**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark**

**2023 Company Scorecard**

**Company name**: PVH  
**Sector**: Apparel (supply chain only)  
**Overall score**: 12.9 out of 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme score</th>
<th>Out of</th>
<th>For theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. Governance and Policy Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Policy Commitments (10% of Total)

##### A.1 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.1          | Commitment to respect human rights | 1 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Met: General HRs commitment: The Corp. Statement on Human Rights indicates: 'We respect and uphold human rights wherever we operate'. [Corp. Statement on Human Rights, N/A: pvh.com]  
  Score 2  
  • Not Met: Commitment to UNGPs: The code A Shared Commitment indicates: 'PVH Corp. is committed to respecting human rights, and supports the ten principles of the UN Global Compact and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights'. However, 'support' is not considered a formal statement of commitment towards the UNGPs according to CHRB wording criteria. A similar statement is placed in the Statement on Human Rights. [A Shared Commitment, N/A: pvh.com] & [Corp. Statement on Human Rights, N/A: pvh.com]  
  • Not Met: Commitment to OECD MNE Guidelines |
| 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  
  • Not Met: Commitment to ILO core principles  
  • Not Met: Explicitly lists all four ILO core principles: The Statement of Corporate Responsibility indicates: 'We will not discriminate [...]'; We will never employ children in our facilities, nor will we do business with any company that makes use of child labor [...]'. The Corp. Statement on Human Rights states: ‘Our longstanding pledge to support workers’ rights, including through the elimination of forced labor, is captured in our "A Shared Commitment" code of conduct, which requires our business partners to ‘comply with International Labor Organization Standards’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.2.b        | Commitment to respect the human rights of workers: Health and safety and working hours | 0.5  | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
- **Met:** Commitment to respect H&S of workers: The Code of Business Conduct and Ethics indicates: ‘Each officer, director and associate has responsibility for maintaining a safe and healthy workplace for all officers, directors and associates by following safety and health rules and practices and reporting accidents, injuries and unsafe equipment, practices or conditions’. [Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, 01/09/2018: pvh.com]  
- **Not Met:** Commitment to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week  
Score 2  
- **Met:** Expects suppliers to commit to H&S of workers: The code A Shared Commitment indicates: ‘Our business partners must provide a safe and healthy workplace designed and maintained to prevent accidents, illness and injury attributable to the work performed or the operation of the facility and machinery. In doing so, our business partners must comply with all national laws, regulations and best practices concerning health and safety in the workplace, as well as provide all required and appropriate workers compensation coverage in the event of injury or fatality’. [A Shared Commitment, N/A: pvh.com]  
- **Met:** Expects suppliers to commit to ILO working hours standards or 48 hour regular work week: The supplier code A Shared Commitment indicates: ‘Our business partners are prohibited from requiring their employees to work more than the regular and overtime hours permitted under the law of the country where they are employed. In no circumstance may regular hours exceed 48 hours in a week and, other than in exceptional circumstances, the sum of regular and overtime hours in a week cannot exceed 60 hours. Employees must have at least 24 consecutive hours of rest in every seven–day period. Our business partners are not permitted to request overtime on a regular basis. All overtime must be consensual and compensated at a premium rate’. [A Shared Commitment, N/A: pvh.com] |
| A.1.3.AP       | Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the sector – vulnerable groups (AP) | 0    | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
- **Not Met:** Commitment to women’s rights: The 2021 Corporate Responsibility Report discloses its progress on gender issues: ‘Participated in the UN Global Compact Target Gender Equality Initiative, which focuses on gender parity in leadership and improving corporate performance against the UN Women’s Empowerment Principles, and implemented the program in Canada and the Netherlands’. The WEP is considered a proxy for respecting women’s rights. However, it is not clear it is committed to it. [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]  
- **Not Met:** Commitment to children’s rights  
- **Not Met:** Commitment to migrant worker’s rights  
- **Not Met:** Expects suppliers to respect these rights: The Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines indicates: ‘We require that our business partners respect and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promote women’s rights to health, education and work. Our approach aligns with the expectations outlined in the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and the International Labour Organization’s Violence and Harassment Convention (C190). However, evidence was found in a supplier guideline, only policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com] Score 2 • Not Met: Commitment refers to CEDAW/Women’s Empowerment Principles • Not Met: Commitment refers to Child Rights Convention/Business Principles • Not Met: Commitment refers to Convention on migrant workers • Not Met: Expects suppliers to respect these rights: The Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines indicates: ‘We require that our business partners respect and promote women’s rights to health, education and work. Our approach aligns with the expectations outlined in the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and the International Labour Organization’s Violence and Harassment Convention (C190)’. However, evidence was found in a supplier guideline, only policy commitments are considered a suitable source for this indicator under CHRB revised approach. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.4 Commitment to remedy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Met: Commitment to remedy adverse HRs impacts: The document Our Approach to CR and Human Rights indicates: ‘We are committed to remedying the adverse impacts which we may have caused or contributed to’. [Our Approach to CR and HR, N/A: pvh.com] • Not Met: Expects suppliers to make this commitment: The Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines discloses broad information on remediation. However, no evidence found that it expects its suppliers to commit it to remedy the adverse impacts on individuals and workers and communities that it has caused or contributed to. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com] Score 2 • Not Met: Commitment to collaborate with judicial or non-judicial mechanisms • Not Met: Commitment to work with suppliers on remedy: The document Our Approach to CR and Human Rights indicates: ‘We are dedicated to supporting our suppliers’ continuous improvement. Our CR program includes remediation and capability building services focused on long-term solutions, created through dialogue and cooperation between management and workers’. However, ‘dedicated to supporting’ is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Our Approach to CR and HR, N/A: pvh.com]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.5 Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Zero tolerance of threats/attacks on HRDs • Not Met: Expects suppliers to make this commitment Score 2 • Not Met: Commitment to working with HRDs to create safe and enabling environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.2 Board Level Accountability (5% of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2.1 Commitment from the top</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Board level responsibility for HRs: The Company states that its Board of Directors has a Corporate Responsibility (CR) Committee that provides support and guidance with respect to CR policies and strategies. However, no further evidence showed that the Company has a board member of committee tasked with specific governance oversight of respect for human rights. [Approach to Corporate Responsibility and Human Rights, 2020: responsibility.pvh.com] • Not Met: Describes HRs expertise of Board member Score 2 • Not Met: Board member/CEO signal importance of HRs in their communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.2 Board responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Process to review HRs strategy at board level • Not Met: Example of HRs issues/trends discussed in last reporting period Score 2 • Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A.2.3 Incentives and performance management

