**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2019 Company Scoresheet**

**Company Name**  
Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd. (Foxconn)

**Industry**  
ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)

**Overall Score (*)**  
17.4 out of 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Score</th>
<th>Out of</th>
<th>For Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. Governance and Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F. Transparency</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 2019 Methodology document. 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)**

<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: In its Code of Conduct Policy, the Company states that it ‘is committed to uphold the human rights of workers, and to treat them with dignity and respect as understood by the international community. This applies to all workers including temporary, migrant, student, contract, direct employees, and any other type of worker.’ [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: UDHR: The Company indicates that ‘The recognized standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) have been used as references in preparing this Code.’ However, to have used a standard as reference is not a commitment to respects the rights set out in the standard. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: International Bill of Rights  
Score 2  
• Not met: UNGPs  
• Not met: OECD |
| A.1.2 | Commitment to respect the human rights of workers | 0.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: ILO Core: The Code of Conduct Policy includes provisions for all ILO core: Non-Discrimination; Child Labor Prohibition and Young Workers Protection; Freedom of association and collective bargaining (IN accordance with local law)  
Foxconn respects the rights of all workers to associate freely, join labor union, bargain collectively, and engage in peaceful assembly as well as respects the right |
<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.1.3.ICT.a</td>
<td>Commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing in conflict areas: In its Code of Conduct, the Company states: ‘Foxconn adheres to international standards and governmental and non-governmental regulations on conflict minerals. Foxconn does not accept, and does not use, conflict minerals in our operations. Foxconn requires suppliers to trace the origin of products potentially containing conflict minerals, including gold (Au), tantalum (Ta), tin (Sn), and tungsten (W), and to provide all relevant information regarding the sources of those minerals to our company.’ In addition, Foxconn’s downstream suppliers are required to fulfill their due diligence on conflict-free minerals pursuant to the relevant international standards and regulations. However, no evidence found of a specific commitment to responsible sourcing of conflict minerals from conflict affected and high risk areas. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: Based on OECD Guidance: See above. It is not clear to which international standards the Company adhered, and whether it includes OECD Guidance. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers: See above. ‘In addition, Foxconn’s downstream suppliers are required to fulfill their due diligence on conflict-free minerals pursuant to the relevant international standards and regulations.’ No evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. In addition, it not clear what ‘exceptional or unusual situations’ would be. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.4          | Commitment to engage with stakeholders | 1                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
* Score 1  
  - Not met: Commit to stakeholder engagement   
  - Met: Regular stakeholder engagement: In its website section 'Stakeholder engagement', the Company discloses a table summarizing its stakeholder engagement activities per group, including communities, suppliers and employees. For each one it discloses communication channels, frequency, topics and issues of interests and 'efforts and outcomes'. [Stakeholder engagement actions, Ap 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
* Score 2  
  - Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design  
  - Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement |

## A.1.5 Commitment to remedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.5          | Commitment to remedy | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
* Score 1  
  - Not met: Commit to remedy  
* Score 2  
  - Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies  
  - Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives  
  - Not met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts |

## A.1.6 Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.6          | 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)  
* Score 2  
  - Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments |

