

Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2022 Company Scoresheet



Company Name TE Connectivity

Industry ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)

Overall Score 9.7 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
1.9	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.7	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
3.5	20	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
1.7	25	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.9	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	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: General HRs commitment: The Human Rights policy states that 'Our commitment to operating with respect for human rights is core to our values-based culture and is embedded in our policies, guides and procedures. () Respect for human rights and the fair and equal treatment of our employees, customers, suppliers and other stakeholders are fundamental to the way we do business. () We are committed to human rights for all people, everywhere in the world'. [Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.com] • Not Met: Universal Declaration of Human rights (UDHR) • Not Met: International Bill of Human Rights Score 2 • Met: Commitment to the UNGPs: It indicates: 'TE respects human rights as reflected in () the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights'. [Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.com]
A.1.2.a	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Company has a commitment to the ILO Core: The HR policy states that 'TE respects human rights as reflected in the () ILO Conventions'. [Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.com] • Not Met: Company has a explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: The Global Policy Human Resources 'prohibits discrimination'. The HR policy indicates: 'We prohibit all forms of forced or trafficked labor, child labor. () Fulfil our obligations concerning collective bargaining'. However, no evidence found on whether the Company commits to respect the right to freedom of association. Previous assessment used evidence from Company's Corporate Responsibility Report, which

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			CHRB no longer considers a suitable source for policy statements. [Global Policy Human Resources, 27/10/2016: te.com] & [Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.com] Score 2
			• Not Met: Company expect suppliers to commit to ILO Core: The Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility (supplier code) indicates: 'The principles in TE's SSR [Supplier Social Responsibility] program also embrace the () International Labour
			Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles'. However, it is not clear the Company expects suppliers to commit it to respecting the human rights that the ILO has declared to be fundamental rights at work. The Guide 'applies to all suppliers of TE globally, which includes all integrated suppliers, temporary personnel, and third party consultants'. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility,
			O8/2019: te.com Not Met: Company explicitly list All four ILO for suppliers: The Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility covers child labour, forced labour, non-discrimination. Regarding freedom of association, it indicates: 'Our suppliers must respect the rights of workers to associate freely, to join or not join labor unions, to seek
			representation, and to join workers' councils in accordance with local laws. Workers shall be able to communicate openly with management regarding working conditions without fear of reprisal, intimidation or harassment'. However, it is not clear whether it expects suppliers to commit to the right to of collective bargaining.
			Lastly, it is not clear whether the Company requires to respect the right to freedom of association in all contexts, as it indicates 'in accordance with local laws'. In these cases, 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. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com]
A.1.2.b	Commitment to		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	respect the human rights of		Score 1 • Met: Commitment to respect H&S of workers: The Company is committed to
	workers: Health		'operating our facilities around the world in a manner that protects our employees, public health and environment; complying with all applicable laws and regulations
	and safety and working hours		at every location where we operate and applying our own more stringent
	Working mours		standards and policies wherever necessary to protect our employees and the environment []'. [Guide to Ethical Conduct, 2020: te.com] & [Environment, Health
			and Safety Policy, 08/08/2017: te.com]
			Not Met: Respect ILO labour standards on working hours or Commits to 48 hours regular work week: The Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility (supplier code)
			indicates: 'TE supports the following specific Labor and Human Rights related
			principles internally for TE, and for our suppliers: () Work weeks are not to exceed the maximum allowable hours set by local law. Further, a work week should not be
			more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be allowed at least one day off per seven-day week'. 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
		0.5	consensual and paid at a premium rate. Lastly, 'supporting a right' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] & [Guide to Ethical Conduct, 2020: te.com] Score 2
			Not Met: Expect suppliers to commit to H&S of their workers: The Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility indicates: 'We are committed to providing a safe working environment for all employees. We do this by following strict safety and
			security rules and practices, which we require our suppliers also to follow (). TE supports the following Health and Safety principles and practices internally and by our suppliers'. It then lists health and safety guidelines that include: occupational
			safety, emergency preparedness, occupational injury and illness reporting and investigation, industrial hygiene, physically demanding work, machine safeguarding, dormitory and canteen. The Guide clarifies 'the values and principles
			under which TE operates as they relate to corporate social responsibility'. However, according to CHRB wording criteria, 'supporting a principle' is not considered a formal commitment, it is not clear the Company expects suppliers to commit to the health of their workers. [Guide to Supplier Social Persponsibility, 08/2019; to some
			 health of their workers. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] Not Met: Expect suppliers to commit to ILO labour standard or to 48 hours regular work week: See above. Requirements for working hours seem to be the
			same for both own employees and suppliers. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.3.a.ICT	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – responsible sourcing of minerals (ICT)	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Responsible mineral sourcing: The Company indicates: 'TE strives to have a Conflict Free supply chain – meaning that the metals and materials in our supply chain are sourced in an ethical manner that does not promote armed conflict or inhumane treatment and TE is committed to sourcing products and materials from non-conflict sources'. [Responsible Minerals and Materials Policy, 01/07/2021: te.com] • Not Met: Based on OECD Guidance: Previous assessment used evidence from Company's Conflict Minerals Report, which CHRB no longer considers a suitable source for policy statements. No further evidence found. • Met: Requires suppliers to commit to responsible mineral sourcing: It indicates: 'TE expects that its suppliers have due diligence processes in place to identify the source of the metals and minerals contained in their products, and that those sources do not support conflict and violations of human rights (). TE expects its suppliers to source from conformant or active smelters or refiners ("SORs"), that have been validated through third party accredited audits such as: RMAP, LBMA, RJC, or TI-CMC'. [Responsible Minerals and Materials Policy, 01/07/2021: te.com] 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.ICT	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry – vulnerable groups (ICT)	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 at least one of 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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: The Company commits to remedy: The Company indicates that it: 'we also [] Promptly investigate allegations and pursue action to remedy any adverse human rights impacts'. However, no direct commitment found to remedy. Current statement refers to investigate and 'pursue action'. The company provided further comments for this indicator. However, the information provided could not be found in the public domain and is therefore not material for the assessment. [Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.com] Not Met: Company expect suppliers to make this commitment Score 2 Not Met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives Met: Work with suppliers to remedy impact: The Company states, on its Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, that its remediation of instances of non-compliance can include a number of activities, such as the Company and suppliers working together to create a corrective action plan for achieving compliance in a clearly defined and reasonable time frame, encouragement for improvement through regular communications with non-compliant suppliers, defining a roadmap for gradually increasing standards and expectations; and termination of a supplier relationship when serious compliance issues are not remedied in spite of repeated notifications. The values, principles and guidelines stated in this Guide are demonstrated by TE in its day-to-day business operations'. Previous assessment was based on this guide. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com]
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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	from the top	0	Score 1
	·		Not Met: Board level responsibility for HRs
			Not Met: Describe HR expertise of Board member