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:

- **Score 1**
  - Not Met: At least one board member incentive linked to HRs commitments
  - Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S
  - Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public
  - Not Met: Review of other board incentives for coherence with HRs policies

- **Score 2**
  - Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public
  - Not Met: Review of other senior management incentives for coherence with HRs policies

### A.2.4 Business model strategy and risks

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:

- **Score 1**
  - Not Met: Board process to review business model and strategy for HRs risks
  - Not Met: Describes frequency and triggers for reviewing business model

- **Score 2**
  - Not Met: Meets both requirements under score 1
  - Not Met: Example of actions resulting from reviews

---

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

#### B.1.1 Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions

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 HRs implementation and decision making
  - Not Met: Describes day-to-day responsibility for implementing HRs commitments
  - Not Met: Day-to-day resources and expertise allocation in own operations

- **Score 2**
  - Not Met: Risk assessment by Audit Committee or independent third party

#### B.1.2 Incentives and performance management

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:

- **Score 1**
  - Not Met: Senior manager incentives linked to HRs commitments
  - Not Met: Incentive scheme linked to key HRs risks beyond employee H&S

- **Score 2**
  - Not Met: Performance criteria linked to HRs made public
  - Not Met: Review of other senior management incentives for coherence with HRs policies

#### B.1.3 Integration with enterprise risk management

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:

