

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2022 Company Scoresheet



Company Name SAIC Motor

Industry Automotive (Own Operations and Supply Chain)

Overall Score 0.1 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
0.1	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 Not Met: General HRs commitment 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 and safety and working hours	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Commitment to respect H&S of workers 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 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: The company states in its Annual Report that 'Strategic committee, audit committee as well as nomination, remuneration and assessment committee are established under the Board of the Company, of which external directors and independent directors account for three fifths, and comprise audit committee and nomination, remuneration and assessment committee with the independent director acting as chairman of the committee'. However, it is not clear if the company has any board member engaged with human rights. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.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: Although the company indicates that 'During the reporting period, the board of supervisors held 5 meetings in total, during which they have deliberated and supervised on important matters such as regular reports, construction for internal control, related party transactions, repurchase of corporate shares, management of the raised funds, and changes in accounting policies etc., and no situations such as violation of laws or regulations or damage to the interests of shareholders was identified.' There is no mention to how this surveillance applies to human rights. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: Although the company states in its Annual Report that 'The Company has selected managerial personnel according to the principle of ability and integrity, equality and fairness and implemented tenure system. In the meantime, the Company has established a performance evaluation and remuneration system which links remuneration of management with the Company's operating performance and individual's performance.' There is no mention to how these incentives are connected to HR. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] 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: Although the company states that 'should reinforce user-oriented mobility services and refined operations focused on emerging electric intelligent connected vehicles, deploy more charging stations, strengthen the mobility service platform digitalization and intelligence, innovate and optimize business models and enhance sustainable profitability', it is not clear how the human rights will impacted the business model or if the company has a process to review business model and strategy with a focus on human rights. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] Not Met: Describe frequency and triggers for reviewing Score 2 Not Met: Keets 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: Although the SAIC Motor indicates that 'the Company has advanced the implementation of ISO14001 environmental management system continuously, and directed the affiliated companies to observe environmental protection laws and regulations and execute the environmental emission standards strictly in the day-to-day operation and project construction.' There is no mention to human rights responsibility and resources allocation. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] 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	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: The company indicates that 'We communicate with those charged with Governance regarding,

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	external stakeholders		among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit and significant audit findings, including any significant deficiencies in internal control that we identify during our audit.' However, there is no indication of communication of policies. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] • 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 indicates 'Meanwhile, the Company also well prepared for the emergency training and practices of emergent environmental incidents.' No information found regarding human rights training. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] Not Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement: Although the company states that 'In 2020, through continuing education, the Company trained 30,000 automotive engineers and organized 5 senior training courses in Shanghai, 1 professional training course at the grassroots level and 3 training courses for urgently needed talents, including 1 national senior training course.' It is not clear human rights training has been performed. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] 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 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			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
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)/mec hanism(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 makes available on its website a phone number called IR Hotline and an email for contact, however, it is not specified whether employees and/or suppliers can contact to report human rights issues. [FAQ, N/A: saicmotor.com] Score 2 Not Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages and workers aware: The company makes available on its website a phone number called IR Hotline and an email for contact, however, it is not specified whether reports can be made in languages other than English or Chinese. [FAQ, N/A: saicmotor.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)/mec hanism(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 makes available on its website a phone number called IR Hotline and an email for contact, however, it is not specified whether the community in general can use these lines, nor whether human rights issues can be addressed. [FAQ, N/A: saicmotor.com] Score 2 Not Met: Describes accessibility and local languages and stakeholder awareness: The company makes available on its website a phone number called IR Hotline and an email for contact, however, it is not specified whether reports can be made in languages other than English or Chinese. [FAQ, N/A: saicmotor.com] Not Met: Communities access mechanism direct or through suppliers Not Met: Expect supplier to convey expectation to their own suppliers

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mec hanism(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)/c hannel(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)
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: The company states in its Annual Report that 'the Company further improves the same-direction linkage mechanism, continuously advances collective negotiation focusing on wage negotiations, and gives different guidance to different enterprises to perfect remuneration allocation, establishes salary growth level and salary adjustment range of employees at different posts in a reasonable manner.' However, it is not clear if or how a living wage is determined. [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com] Not Met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 Not Met: Paying living wage

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	2) Explanation		
			Not Met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions		
D.5.1.b	Living wage (in		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
	the supply		Score 1		
	chain)	0	Not Met: Discloses living wage requirements in supplier code or contracts Not Met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers		
		U	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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
	purchasing		Score 1		
	decisions with	0	Not Met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices)		
	human rights		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	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
	disclosing the		Score 1		
	supply chain		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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
2.01.1.0	child labour:		Score 1		
	Age verification		Not Met: Does not use child labour		
	and corrective	_	Not Met: Age verification of workers recruited		
	actions (in own	0	Score 2		
	production or		Not Met: Remediation if children identified		
	manufacturing				
	operations)				
D.5.4.b	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
	child labour:		Score 1		
	Age verification		Not Met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts		
	and corrective	0	Not Met: How working with suppliers on child labour		
	actions (in the		Score 2 • Not Met: Assessement of number affected by child labour in supply chain		
	supply chain)		Not Met: Analysis of trends in progress made		
D.5.5.a	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
D.3.3.4	forced labour:	0	Score 1		
	Recruitment		Not Met: Job seekers and workers do not pay recruitment fee		
	fees and costs		Not Met: Commits to fully reimbursing if they have paid		
	(in own		Score 2		
	production or		Not Met: How practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour		
	manufacturing		brokers or recruiters		
	operations)				
D.5.5.b	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
	forced labour:		Score 1		
	Recruitment		Not Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts		
	fees and costs	0	Not Met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees		
	(in the supply		Score 2		
	chain)		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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:		
D.5.5.C	forced labour:	0.5	Score 1		
	Wage practices		Met: Pays workers in full and on time: The company states that 'In the aspect of		
	(in own		compensation and welfare, the Company complied with relevant laws and		
	production or		regulations strictly by paying employees remuneration in full and on time,		
	manufacturing	0.5	contributing to employee social insurance schemes, and providing welfare like paid		
	operations)		annual leave and holidays.' [Annual Report 2021, 26/03/2021: saicmotor.com]		
	2,5 2. 30.00,		Not Met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions Score 2		
			Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or		
Ī			recruiters		