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2
			Not Met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO
A.2.2	Board		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	responsibility		Score 1
	,		Not Met: Board/Committee review HRs strategy: The company states that "The
			Chief Human Resources officer has executive responsibility which includes
			providing regular updates to the TE Connectivity Board of Directors." However, no
		0	information is disclosed on when and how the Board addresses dilemmas arising
			from tension between respect for human rights and other business interests.
			[Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.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
A.2.3	Incentives and		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	performance		Score 1
	management		Not Met: Incentives for at least one board member
		0	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		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	model strategy		Score 1
	and risks		Not Met: Board process to review bussiness model and strategy
		0	Not Met: Describe frequency and triggers for reviewing
			Score 2
			Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
			Not Met: Example of actions decided

B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence (25% of Total)

B.1 Embedding Respect for Human Rights in Company Culture and Management Systems (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a Met: Senior responsibility for HR implementation and decision making: The company states "Our Human Resources and Legal departments lead the implementation of our human rights program, training and due diligence. The Chief Human Resources officer has executive responsibility which includes providing regular updates to the TE Connectivity Board of Directors." [Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.com] Score 2 Not Met: How it assigns Day-to-day responsibility Not Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own ops Not Met: Resources and expertise allocation in the supply chain
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Senior manager incentives for human rights Not Met: At least one key HR risk, beyond employee H&S Score 2 Not Met: Performance criteria made public Not Met: Review of other senior management performance
B.1.3	Integration with enterprise risk management	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: HR risks is integrated as part of enterprise risk system Not Met: Provides an example Score 2 Not Met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment
B.1.4.a	Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to workers and external stakeholders	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Score of 1 on A.1.2.a Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: The Company states that ensures that 'everyone across the TE organization and our supply chain understands and demonstrates our core values and social responsibility platform'. Every employee is required to participate annually in a training session on the Guide to Ethical Conduct, to commit to embrace and utilize the Guide's principles in