- **Score 1**
  - Not Met: HRs risks integrated as part of enterprise risk system: The Company states that: 'The Board of Directors oversees the management of risks related to the operation of our business. As part of its oversight, the Board receives periodic reports from members of senior management on various aspects of risk, including our enterprise risk management program, business continuity planning and cybersecurity.' The Company also states that in 2021, it piloted the Sustainable Business Risk Assessment process. Following the assessment, the Company identified salient issues including human rights risks. However, there is not explicit description of how human rights risks is integrated into its enterprise risk management system. [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]
  - Not Met: Provides an example

- **Score 2**
  - Not Met: Risk assessment by Audit Committee or independent third party

#### B.1.4.a Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to workers and external stakeholders

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:

- **Score 1**
  - Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to all workers in own operations

- **Score 2**
  - Not Met: Communicates HRs policies to stakeholders
  - Not Met: Example of how HRs policies are accessible for intended audience

#### B.1.4.b Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:

- **Score 1**
  - Met: Meets ILO requirement for suppliers on A.1.2.a
  - Not Met: Requires suppliers to communicate HRs policies

- **Score 2**
  - Not Met: Describes steps to communicate HRs policies to supply chain
  - Not Met: Requires suppliers to communicate HRs policies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Met: Describes how HRs policies are contractual/binding for suppliers: The Company states that: ‘All prospective (new) factories must go through a CR authorization process as outlined below and receive a written PVH CR Assessment Notification indicating that the factory is approved prior to the placement of production in their facilities, including the manufacturing of samples and test orders.’ However, no evidence found how the Company human rights commitments are reflected in the contracts or other binding arrangements. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a  
  - Not Met: Describes how workers are trained on HRs policy commitments: The Company states: ‘We regularly post stories on our internal intranet, and we conduct classes and trainings through PVH U, our internal education platform.’ However, no details of training was found. [Approach to Corporate Responsibility and Human Rights, 2020: responsibility.pvh.com]  
  - Not Met: Trains relevant managers including procurement on HRs |
| B.1.6          | Monitoring and corrective actions | 0.5             | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
- Score 1  
  - Not Met: Score of at least 1 on A.1.2.a  
  - Not Met: Monitors implementation of HRs policy commitments across global ops and supply chain: The Company states that ‘we require human rights and environmental impact assessments during supplier onboarding and throughout the production life cycle.’ The Company reports that in 2021, 100% of suppliers were subject to social audits and 94% of suppliers met or exceeded its Code of Conduct standards. However, no evidence found the Company has a procedure to monitor the implementation of its human rights policy across its own operations. [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]  
  - Met: Discloses % of supply chain monitored: The Company reports that in 2021, 100% of suppliers were subject to social audits and 94% of suppliers met or exceeded its Code of Conduct standards. [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]  
  - Not Met: Describes how workers are involved in monitoring  
  - Not Met: Score of 2 on A.1.2.a  
  - Not Met: Describes corrective actions process: The Company states that ‘After an assessment, any discovered non-compliances will result in creation of a corrective action plan (CAP) with draft findings of non-compliance issues. The final corrective action plan (CAP) (with detailed root cause evaluation, timelines for completion, responsible parties, etc.) should be developed by the factory and provided to PVH CR or PVH’s partner Elevate within 14 calendar day and within 30 calendar days for licensees, unless otherwise specified after the assessment.’ However, the CAP is for supply chains. No evidence found the Company has CAP for its own operations. [CR Supplier Guidelines, 01/2020: responsibility.pvh.com]  
  - Not Met: Discloses findings and number of correction action processes |
### B.1.7 Engaging and terminating business relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.1.7          | 1               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Met: HRs performance affects selection suppliers: The Company states that ‘All prospective (new) factories must go through a PVH CR authorization process as outlined below and receive a written PVH CR Assessment Notification indicating that the factory is approved prior to the placement of production in their facilities, including the manufacturing of samples and test orders.’ The authorization process includes: New Factory Set-up, Assessment Planning and Preparation, Conducting Assessments, Post-Assessment, and remediation and Capability Building. The Company also reports that ‘Factories receiving a Red or White rating will receive a PVH CR Assessment Notification stating that they are not authorized for production and will not be eligible for reconsideration for a minimum duration noted in the Assessment Notification.’ [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Met: HRs performance affects continuation supplier relationships: The Company states that ‘Sustainable Business Risk Assessment (SBRA) process is conducted on an annual basis or when major business decisions or changes are anticipated. In addition, PVH conducts pre-sourcing assessments at all Level 1 factories before they are allowed to produce any products for us. We also conduct pre-sourcing assessments at certain key Level 2 factories. In addition, we conduct regular audits at all Level 1 and key Level 2 factories once production begins, work closely with factories to remediate any identified deficiencies and, when necessary, terminate supplier factories that fail to comply with our policies, procedures or guidelines.’ [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]  