## A.2 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.2.1          | Commitment from the top         | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
* Score 1  
  - Not met: CEO or Board approves policy: The Code of Conduct Policy was approved by the FGSC Chairman and all business groups’ executives. However, the FGSC is not a part of the Board of Directors. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Organization Chart, Apr 2019: foxconn.com]  
  - Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs: In its SER 2017, the Company indicates: ‘In March 2007, Foxconn established the Group’s Global Social and Environmental Responsibility Committee (FGSC). […] Every year, the FGSC conducts evaluations and audits of the various business groups to ensure that the SER policy is integrated across Foxconn’s operations and at every manufacturing facility. However, the FGSC is not a part of the Board of Directors. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
* Score 2  
  - Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO |
| A.2.2          | Board discussions               | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
* Score 1  
  - Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs  
  - Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion  
* Score 2  
  - Not met: Both examples and process |
| A.2.3          | Incentives and performance management | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
* Score 1  
  - Not met: Incentives for at least one board member  
  - Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&S  
* Score 2  
  - Not met: Performance criteria made public |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2.                                                                                              | Score 2  
|                |                                                                                |                  | • Met: Senior responsibility for HR: In its SER Report 2017, the Company indicates:                                                                    |                                                            | [In March 2007, Foxconn established the Group’s Global Social and Environmental Responsibility Committee (FGSC). [...] Every year, the FGSC conducts evaluations and audits of the various business groups to ensure that the SER policy is integrated across Foxconn’s operations and at every manufacturing facility. [...] the committee has established independent and professional bodies and separate SER teams within the business groups to ensure that social and environmental responsibility is fully integrated into the company’s corporate culture and that our SER policy is adhered to, implemented, and monitored by the FGSC. ‘Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
|                |                                                                                |                  | • Met: Day-to-day responsibility: See above. In addition, it states: ‘Foxconn has established a team of more than 1,000 SER professionals to work with customers, government agencies, and the community, to enhance transparency and to implement Foxconn’s SER duties and responsibilities.’ ‘Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
| 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                                                                                                     | Score 2  
| 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                                                                                      | Score 2  
| B.1.4.a        | Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations | 0.5              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:                                                                                       | Score 1  
|                |                                                                                |                  | • Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2                                                                                              | Score 2  
|                |                                                                                |                  | • Met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: In its SER Report 2017, the Company indicates that ‘to ensure 100% coverage of CoC education within the company, CoC education and training is mandatory for all new employees and all employees are required to receive regular training and abide by the CoC.’ ‘Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
| B.1.4.b        | Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships  | 0.5              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:                                                                                       | Score 1  
|                |                                                                                |                  | • Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2                                                                                     | Score 2  

<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>B.1.5</td>
<td>Training on Human Rights</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: In its SER Report 2017, the Company indicates that ‘to ensure 100% coverage of CoC education within the company, CoC education and training is mandatory for all new employees and all employees are required to receive regular training and abide by the CoC.’ [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com &amp; Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: Trains relevant ICT managers including procurement Score 2 • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met: See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.6</td>
<td>Monitoring and corrective actions</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments: In its Code of Conduct the Company indicates: 'The executive of FGSC will monitor adherence to this CoC policy under the guidance of the FGSC Chairman. The SER teams of all business groups are responsible for enunciating and monitoring compliance with this Code, and providing feedback to FGSC regarding local practices contravening the CoC policy. [...] Foxconn internal audits are carried out by using internal professional staff teams or by resorting to external third-party service institutes annually or quarterly as per the Group’s demands. Audits cover the areas of labor, ethics, environment, health and safety, and SER management systems, which are required under the RBA standard.' [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Met: Monitoring ICT suppliers: In addition, it indicates: &quot;Foxconn systematically monitors all aspects of our operations and our supply chain, and conducts supplier audits and training to ensure alignment with sustainability requirements. [...] Foxconn has established a group supplier management platform, which comprises a combination of online supplier management programs and offline audits and supplier engagement sessions. We regularly conduct online checks and training for suppliers, as well as on-site audits to improve and reinforce supplier compliance capabilities as part of our goal to build a green supply chain.[...] To ensure that our suppliers comply with Foxconn’s Supplier SER Code of Conduct, we adopt a risk classification approach and conduct regular on-site audits on any high-risk suppliers.&quot; [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com &amp; Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com] Score 2 • Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2 • Not met: Describes corrective action process: In addition, the Company indicates: 'For those suppliers whose audits showed unsatisfactory progress or who lack willingness to cooperate, we adopted a step-by-step approach to motivate suppliers to make improvements so they can meet our requirements and expectations and those of our customers.' However, no evidence found about the number of incidents found or the corrective action process. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com &amp; Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: Example of corrective action • Not met: Discloses % of ICT supply chain monitored: 'As of the end of 2017, we have completed 505 on-site audits and no major violations by our suppliers were found.' However, there is no information about the proportion of the supply chain that represent the audited suppliers. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com &amp; Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.7</td>
<td>Engaging business relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: HR affects ICT selection of suppliers: In its SER Report 2017, The Company states: 'Foxconn strictly manages our new suppliers according to the company’s supplier verification process. The process takes into account risk assessments, product samplings and supplier audits, with an emphasis on social and environmental responsibility risk assessment, to evaluate the supplier’s production capabilities and commitment towards to the business relationship. This also allows us to build effective long-term relationships with suppliers, contributing to the company’s sustainable operations.' However, there is no further information describing how human rights performance is taken into account. [Social and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Code</td>
<td>Indicator name</td>
<td>Score (out of 2)</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Not met: HR affects on-going ICT supplier relationships: In addition, the Company indicates: 'For those suppliers whose audits showed unsatisfactory progress or who lack willingness to cooperate, we adopted a step-by-step approach to motivate suppliers to make improvements so they can meet our requirements and expectations and those of our customers.' However, it is not clear how the supplier's performance affect the decisions to renew, expand or terminate business relations. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: [ser.foxconn.com](http://ser.foxconn.com) & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: [ser.foxconn.com](http://ser.foxconn.com)]