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			their daily work activities, and to report any activity that may be deemed a violation of the Guide. The Guide includes the Company's commitment to human rights. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] Score 2 Not Met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder [Board Governance Principles, 2019: te.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: The Company indicates: 'We believe it is critical that our suppliers understand, share, and apply our core values in their own operations and business interactions'. Also, it states that encourages 'open and effective communication and interaction'. However, there are no evidences indicating the steps it takes in order to communicate its policy. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] Not Met: Requires suppliers to communicate policy requirements Score 2 Not Met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual: Although the Company indicates 'Termination of a supplier relationship when serious compliance issues are not remedied in spite of repeated notifications' as one of its actions against non-compliance, there are no further details against human rights approach in contractual arrangements. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] Not Met: Company requires suppliers to cascade down to their suppliers
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0.5	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 every employee is required to participate annually in a training session on the Guide to Ethical Conduct, to commit to embrace and utilize the Guide's principles in their daily work activities, and to report any activity that may be deemed a violation of the Guide. The Guide includes the Company's commitment to human rights.' However, no further evidence found on the content of training or on how the company provide the training. [Corporate Responsibility Report 2020, 2021: te.com] Not Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement [Corporate Responsibility Report 2020, 2021: te.com] Score 2 Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 Met: Trains suppliers to meet company's HR commitment: The company indicates that the suppliers are part of the human right training as stated here 'In addition to our annual Guide to Ethical Conduct ("the Guide") training and certification, we seek a separate confirmation from our key HR leaders with global and/or regional responsibilities and members of the TE Law Department who have oversight over labor and employment-related matters that the individual is not aware of any labor and employment practice maintained by TE that would violate the Guide or evidence human rights issues.' [Global Human Rights Policy, 03/08/2021: te.com] 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 [Annual Report 2021, 2022: s1.q4cdn.com] Score 2 Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a Not Met: Describes corrective action process: The Company indicates corrective actions plans with its suppliers as remediation of instances of non-compliance. However there are no sufficient evidences to indicate the human rights policy implementation monitoring. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] Not Met: Disclose findings and number of corrective action

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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: The Company states that it considers the sustainability journey and performance in the selection of new suppliers. Also, it indicates: 'TE encourages suppliers to join and participate actively in the United Nations Global Compact. Joining the Global Compact is a sign that the supplier is taking sustainability issues seriously'. However, no evidence was found on whether being a participant in the UNGC is relevant for selection or whether it is an effort performed by the Company after selection. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.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
B.1.8	Approach to engagement with affected stakeholders	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Stakeholder process or systems to identify and engage with workers/communities in the last two years Not Met: Discloses stakeholders that HRs may be affected Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders Score 2 Not Met: Analysis of stakeholder views on company's HR issues Not Met: Describe how views influenced company's HR approach