| B.1.8          | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not Met: Describes how workers and communities identified and engaged in the last two years  
• Not Met: Discloses stakeholders whose HRs may be affected  
• Not Met: Provides two examples of engagement with stakeholders  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.2 Human Rights Due Diligence (15% of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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: Describes process of identifying risks in own operations  
• Not Met: Describes process for identifying risks in business relationships  

| B.2.2          | Assessing human rights risks and impacts | 1               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not Met: Describes assessment process and discloses salient HRs risks: The Company states that it ‘piloted the Sustainable Business Risk Assessment (SBRA) process, which assesses the actual and potential adverse impacts of PVH’s business on rights holders and the environment. Our SBRA analytical framework covers both PVH’s owned and operated facilities, as well as the supply chain from raw materials to finished products.’ The Company reports 2021 SBRA Salient Issues for human rights include wages & severance, freedom of association & collective bargaining, gender-based violence & harassment. However, no further details found on the SBRA process. [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes how process applies to supply chain  
• Met: Public disclosure of results of HRs risk assessment: The Company notes that ‘human rights risks most critical are: Expanding the application of PVH’s social and environmental standards to the manufacturing of all products and materials; Improving working environments through worker engagement and representation; Ensuring safe and healthy workplaces for all workers in our supply chain; Creating the conditions for national living wage agreements through industry-wide collective bargaining linked to our purchasing practices; Partnering with suppliers to ensure ethical recruitment practices for migrant workers; Removing barriers to
advancement and create pathways to opportunity and choice for women in our
supply chain; Creating an inclusive environment where every individual is valued;
Developing a talented and skilled workforce that embodies PVH's values and an
entrepreneurial spirit, while empowering associates to design their future;
Supporting the needs of women and children around the world by creating safe
spaces, improving access to education and enhancing quality of life.'

[Our Approach to CR and HR, N/A: pvh.com]
Score 2
• Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1
• Not Met: Describes how assessment involved affected stakeholders

B.2.3 Integrating and acting on human rights risks and impact assessments

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
Score 1
• Not Met: Describes system to prevent, mitigate and remediate HRs issues
• Not Met: Describes how global system applies to supply chain: The Company
states that 'after an assessment, any discovered non-compliances will result in
creation of a corrective action plan (CAP) with draft findings of non-compliance
issues. The final corrective action plan (CAP) (with detailed root cause evaluation,
timelines for completion, responsible parties, etc.) should be developed by the
factory and provided to PVH CR or PVH's partner Elevate within 14 calendar day
and within 30 calendar days for licensees, unless otherwise specified after the
assessment. Licensee/vendors should be responsible to review and manage
factories CAP as well as work to ensure improvements are implemented and
progress before next social/environmental assessment. Suppliers are expected to
make progress in correction of all identified issues, with priority given to address
the most serious issues first'. However, this indicator looks for evidence of how the
Company takes proactive action plans to prevent, mitigate or remediate what it
considers to be its salient issues rather than conducting individual corrective action
plans once a non-compliance is found. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines,
07/2022: pvh.com]
• Not Met: Example of actions decided on at least 1 salient HRs issue
Score 2
• Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1
• Not Met: Describes how stakeholders involved in decisions about actions taken

