Sourcing Policy_2, 05/04/2019: microchip.com] <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.ICT	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – vulnerable groups (ICT)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Women's rights • Not Met: Children's rights • Met: Migrant worker's rights: According to the webpage section 'Ethics and Conduct': 'We have also adopted the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) Code of Conduct standards for Labor, Health and Safety, the Environment and Ethics for all our operations'. It indicates that 'Participants are committed to uphold the human rights of workers, and to treat them with dignity and respect as understood by the international community. This applies to all workers including (...) migrant'. [RBA v.7.0, 2021: responsiblebusiness.org] & [Ethics and Conduct web, N/A: microchip.com] • Met: Expects suppliers to respect at least one of these rights: It indicates, on its Supplier Code of Conduct, that 'It indicates that 'Participants are committed to uphold the human rights of workers, and to treat them with dignity and respect as understood by the international community. This applies to all workers including (...) migrant'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] <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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 • 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 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 bussiness 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: Microchip states that 'Our commitment to sustainability is steadfast, and it guides our approach to policy, operations, risk management, capital investment and transparency'. Although the Company indicates that sustainability is a part of its risk management system, no evidence that HR risk are part of company's risk system> [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provides an example

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			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: The Company states that 'Microchip invests in our employees' futures, by ensuring access to our training is available in native languages and during times that accommodate our global presence and workforce.' However, it is not clear if the company's training cover Human Rights. Additional evidence was not found in more recent documents. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] 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: The Company states that 'Microchip's Compliance with Laws policies require compliance with laws by our employees, agents, contractors, and consultants. Microchip provides ethics training to employees, which includes an obligation to comply with laws and report violations of laws.' However, it is not clear if the training includes HR issues and/or how training is provided. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • 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 • 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: The Company states that 'Microchip Technology Incorporated has mapped all integrated circuits in its supply chain, including internal and external foundries, probe, assembly, and test locations. By doing this, we understand potential supply chain risk and recovery timing'. However, it is not clear the percentage of supply chain that is being monitored for compliance with human rights commitments. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • 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: According to its CSR report, 'Capabilities and quality standards are surveyed and reviewed at the time of supplier selection, as well as during quarterly reviews.' However, no evidence was found on how human rights issues affect selection of suppliers. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • 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

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: The Company states that 'Identification of primary stakeholders and the stakeholder engagement process tend to be decentralized based on functional group sensitivities and priorities. Microchip has chosen to focus on stakeholder groups with high interest, high impact to our business.' However, no further evidence found, including how identified affected stakeholders and engaged with them in the last two years, including human rights. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • Not Met: Discloses stakeholders that HRs may be affected • Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders: The company provides a table with the stakeholders the company engage on page 12 of the Sustainability Report. However, it is not clear what is the frequency the company engages with these stakeholders and no example of engagement found. [2020 Sustainability Report, 2021: microchip.com] <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 'Microchip has established a Corporate Business Continuity (CBC) Steering Committee. The CBC Steering Committee is responsible for managing Microchip's CBC program and has created a Guidance Document (GD) to establish the expectations and standards to be used by all Microchip entities with respect to business continuity planning. The GD defines the minimum requirements for how to: 1. Identify and evaluate internal and external risks [...]' However, no further details found including how it identifies human rights risks. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • Not Met: Identifying risks through relevant business relationships <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 materiality assessment. However, no evidence found regarding description of system to determine salient human rights risks. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.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: The Company states that 'assessing vendors for environmental, social, and governance issues and taking appropriate steps to mitigate risk' is one of the findings of the materiality assessment. However, no evidence regarding a system to take action to prevent, mitigate or remediate the Company's salient human rights issues was found. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • 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	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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	human rights risks and impacts		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
B.2.5	Communicating on human rights impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Provides two examples of comms with stakeholders Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: According to its policy, the Company states that 'Microchip has grievance mechanisms whereby employees, suppliers, and others can report suspected non-compliance with legal requirements and suspected non-compliance with Microchip's Code of Business Conduct & Ethics.' [Form SD, 2019: ww1.microchip.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The company states that: "Microchip has grievance mechanisms whereby employees, suppliers, and others can report suspected non-compliance with legal requirements and suspected non-compliance with Microchip's Code of Business Conduct & Ethics." [Form SD, 2019: ww1.microchip.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Engages users to create or assess system • Not Met: Examples (at least two) of how they do this Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The company states: "Protection Against Retaliation – Retaliation in any form against an individual who reports a violation of this Code of Business Conduct and Ethics or of the law, even if the report is mistaken, or who assists in the investigation of a reported violation, is itself a serious violation of this policy and applicable law. Acts of retaliation should be reported immediately. The Company will investigate reports of retaliation, and will discipline individuals suspected of retaliating up to and including termination, as appropriate." [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, N/A: ww1.microchip.com] • Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: The Company offer the option to submitted complaints anonymously to their Microchip Technology Incorporated, P.O. Box. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, N/A: ww1.microchip.com] Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Company indicate it will not retaliate against workers/stakeholders