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.5.d	Prohibition of	,	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	forced labour:		Score 1
	Wage practices		• Not Met: Requirement for suppliers to pay workers in full and on time in codes or
	(in the supply	0	contracts
	chain)	Ĭ	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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
υ.5.5.e	forced labour:		Score 1
		0	Not Met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement
	Restrictions on		Score 2
	workers (in		Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or
	own production		recruiters
	or		
	manufacturing		
2556	operations)		
D.5.5.f	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1
	forced labour:		Not Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts
	Restrictions on		Not Met: How working with suppliers on free movement
	workers (in the	0	Score 2
	supply chain)		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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	association and		Score 1
	collective		• Not Met: Commits not to interfere with union rights / Steps to avoid intimidation
	bargaining (in		or retaliation
	own production	0	• Not Met: Discloses % total direct operations covered by collective CB agreements
	or		Score 2
	manufacturing		Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
	operations)		
D.5.6.b	Freedom of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	association and	0	Score 1
	collective		Not Met: FoA & CB rules in codes or contracts
	bargaining (in		Not Met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB
	the supply		Score 2
	chain)		• 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	+	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
D.3.7.a	safety:		Score 1
	Fatalities, lost		Not Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts
	days, injury,		Not Met: Injury Rate or Lost days or Near Miss disclosures for last reporting
	occupational		period
	disease rates	0	Not Met: Discloses Fatalities for last reporting period
	(in own		Not Met: Occupational disease rate for last reporting period
	production of		Score 2
	manufacturing		Not Met: Set targets for H&S performance Not Met: Not targets or explain why not or what is doing to improve
	operations)		Not Met: Met targets or explain why not or what is doing to improve management systems
D.5.7.b	Health and		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
D.5.7.b			Score 1
	safety: Fatalities, lost		Not Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements
			Not Met: Injury rate disclosures and lost days (or near miss disclosures) for the
	days, injury,		last reporting period
	occupational	0	Not Met: Fatalities disclosures for lasting reporting period
	disease rates		Not Met: Occupational disease rates for the last reporting period
	(in the supply		Score 2
	chain)		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 and via of translation assessment of the number affected by H&S issues in the SP
			Not Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.5.8.a	Women's rights		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	(in own		Score 1
	production or		Not Met: Process to stop harassment and violence against women
	manufacturing	0	Not Met: Working conditions take account of gender Not Met: Massures and store to address gender now gen at all levels of
	operations)	U	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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	(in the supply		Score 1
	chain)		Not Met: Women's rights in codes or contracts
		0	Not Met: How working with suppliers on women's rights
			Score 2
			Not Met: Assessment on the number affected by discrimination or unsafe working and discrepance.
			working conditions • Not Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.5.9.a	Working hours		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
D.3.3.a	(in own		Score 1
	production or		Not Met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations
	manufacturing	0	Not Met: Assesses ability to comply with its commitments when allocating
	operations)		work/targets
	operations)		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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	(in the supply		Score 1 • Not Met: Working hours in codes or contracts
	chain)	0	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
D.5.10.a	Responsible		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	Mineral		Score 1
	Sourcing:		Not Met: Due diligence in accordance with OECD Guidance in supplier contracts
	Arrangements		Not Met: Works with smelters/refiners and suppliers to build capacity
	with suppliers		Score 2 • Not Met: Contractual requirement to disclosure smelter/refiner information
	and	0	Not Met: Contractual requirement to disclosure sillerter/refiner information Not Met: Contractual requirement covers all minerals
	smelters/refine		Hot Met. Contractad requirement covers an immerals
	rs in the		
	mineral		
	resource supply		
	chains		
D.5.10.b	Responsible		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	Mineral		Score 1
	Sourcing: Risk	_	Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance
	identification in	0	Not Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD Guidance Secret 2.
	mineral supply		Score 2 • Not Met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD Guidance
	chain		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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
3.3.10.0	Mineral		Score 1
	Sourcing: Risk		Not Met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain
	management in		Not Met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation
	the mineral	0	over time
	supply chain		Not Met: Disclose better risk prevention/mitigation over time
	Supply Chain		Score 2
			Not Met: Suppliers and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy Not Met: Bisk management and response processes sover all minerals.
D E 11	Posnensikla		Not Met: Risk management and response processes cover all minerals The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
D.5.11	Responsible		Score 1
	Materials		Not Met: Due diligence for raw materials in supplier code/contracts
	Sourcing	_	Not Met: Bue differed for faw finaterials in supplier code/contracts Not Met: Works with suppliers to build capacity in risk assessment and due
		0	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			No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score
			of 0.09 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D has been applied to produce a score
			of 0.02 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