B.2.4 Tracking the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
Score 1
• Not Met: Describes system for evaluation effectiveness of actions
• Not Met: Example of lessons learned from evaluation effectiveness of actions
Score 2
• Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1
• Not Met: Involves stakeholders in evaluation effectiveness of actions

B.2.5 Communicating on human rights impacts

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: Describes challenges to effective comms and how it is working to
address them

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (20% of Total)

C.1 Grievance mechanism(s) for workers

The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
Score 1
• Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all workers: The Company states that
'Tell PVH, our global reporting hotline, is another way we ensure worker voices and
concerns are heard. Tell PVH is available to all global PVH associates and workers in
our supply chain.' [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]
Score 2
• Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and workers
made aware: The Company indicates that it is possible to make reports in 15
languages. However, it is not clear how it ensures all workers are aware of the
mechanism. [Our Approach to CR and HR, N/A: pvh.com]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C.2            | Grievance mechanism(s) for external individuals and communities | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  - Not Met: Grievance mechanism accessible to all external individuals and communities: The Company states that ‘Because of our commitment to engage with NGOs as a key stakeholder, we receive and respond to inquiries from NGOs engaging with our sourcing communities.’ However, it is not clear if external individuals also have the opportunity to raise concerns or how communities that are not engaged with NGOs can report grievances. [Our Approach to CR and HR, N/A: pvh.com]  
  Score 2  
  - Not Met: Grievance mechanism available in appropriate languages and affected stakeholders made aware  
  - Not Met: Describes how external individuals/communities access grievance mechanism  
  - Not Met: Expects supplier to convey expectation to their suppliers |
| C.3            | Users are involved in the design and performance of the mechanism(s) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  - Not Met: Describes how users engaged on design and performance  
  - Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on design and performance  
  Score 2  
  - Not Met: Describes how users engaged on improvement of mechanism  
  - Not Met: Provides user engagement examples (at least two) on improvement |
| C.4            | Procedures related to the mechanism(s) are equitable, publicly available and explained | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  - Not Met: Describes procedure and timescales for managing complaints or concerns  
  - Not Met: Describes technical, financial, advisory support to enable equal access  
  Score 2  
  - Not Met: Describe types of outcome to complainant through use of mechanism  
  - Not Met: Describes escalation to senior levels / independent adjudicators |
| 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 against workers/stakeholders: The Company states that ‘retaliation of any kind against employees who provided information in good faith during an assessment or through Tell PVH, as well as part of an investigation, is strictly prohibited.’ However, it is not clear whether its non-retaliation policy also applies for external stakeholders. [Our Approach to CR and HR, N/A: pvh.com]  
  Score 2  
  - Not Met: Describes practical measures to prevent retaliation  
  - Not Met: Specifies no legal action, firing or violence  
  - 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 legal rights  
  - Not Met: Does not require confidentiality provisions  
  Score 2  
  - Not Met: Cooperates 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 approach taken to remedy adverse HRs impacts  
  - Not Met: Describes how remedy would be provided if no adverse impact identified |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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: Discloses number of grievances filed, addressed or resolved and outcomes achieved  
• Not Met: Example of how lessons from mechanism improved HRs management system  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Describes process to evaluate mechanism and changes made as a result  
• Not Met: Describes procedures to address delays of outcomes agreed with stakeholders |