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.1	Identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Identifying risks in own operations Not Met: Identifying risks through relevant business relationships Score 2 Not Met: Describe ongoing global risk identification in consultation with stakeholder/HR experts Not Met: Triggered by new circumstances Not Met: Describes risks identified
B.2.2	Assessing human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Describe process for assessment of HR risks and discloses salient HR issues Not Met: How process applies to supply chain Not Met: Public disclosure of the results of HR assessment Score 2 Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 Not Met: How it involved affected stakeholders in the assessment
B.2.3	Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impact assessments	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Action Plans to mitigate risks Not Met: Description of how global system applies to supply chain Not Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HR issues Score 2 Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 Not Met: Involve stakeholders in decisions about actions
B.2.4	Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: System for tracking or monitor if actions taken are effective Not Met: Lessons learnt from checking system effectiveness Score 2 Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 Not Met: Involve stakeholders in evaluation of actions taken
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	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The company states in its website that 'The Ombudsman is a TE employee and the Office of Ombudsman acts as an independent, impartial, and confidential resource to whom employees, suppliers, investors, customers, and other third parties can communicate questions or address concerns about potential violations of the Guide, TE policies, ethics and compliance, applicable laws or regulations, safety, or other serious concerns. All issues reported are taken seriously and appropriately investigated and resolved. TE encourages all employees to report their concerns, and retaliation is prohibited for reports made in good faith.' [Office of Ombudsman, N/A: te.com] Score 2 • Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages and workers aware: The TE Connectivity hotline is available in sixteen languages, as exposed in the TE Office of Ombudsman. [Office of Ombudsman, N/A: te.com] • Met: Describe how workers in the supply chain have access to grievance mechanism: The company indicates in its Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility that 'You can report concerns of a potential violation of law/regulation/policy via TE Connectivity's confidential reporting channels Concerned and ConcernLINE. Concerned is an online reporting platform while ConcernLINE is a toll-free telephone hotline, and both are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Both the Concerned platform and country specific ConcernLINE telephone numbers can be found at concernnet.com.' [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] • 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	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company states 'The Ombudsman is a TE employee and the Office of Ombudsman acts as an independent, impartial, and confidential resource to whom employees, suppliers, investors, customers, and other third parties can communicate questions or address concerns about potential violations of the Guide, TE policies, ethics and compliance, applicable laws or regulations, safety, or other serious concerns. All issues reported are taken seriously and appropriately investigated and resolved. TE encourages all employees to report their concerns, and retaliation is prohibited for reports made in good faith'. [Office of Ombudsman, N/A: te.com] & [Global Policy Reporting and Investigating Miscoduct, 25/01/2019: te.com] Score 2 • Met: Describes accessibility and local languages and stakeholder awareness: The company states 'Each TE location is responsible for promoting the ConcernLINE and ConcernNET reporting resources, through the posting of materials provided by the Office of Ombudsman, which may include posters, digital signage and other awareness materials. Physical posters should be dispersed throughout the site in locations that are conspicuous and regularly visited by employees (canteens, manufacturing floors, breakrooms, employee entrances/exits, etc.). To the extent possible, posters and other awareness materials, will be made available upon request in most local languages and in English.' The ConcernLINE and ConcernNET services are available in multiple languages and let users select the geographic area. [Global Policy Reporting and Investigating Miscoduct, 25/01/2019: te.com] & [Office of Ombudsman, N/A: te.com] • Met: Communities access mechanism direct or through suppliers: The company indicates that 'The TE Office of Ombudsman is an independent, impartial, and confidential resource to whom employees, suppliers, investors, customers, and other third parties can report concerns of potential
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mec hanism(s)	0	Not Met: Expect supplier to convey expectation to their own suppliers 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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 Not Met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Company has a non- retaliation policy, which states that an employee who, in good faith, seeks advice, raises a concern or reports misconduct is following its Guide of Ethical Conduct and doing the right thing. It takes claims of retaliation seriously. However, no evidence found of this commitment being extended to external stakeholders. [Guide to Ethical Conduct, 2020: te.com] & [Global Policy Reporting and Investigating Miscoduct, 25/01/2019: te.com] Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: Allegations of retaliation will be investigated, and any retaliatory acts against individuals who report suspected misconduct will be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination. The Company also states that its 24-hours reporting hotline and website guarantee reporters' anonymity. [Guide to Ethical Conduct, 2020: te.com] & [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 2018: te.com] 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: The Company states that 'In fiscal year 2019, the Office of Ombudsman received approximately 1,000 cases. Of cases closed during fiscal year 2019, approximately 46 percent were substantiated, and appropriate actions were taken to address those matters. Of the unsubstantiated allegations, approximately 19 percent led to additional corrective actions even though unsubstantiated, enabling TE to change a business process, rectify an inefficiency or clarify a policy'. However, it is not clear how many of them addressed human rights issues. [Office of Ombudsman, N/A: te.com] & [2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.com] 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)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.1.a	Living wage (in		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	own production		Score 1
	or		Not Met: Pays living wage or sets target date
	manufacturing	0	Not Met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2
	operations)		Not Met: Paying living wage
			Not Met: Definition of living wage reviewed with unions
D.4.1.b	Living wage (in		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	the supply		Score 1
	chain)		Not Met: Discloses living wage requirements in supplier code or contracts
		0	Not Met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers
			Score 2
			Not Met: Assessment of number affected by payment below living wage
D.4.2	Aligning		Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
D.4.2	Aligning		Score 1
	purchasing decisions with		Not Met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs (purchasing practices): The
			company indicates in its Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility that 'As our
	human rights		supplier, you are required to exercise due diligence to ensure that proper
			import/export related policies, procedures and controls are adopted within your
			organization. Failure to do so could expose TE, along with our customers and
			suppliers, to increased scrutiny from government agencies and associated negative
		0	publicity. TE's ability to conduct business on a global basis must not be
			jeopardized.' However, not clear how the company avoids putting HR pressure on suppliers [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com]
			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.4.3	Mapping and		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)
		0	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.4.4.a	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	child labour:		Score 1
	Age verification		• Met: Does not use child labour: The Company states that it forbids child labour at its facilities. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com]
	and corrective	0.5	Not Met: Age verification of workers recruited
	actions (in own		Score 2
	production or		Not Met: Remediation if children identified
	manufacturing		
D 4 4 1	operations)		The individual elements of the comment of the comme
D.4.4.b	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1
	child labour:		Not Met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts
	Age verification	0	Not Met: How working with suppliers on child labour
	and corrective		Score 2
	actions (in the		Not Met: Assessement of number affected by child labour in supply chain
	supply chain)		Not Met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.5.a	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	forced labour:		Score 1
	Recruitment		Not Met: Job seekers and workers do not pay recruitment fee: Although the company indicates that 'All employment will be voluntary, and workers should be
	fees and costs		free to leave upon reasonable notice. Workers shall not be required to surrender
	(in own	_	government-issued identification, passports or work permits as a condition of
	production or	0	employment,' we found no information regarding recruitment fees. [Slavery and
	manufacturing		Human Trafficking Statement, 2018: te.com
	operations)		Not Met: Commits to fully reimbursing if they have paid
			Score 2
			Not Met: How practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour
	<u> </u>		brokers or recruiters