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Expects suppliers to prohibit retaliation against workers/stakeholders
C.6	Company involvement with state-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Complainants not asked to waive rights • Not Met: Company does not require confidentiality provisions <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Describes how remedy has been provided • Not Met: Says how it would provide remedy for victims if no adverse impact identified <p>Score 2</p> <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	<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: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcome achieved: The company says 0 Legal Claims Against Microchip were filed in 2020 and 2021. However, no information was found on grievances files through non-judicial mechanisms. [2020 Sustainability Report, 2021: microchip.com] • Not Met: How lessons from mechanism improve management system <p>Score 2</p> <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)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.1.a	Living wage (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: Pays living wage or sets target date • Not Met: Describes how living wage determined <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Paying living wage • Not Met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions
D.4.1.b	Living wage (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses living wage requirements in supplier code or contracts: The company states that: "Compensation paid to workers shall comply with all applicable wage laws, including those relating to minimum wages, overtime hours and legally mandated benefits." However, local laws do not always provide for a living wage. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] • Not Met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with 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: 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 <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.3	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) <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses names and locations of significant parts of SP and why

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Discloses which direct or indirect suppliers is involved in higher-risk activities: The company states that "Microchip recognizes the significant risks and adverse impacts which may be associated with extracting, trading, handling and exporting Conflict Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas (CAHRAs). Recognizing that Microchip has the responsibility to respect human rights and not contribute directly to conflict, we commit ourselves to taking actions to source responsibly throughout our operations worldwide.". However, no information about which suppliers are involved in this higher-risk activities is disclosed. [2020 Sustainability Report, 2021: microchip.com]
D.4.4.a	Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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: Does not use child labour: The company says: "We are committed to ensuring that our facilities comply with all local and national laws and regulations as they relate to the health and safety of our employees. We also have policies prohibiting the use of forced or compulsory labor, child labor and discrimination." [2020 Sustainability Report, 2021: microchip.com] • Not Met: Age verification of workers recruited: The Company states that 'Additionally, with very few exceptions for internship-type programs in the United States which are allowed by law, Microchip requires all employees to be 18 years of age or older'. However, no evidence regarding verification of job applicants age was found. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Remediation if children identified
D.4.4.b	Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: The company states that: "Child labor is not to be used in any stage of manufacturing. The term 'child' refers to any person under the age of 15, or under the age for completing compulsory education, or under the minimum age for employment in the country, whichever is greatest." [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] • 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.4.5.a	Prohibition of forced labour: Recruitment fees and costs (in own production or manufacturing operations)	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: Job seekers and workers do not pay recruitment fee: The company states that: "The U.S. Government policy against human trafficking and FAR 52.222-50 prohibits all federal contractors and subcontractors at any tier from trafficking persons and from engaging in trafficking-related activities such as: Charging employees or applicants fees related to their recruitment." [Microchip Combatting Trafficking in Persons Policy, 31/03/2020: ww1.microchip.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.4.5.b	Prohibition of forced labour: Recruitment fees and costs (in the supply chain)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: The company says: Workers shall not be required to pay employers' agents or sub-agents' recruitment fees or other related fees for their employment. If any such fees are found to have been paid by workers, such fees shall be repaid to the worker." [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, N/A: ww1.microchip.com] • 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
D.4.5.c	Prohibition of forced labour: Wage practices (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: Pays workers in full and on time • Not Met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.5.d	Prohibition of forced labour: Wage practices (in the supply chain)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Requirement for suppliers to pay workers in full and on time in codes or contracts: The Company state that "compensation paid to workers shall comply with all applicable wage laws, including those relating to minimum wages, overtime hours and legally mandated benefits. In compliance with local laws, workers shall be compensated for overtime at pay rates greater than regular hourly rates. Deductions from wages as a disciplinary measure shall not be permitted. For each pay period, workers shall be provided with a timely and understandable wage statement that includes sufficient information to verify accurate compensation for work performed." [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] • Not Met: How working with supply chain to pay workers regularly and on time <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.5.e	Prohibition of forced labour: Restrictions on workers (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 retain documents or restrict movement: The company states that: "The U.S. Government policy against human trafficking and FAR 52.222-50 prohibits all federal contractors and subcontractors at any tier from trafficking persons and from engaging in trafficking-related activities such as: Destroying, confiscating, or otherwise denying an employee access to his or her identity or immigration documents." [Microchip Combatting Trafficking in Persons Policy, 31/03/2020: ww1.microchip.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters
D.4.5.f	Prohibition of forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The Company state "All work must be voluntary, and workers shall be free to leave work at any time or terminate their employment without penalty if reasonable notice is given as per worker's contract. Employers, agents, and sub-agents' may not hold or otherwise destroy, conceal, or confiscate identity or immigration documents, such as government-issued identification, passports, or work permits. Employers can only hold documentation if such holdings are required by law. In this case, at no time should workers be denied access to their documents." • Not Met: How working with suppliers on free movement <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (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: Commits not to interfere with union rights / Steps to avoid intimidation or retaliation: The Company states that 'While none of Microchip's employees are unionized, we do acknowledge the right to collective bargaining where allowed by law'. No evidence found of a commitment to not interfere with workers trying to exercise these rights and measures in place to guarantee so. [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • Not Met: Discloses % total direct operations covered by collective CB agreements <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
D.4.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (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: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts: Company states that: "In conformance with local law, participants shall respect the right of all workers to form and join trade unions of their own choosing, to bargain collectively, and to engage in peaceful assembly as well as respect the right of workers to refrain from such activities." However, it is unclear whether this is applied under any circumstances, as the company refers to the necessity to conform with local laws. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.com] • Not Met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB <p>Score 2</p> <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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in own production of 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: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts • Not Met: Injury Rate or Lost days or Near Miss disclosures for last reporting period: The Company discloses the injury rate in its Sustainability Report for some of its operations but not clear what is the company's overall injury rate or lost day or near miss [Sustainability Report, 20/12/2019: ww1.microchip.com] • Not Met: Discloses Fatalities for last reporting period • Not Met: Occupational disease rate for last reporting period <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in the supply chain)	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: Company states that: "Participants recognize that in addition to minimizing the incidence of work-related injury and illness, a safe and healthy work environment enhances the quality of products and services, consistency of production and worker retention and morale. Participants also recognize that ongoing worker input and education are essential to identifying and solving health and safety issues in the workplace. Recognized management systems such as ISO 45001 and ILO Guidelines on Occupational Safety and Health were used as references in preparing the Code and may be useful sources of additional information." [Supplier Code of Conduct, 05/06/2021: microchip.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 <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.8.a	Women's rights (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: 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 <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 • Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating closing gender pay gap
D.4.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Women's rights in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on women's rights <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.9.a	Working hours (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: 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 <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Working hours in codes or contracts • Not Met: How working with suppliers on working hours <p>Score 2</p> <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.4.10.a	Responsible mineral sourcing: Arrangements with suppliers and smelters/refiners in the mineral resource supply chains	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: Due diligence in accordance with OECD Guidance in supplier contracts • Not Met: Works with smelters/refiners and suppliers to build capacity <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Contractual requirement to disclosure smelter/refiner information • Not Met: Contractual requirement covers all minerals
D.4.10.b	Responsible mineral sourcing: Risk identification and responses in mineral supply chain	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance: While the Company discloses which smelters or refiners it has found to be at risk, no process of human rights risk identification or disclosure could be found. [Conflict Minerals Report 2019, 2020: microchip.com] • Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD Guidance: The Company requests its suppliers complete the Conflict Minerals Reporting Template. 'We review the lists of smelters reported by our supply chain against the RMI RMAP "Conformant" smelter lists, their "active" smelter lists, the TI-CMC "active" smelter list (TI-CMC Category A, Members Progressing Toward RMAP Validation), and the KUMA "active" smelter list (KUMA, Members Progressing Toward RMAP Validation). [...] For the eight smelters reported to be in the supply chain for Category B products that were neither recognized by the RMI RMAP as Conformant with the organization's responsible minerals sourcing protocols and listed on the RMI RMAP "Conformant" smelter lists nor the organization's "active" smelter lists, or the TI-CMC "active" smelter list (TI-CMC Category A Members Progressing Toward RMAP Validation), Microchip performed additional due diligence.' [Conflict Mineral Sourcing Policy, 2019: ww1.microchip.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD Guidance: The Company discloses and describes the eight smelters and refiners it has found to be potentially risky. Additionally, it discloses a list of all smelters and refiners reported in the supply chain. [Conflict Minerals Report 2019, 2020: microchip.com] • Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure covers all minerals
D.4.10.c	Reporting on responsible sourcing of minerals	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: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain • Not Met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time: The Company states that 'Participating as a member of the Responsible Minerals Initiative ("RMI") that engages Smelters and Refiners ("SOR") and conducts audits of the SOR against responsible minerals sourcing protocols. The RMI maintains lists of SOR that have successfully completed their responsible minerals sourcing audits (including audits by similar industry-specific trade organizations) or are actively participating with the RMI or similar organization ("Conformant" and "active" smelter lists, respectively), and the RMI publishes the industry-standard Conflict Minerals Reporting Template for conducting a Reasonable Country of Origin Inquiry ("RCOI")'. Although the Company indicates that the sourcing are audited, there is no evidence that they track or monitor risk prevention and whether it has improved over time. [Conflict Minerals Report 2019, 2020: microchip.com] <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Met: Disclose better risk prevention/mitigation over time • Not Met: Suppliers and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy • Not Met: Risk management and response processes cover all minerals

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 6.02 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D has been applied to produce a score of 1.51 out of 20 points for theme E.

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/)