| D.2.1.b       | Living wage (in the supply chain) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not Met: Requirements on living wage in supplier codes and contracts: The Company states that ‘Our business partners must pay at least the minimum wage or the appropriate prevailing wages, whichever is higher, comply with all legal requirements on wages, and provide any fringe benefits required by law or contract. If the compensation paid does not meet the workers’ basic needs and provide some discretionary income, our business partners are required to take appropriate actions that seek to progressively realize a level of compensation that does.’ However, it is not clear if this definition of ‘living wages’ takes into consideration the workers’ families or dependents. The Company also reports in its Corporate Responsibility Report that 100% of its key suppliers in two key production countries by 2025 and four by 2030 proactively support industry-wide collective bargaining to achieve living wages. However, it is not clear if this is based on requirements the Company put on the suppliers and what the definition of living wages is that is applied. [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com] & [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes work with suppliers on living wage: The Company states that regarding living wages, it approach ‘centres on three aspects including ‘understanding the compensation and payment systems of all suppliers by conducting factory assessments and providing advisory services, requiring 100% of our suppliers to honour compensation and benefits agreed upon through collective bargaining, and embedding ACT Global Purchasing Practices Commitments across our company to better support our suppliers’ ability to pay workers the agreed-upon living wage in their respective countries, ensuring that living wages are upheld.’ However, it is not clear whether the definition of living wages applied takes into consideration the workers’ families or dependents. [2021 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2022: pvh.com]  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of payment below living wage in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.2.2         | Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not Met: Describes practices to avoid price or short notice requirements that undermine HRs  
• Not Met: Describes practices to pay suppliers in line with agreed timeframes  
• Not Met: Reviews own operations to mitigate negative impact of purchasing practices  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Meets all requirements under score 1  
• Not Met: Example of assessing and changing of purchasing practices |
| D.2.3         | Mapping and disclosing the supply chain | 1 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Met: Identifies direct and indirect suppliers including manufacturing sites: The Company has listed up all finished goods factories directly sourced and its most strategic fabric and trim suppliers. The list includes level 1 and level 2 facilities, total 714 factories. [Factory Disclosure List, 31/12/2021: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes changes to systems, processes and practices to prevent future impacts  
• Not Met: Describes approach to monitoring/implementing agreed remedy  
• Not Met: Describes approach to learning from incidents if no adverse impacts identified |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D.2.4.b        | Prohibition of child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain) | 0.5              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not Met: Requirements on child labour in supplier codes and contracts: The Company states in its Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines that employees of its business partners must be at least 15 years old or over the age required for completion of compulsory education in the country of manufacture, whichever is higher. The Company also lists keys to avoiding unlawful use of child labour. During recruitment process, the Company mentioned ‘check original ID or both certificate for proof of age’ and ‘cross-check with other ID documents to verify age’. The Company also requires ‘remediation when child labour is discovered’, including ‘pay for schooling if worker below legal age for education and continue paying wage during education, factory to provide vocational training if worker is too old for schooling but too young to work – continue paying wage, and comply with law’. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of child labour in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.2.5.b        | Prohibition of forced labour: Recruitment fees and costs (in the supply chain)        | 0.5              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not Met: Requirements on debt/fees in supplier codes and contracts: The Company states that ‘PVH maintains a “no fees” policy and suppliers, factories and facilities are required to ensure that migrant workers are not responsible for paying fees or expenses to secure or maintain employment with a factory or facility at any point during the employment life cycle.’ The Company also indicated that ‘Companies should ensure that employment is freely chosen. Labour brokers or others are monitored to ensure they do not entice workers into compulsory arrangements’. However, no evidence found that requirement covers all workers, going beyond ‘migrant’. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Discloses work with suppliers on eliminating child labour  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of child labour in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress  
• Not Met: Discloses direct or indirect suppliers involved in higher-risk activities |