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.5.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 Score 2
	(in the supply		Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by payment of recruitment fees
	chain)		Not Met: Analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.5.c	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	forced labour:		Score 1
	Wage practices		• Met: Pays workers in full and on time: The Company states that the basis on
	(in own		which workers are being paid is to be provided in a timely manner via pay stub or
	production or		similar documentation. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com] • Met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions: The Company states that the basis
	manufacturing	1	on which workers are being paid is to be provided in a timely manner via pay stub
	operations)		or similar documentation. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019:
			te.com]
			Score 2
			Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or
	5 111111		recruiters
D.4.5.d	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1
	forced labour:		• Not Met: Requirement for suppliers to pay workers in full and on time in codes or
	Wage practices		contracts
	(in the supply chain)	0	Not Met: How working with supply chain to pay workers regularly and on time
	Chain)		Score 2
			Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by failure to pay directly
5.4.5	5 11111		Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.4.5.e	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1
	forced labour:		Not Met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement
	Restrictions on		Score 2
	workers (in	0	Not Met: How these practices are monitored for agencies, labour brokers or
	own production or		recruiters
	manufacturing		
	operations)		
D.4.5.f	Prohibition of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	forced labour:		Score 1
	Restrictions on		• Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The company indicates that 'All
	workers (in the		employment will be voluntary, and workers should be free to leave upon
	supply chain)		reasonable notice. Workers shall not be required to surrender government-issued identification, passports or work permits as a condition of employment, except for
			the purpose of legal status verification, in which case the documents must be
		0.5	promptly returned to the worker.' [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility,
			08/2019: <u>te.com</u>]
			Not Met: How working with suppliers on free movement
			Score 2
			Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by retaining docs or restricting
			 movement Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.4.6.a	Freedom of		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
2	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 • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
	manufacturing		Hot met meet both regulients under score 1
	operations)		
D.4.6.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: The company states 'suppliers The company states 'suppliers' associate freely, to icin or not icin labor.
	bargaining (in		must respect the rights of workers to associate freely, to join or not join labor unions, to seek representation, and to join workers' councils in accordance with
	the supply		local laws. Workers shall be able to communicate openly with management
	chain)		regarding working conditions without fear of reprisal, intimidation or harassment.'
			However, there is no information about collective bargaining commitment. [Guide
			to Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: <u>te.com</u>]

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	
			Not Met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB
			Score 2
			Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by restrictions to FoA and CB in the SP
			Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating progress
D.4.7.a	Health and		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	safety:		Score 1
	Fatalities, lost		Not Met: Describes process to identify H&S risks and impacts
	days, injury,		Met: Injury Rate or Lost days or Near Miss disclosures for last reporting period: The company reported a 0.14 LTRIR per 100 employee [Corporate Responsibility]
	occupational		Report 2021, 2022: te.com
	disease rates		Met: Discloses Fatalities for last reporting period: The company discloses that it
	(in own		had no fatalities in the 2021 reporting period. [Corporate Responsibility Report
	production of	0.5	2021, 2022: te.com
	manufacturing operations)		Not Met: Occupational disease rate for last reporting period: The company indicates that 'We currently keep track of injury type, occupational diseases and
	operations)		lost days internally but we only report an aggregate statistic of TRIR externally. We
			do not track absenteeism.' No further information found [2019 Corporate
			Responsibility Report, 07/2020: <u>te.com</u>]
			Score 2
			Not Met: Set targets for H&S performance Not Met: Met targets or explain why not or what is doing to improve
			management systems
D.4.7.b	Health and		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	safety:		Score 1
	Fatalities, lost		Met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements: The Company states several requirements to its suppliers in order to provide a safe working environment. It
	days, injury,		includes: occupational safety, emergency preparedness, occupational injury and
	occupational		illness reporting and investigation, industrial hygiene, physically demanding work,
	disease rates		machine safeguarding, dormitory and canteen. [Guide to Supplier Social
	(in the supply chain)	0.5	Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com
	Citatily		Not Met: Injury rate disclosures and lost days (or near miss disclosures) for the last reporting period
			Not Met: Fatalities disclosures for lasting reporting period
			Not Met: Occupational disease rates for the last reporting period
			Score 2
			 Not Met: How working with suppliers on H&S Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by H&S issues in the SP
			Not Met: Assessment of the number affected by flad issues in the SF Not Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
D.4.8.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: Although the
	manufacturing		Company states that to 'For us, an acceptable standard of human rights means freely chosen employment that provides employees with freedom of association,
	operations)		equal opportunities, clean and safe working environments, protection from any
			form of harassment' and prohibits 'any form of physical punishment or abuse', no
		0	indication found of a process to stop harassment, violence and intimidation against
			women. [2019 Corporate Responsibility Report, 07/2020: te.com] • Not Met: Working conditions take account of gender
			Not Met: Measures and steps to address gender pay gap at all levels of
			employment
			Score 2
			Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1 Not Met: Resuide analysis of translation also in a part of translation
D 4 8 h	Women's rights		Not Met: Provides analysis of trends demonstrating closing gender pay gap The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
D.4.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	Score 1
			Not Met: Women's rights in codes or contracts
			Not Met: How working with suppliers on women's rights
			Score 2
			Not Met: Assessment on the number affected by discrimination or unsafe working conditions
			Not Met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made
	I.	1	