*Note: pvh.com is a website URL, likely referring to PVH's website.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D.2.5.d        | Prohibition of forced labour: Wage practices (in the supply chain)              | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not Met: Requirements on paying in full and on time in supplier codes and contracts: Regarding worker compensation, the Company has various requirements for its suppliers, including ‘Do pay all wages, including overtime compensation in cash, through check, wire transfer or other secure form of payment.’ However, no evidence found it also has requirements for paying workers directly and on time.  
[Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes work with suppliers on paying workers regularly, in full and on time  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Assessment scope of failure to pay workers in full and on time in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.2.5.f        | Prohibition of forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)    | 0.5              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Met: Requirements on free movement in supplier codes and contracts: The Company requires it suppliers ‘DO Ensure that migrants are free to return their home country during times of annual or personal leave without having to pay a deposit, threat of termination or other type of penalty. DO NOT Restrict freedom of movement within the factory or residences. And DO NOT Maintain ownership, require the handing over of, or withhold access to personal and travel documents at any point during the employment term, except for the purpose of copying documentation for legal purposes upon initial arrival or for legally required government approvals.’  
[Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes work with suppliers on free movement of workers  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of restriction of movement in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.2.6.b        | Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)         | 0.5              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Met: Requirements on FoA/CB in suppliers codes and contracts: The Company states that ‘Our business partners are required to recognize and respect the right of their employees to freedom of association (FOA) and collective bargaining. Employees should be free to form and join organizations of their choice. Employees should not be subjected to punishment, intimidation or harassment due to the exercise of their right to join or to refrain from joining any organization, or due to their union activities.’  
[Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes work with suppliers on FoA/CB  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of restriction of FoA/CB in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.2.7.b        | Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury, occupational disease rates (in the supply chain) | 0.5              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Met: Requirements on H&S in supplier codes and contracts: The Company states in its Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines that ‘Our business partners must provide a safe and healthy workplace designed and maintained to prevent accidents, illness and injury attributable to the work performed or the operation of the facility and machinery. In doing so, our business partners must comply with all national laws, regulations and best practices concerning health and safety in the workplace, as well as provide all required and appropriate workers compensation coverage in the event of injury or fatality.’  
[Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Discloses injury rate or lost days in supply chain in last reporting period  
• Not Met: Discloses fatalities for workers in supply chain in last reporting period  
• Not Met: Discloses occupational disease rate in supply chain in last reporting period  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Describes work with suppliers of H&S  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of H&S issues in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D.2.8.b        | Women's rights (in the supply chain) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not Met: Requirements on women's rights in contracts/codes with suppliers: The Company requires its suppliers 'DO have recruitment and employment policies and practices that are free from any type of discriminatory bias, for example questions about race, marital status, or political memberships.', 'DO pay men and women workers equally for equal work.' 'DO NOT require women to provide commitments (verbally or in writing) that they will not become pregnant within a certain period.' However, no information was found regarding eliminating health and safety concerns that are particularly prevalent among women workers. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes work with suppliers on women's rights Score 2  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of unsafe working conditions/discrimination against women in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.2.9.b        | Working hours (in the supply chain) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not Met: Requirements on working hours in codes/contracts with suppliers: The Company states in its Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines that 'Our business partners are prohibited from requiring their employees to work more than the regular and overtime hours permitted under the law of the country where they are employed. In no circumstance may regular hours exceed 48 hours in a week and, other than in exceptional circumstances, the sum of regular and overtime hours in a week cannot exceed 60 hours. Employees must have at least 24 consecutive hours of rest in every seven-day period.' The Company also requires its suppliers 'DO provide reasonable meals, beverage, rest breaks, transportation, and other benefits to workers for normal or overtime work hours, which, at a minimum, must comply with local laws.' However, the requirements regarding overtime are not in line with international standards. [Supply Chain Standards and Guidelines, 07/2022: pvh.com]  
• Not Met: Describes work with suppliers on working hours Score 2  
• Not Met: Assessment of scope of excessive working hours in supply chain  
• Not Met: Analysis of trends demonstrating progress |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E(1).0         | Serious allegation No 1 | | • Area: Forced Labour, Discrimination  
• Headline: PVH’s supplier blacklisted by U.S. Department of Commerce for implication in Uighur Muslim human rights abuses  
• Story: On July 20, 2020, Changji Esquel Textile, a supplier of Tommy Hilfiger, a PVH brand, was one of the eleven companies blacklisted by the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Industry and Security over alleged human rights abuses involving Uighur Muslims in China.  