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.9.a	Working hours		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	(in own		Score 1
	production or		Not Met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations: The Communication of the property of the
	manufacturing		The Company states: 'Work weeks are not to exceed the maximum allowable hours
	operations)		set by local law. Further, a work week should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be
			allowed at least one day off per seven-day week'. However, no mention to ILO
		0	standards on working hours or standard working hours for regular weeks. [Guide to
			Supplier Social Responsibility, 08/2019: te.com
			Not Met: Assesses ability to comply with its commitments when allocating
			work/targets
			Score 2
			 Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1 Not Met: How it implements and checks this in its operations
D.4.9.b	Working hours		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
0.4.3.0	(in the supply		Score 1
	chain)		Not Met: Working hours in codes or contracts: The Company states that a work
	Chairi		week should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in
			emergency or unusual situations, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off
		0	per seven-day week. However, no evidence found of references to international
			standards, standard weekly hours. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility,
			08/2019: te.com 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.4.10.a	Responsible		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	mineral		Score 1
	sourcing:		Met: Due diligence in accordance with OECD Guidance in supplier contracts: The
	Arrangements		Company states that it expects that its suppliers have due diligence processes in place to identify the source of the Conflict Minerals contained in their products,
	with suppliers		and that those sources do not support conflict and violations of human rights. The
	and		Company also states 'We work to implement contracts with those direct suppliers
	smelters/refine		to impose contract terms that compel these suppliers to support our due diligence
	rs in the	0.5	efforts with respect to 3TG content. []Our due diligence measures have been
	mineral		designed to conform, in all material respects, with the five-step framework of the
	resource supply		OECD Due Diligence Guidance as applicable to downstream companies such as TE'.
	chains		[Conflict Minerals Report 2020, 29/05/2020: d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net] &
			[Conflict Minerals Report 2020, 29/05/2020: d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net] • Not Met: Works with smelters/refiners and suppliers to build capacity
			Score 2
			Not Met: Contractual requirement to disclosure smelter/refiner information
			Not Met: Contractual requirement covers all minerals
D.4.10.b	Responsible		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	mineral		Score 1
	sourcing: Risk identification	0	Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance: The
			Company states that 'We survey direct suppliers of components or raw materials
	and responses		that were at risk for containing 3TG that were "necessary to the functionality or production" of our products described above. Unlike past years, where TE relied on
	in mineral supply chain		our internally developed system to survey suppliers, for 2019 TE relied on our TPCS
			to lead our supplier survey. For 2019, approximately 313 commodity codes and
			173,225 associated TE products required RCOI survey activity due to their risk
			profiles. For HCC, approximately, 2,466 products were subject to RCOI survey, and
			HCC's supplier response rate was 80.8% for the parts surveyed.' However, no
			further details found on risk identification, including risks identified [Conflict
			Minerals Report 2020, 29/05/2020: d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net] • Not Met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD Guidance: The Company
			indicates that 'our 2019 supplier survey campaign requested that the identified
			suppliers provide information to us regarding 3TG and SOORs using the Conflict
			Minerals Reporting Template [] As in past years some supplier responses
			continued to note that the source of the conflict minerals could not be ascertained
			at the time of the supplier's response. [] As to country of origin, TE relies on third-
			party assessments and information available from such sources as RMI RMAP and
			the London Bullion Market Association, as well as our assessment of our supplier
			responses, and has concluded that, TE, at this time, does not have sufficient information to conclusively determine the countries of origin of the 3TG in all of
			our products. [Conflict Minerals Report 2020, 29/05/2020:
			d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net]
<u> </u>	1	İ	

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2
			• Not Met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD Guidance: The
			Company states 'We do not typically have a direct relationship with 3TG smelters
			and refiners and therefore do not perform or direct audits of these entities. We
			support SOR audits conducted by independent third parties through our
			participation in the RMI's RMAP, and have obtained the RMI list of "RMAP
			Conformant" smelters and refineries. We continue to examine how best to
			introduce our own supplier audit process, to be managed in tandem with our third-
			party conducted supplier social responsibility audits, based on certain risk criteria
			(i.e. stated 'conflict free' supplier, or products originally deemed high risk but
			responded as "out of scope" on a supplier response). Although the Company
			discloses a list, it is not clear which are validated/conformant. [Conflict Minerals
			Report 2020, 29/05/2020: d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net]
			Not Met: Risk identification and disclosure covers all minerals
D.4.10.c	Reporting on		The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
	responsible		Score 1
	sourcing of		Met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain: The Company
	minerals		states that 'our management system includes an executive steering committee
	Illinerais		overseen by the Global Supply Chain Counsel, and a team of subject matter experts
			from functions such as supplier management, engineering, finance and law'. 'We
			intend to take the following steps as continuous improvement measures to our due
			diligence to be conducted in 2020, to further mitigate the risk that any necessary
			3TG in our products finance or benefit armed groups in any of the Covered
			Countries: Adapt our processes to accommodate the RMI's new CMRT 6.0; Work
			directly with suppliers to improve overall supplier response rate; Engage any
			suppliers if found to be providing us with components or materials containing 3TG
			from sources that finance or benefit armed groups in the Covered Countries [] to
			establish an alternative source of 3TG that does not support the activities of any
		0.5	such group; Conduct independent third-party audits of select high risk suppliers to
			validate their compliance with the requirements of TE's Conflict Minerals Program;
			Help and provide tools (by way of our third-party compliance solution provider) to
			those who want to build supply chain transparency via their own programs; [] TE
			plans to continue its ad-hoc survey of parts containing intentionally added cobalt to
			help assess the extent of and ability to conduct cobalt due diligence to help meet
			anticipated customer requests'. [Conflict Minerals Report 2020, 29/05/2020:
			d18rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net]
			Not Met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation
			over time
			Not Met: Disclose better risk prevention/mitigation over time
			Score 2
			Not Met: Suppliers and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy
			Not Met: Risk management and response processes cover all minerals

E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score
	allegation No 1		of 7.10 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D has been applied to produce a score
			of 1.77 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