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Changji Esquel Textile was named on the list "in connection with the forced labour of Uighurs and other Muslim minority groups in western China". Companies on the list must apply for special licenses to access U.S. technologies.  

Previously, in March, 2020, a report by the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) revealed that thousands of Uighurs have been transferred to work in factories across China, under conditions the ASPI report said “strongly suggest forced labour” and linked those factories to more than 80 high-profile brands, including Tommy Hilfiger.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E(1).1         | The company has responded publicly to the allegation                           | 2                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
• Met: Public response: In a response to Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, the PVH Corporation stated: "Our longstanding pledge to support workers’ rights is captured in our “A Shared Commitment” code of conduct, which requires our business partners to comply with International Labor Organization Standards, including the elimination of all forms of forced labor. We monitor our business partners when possible to verify that they adhere to this requirement and require them in all instances to certify on their own that they do. While our suppliers have assured us that no violations exist within their business operations, we take seriously recent reports on the issue”. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 17/03/2020, "PVH Corp. Statement on Xinjiang": media.business-humanrights.org]  
Score 2  
• Met: Detailed response: In a response to Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, the PVH Corporation stated: "Our longstanding pledge to support workers’ rights is captured in our “A Shared Commitment” code of conduct, which requires our business partners to comply with International Labor Organization Standards, including the elimination of all forms of forced labor. We monitor our business partners when possible to verify that they adhere to this requirement and require them in all instances to certify on their own that they do. While our suppliers have assured us that no violations exist within their business operations, we take seriously recent reports on the issue (...) PVH and its affiliated brands are in full support of the views expressed in the Joint Statement issued by these associations”.[Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 17/03/2020: media.business-humanrights.org] |
| E(1).2         | The company has investigated and taken appropriate action                       | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders  
• Not Met: Identified cause: In a response to Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, the PVH Corporation stated: "Our longstanding pledge to support workers’ rights is captured in our “(...)We monitor our business partners when possible to verify that they adhere to this requirement and require them in all instances to certify on their own that they do. While our suppliers have assured us that no violations exist within their business operations, we take seriously recent reports on the issue”. However, the company does not present investigative results on the underlying causes of the events concerned. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 17/03/2020: media.business-humanrights.org]  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements  
• Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken |
| E(1).3         | The company has engaged with affected stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies) | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not Met: Provided remedy  
• Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link: The company stated: "While our suppliers have assured us that no violations exist within their business operations, we take seriously recent reports on the issue". However, this is not sufficient evidence to prove the affected stakeholder did not suffer the alleged impacts/ the company is not linked to the impact as the Company’s statement does not include the indirect supply chain. [Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, 17/03/2020: media.business-humanrights.org]  
Score 2  
• Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders  
• Not Met: Remedy delivered  
• Not Met: Independent remedy process used |
| E(2).0         | Serious allegation No 2                                                         |                  | • Area: Discrimination  
• Headline: PVH among other brands called on to sign an agreement to end gender-based violence in the supply chain  
• Story: On February 11, 2021, Ecotextile News reported that more than 90 organisations from around the world, including worker unions and women’s empowerment groups, have joined India’s Tamil Nadu Textile and Common Labour Union (TTCU) as it called on garment brands to sign a binding agreement to end gender-based violence, after TTCU member was allegedly raped and murdered by her supervisor at H&M’s supplier Natchi Apparels site, owned by Eastman Exports Global, which reportedly also supplies PVH Corp, and Gap. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E(2).1</td>
<td>The Company has responded publicly to the allegation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Public response Score 2 • Not Met: Detailed response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(2).2</td>
<td>The company has investigated and taken appropriate action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Engaged with stakeholders • Not Met: Identified cause Score 2 • Not Met: Identified and implemented improvements • Not Met: Stakeholder input to steps taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(2).3</td>
<td>The company has engaged with affected stakeholders to provide for or cooperate in remedy(ies)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not Met: Provided remedy • Not Met: Evidence for lack of Impact or link Score 2 • Not Met: Remedy satisfactory to stakeholders • Not Met: Remedy delivered • Not Met: Independent remedy process used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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