Score 2
- Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met
- Not met: Working with ICT suppliers to improve performance: See above. However, CHRB could not find an example of how the Company works with its suppliers to improve their human rights performance.

**B.1.8 Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders**

<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>Indicator name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Score 1
- Met: Stakeholder process or systems: In its website section 'Stakeholder engagement', the Company indicates that its 'stakeholders are identified based on the AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standards. Members from Foxconn’s SER Committee and other relevant personnel have identified key stakeholders for the Group through a stakeholder engagement assessment, which evaluates five core components, including both the dependence and influence of the stakeholder on Foxconn, responsibility of our Group towards the stakeholder, level of stakeholder interest, and feedback provided to our company. Based on this assessment, Foxconn has identified employees, customers, suppliers, the community, shareholders and investors, and NGOs as our key stakeholders. Foxconn has developed various communication channels to engage with our stakeholders to better understand their expectations of Foxconn and to learn from their best practices and feedback.' The Company also discloses for each stakeholder a list of topics and issues and 'efforts and outcomes'. [Stakeholder engagement, Ap 2019: [ser.foxconn.com](http://ser.foxconn.com)]

- Met: Frequency and triggers for engagement: On its website, the Company includes a table which includes the following information per stakeholder group: Communication Channels and Frequency; Topics and Issues of Interest; Efforts and Outcomes' [Stakeholder engagement actions, Ap 2019: [ser.foxconn.com](http://ser.foxconn.com)]

Score 2
- Not met: Workers in ICT SC engaged
- Not met: Communities in the ICT SC engaged: See above. However, its engagement activities are focus on 'Community care and charitable projects and Cultural promotion', and no evidence found in specific dialogue, including human rights. [Stakeholder engagement actions, Ap 2019: [ser.foxconn.com](http://ser.foxconn.com)]

**B.2 Human Rights Due Diligence (15% 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>
| B.2.1          | Identifying: Processes and triggers for 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 in ICT suppliers

Score 2
- Not met: Ongoing global risk identification
- Not met: In consultation with stakeholders
- Not met: In consultation with HR experts
- Not met: Triggered by new circumstances

B.2.2 Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1

Score 2
- Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.2.3          | Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action | 0              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks  
• Not met: Including in ICT supply chain  
• Not met: Example of Actions decided  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met |
| B.2.4          | Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating 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 to check if Actions are effective  
• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met |
| B.2.5          | Communicating: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed | 0              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks  
• Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks  
• Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks  
• Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans  
• Not met: Including ICT suppliers  
Score 2  
• Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns  
• Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications |

C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (15% 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>
| C.1            | Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers | 1              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Met: Channel accessible to all workers: In its SER 2017, the Company indicates: ‘The Labor Union has instituted an integrated system to care for, protect the rights of, and support our employees. This includes hotlines at all of our campuses, and dedicated phone numbers to reach key business functions and departments, for employees to share feedback, and to provide employees with care and counseling services. [...] employees are able to communicate with the unions and the company’s management team directly’. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company discloses some information such as ‘In 2017, Foxconn received a total of 28,000 employee feedback submissions and achieved a successful case resolution rate of 99.3%’, however, there is no specific information about the number of grievances related to human rights. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages  
• Not met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: Its Code of Conduct requires to have in place a management system which includes a ‘Worker Feedback, Participation and Grievance Ongoing processes, including an effective grievance mechanism, to assess employees’ understanding of and obtain feedback on or violations against practices and conditions covered by this Code and to foster continuous improvement’. However, no evidence found of a requirement to cascade the same expectation down its suppliers’ supply chain. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers |
| C.2            | Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from community | 0              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Grievance mechanism for community  
Score 2  
• Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages  
• Not met: Expects ICT supplier to have community grievance systems |
<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>concerns from external individuals and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not met: ICT supplier communities use global system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>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: Description of how they do this Score 2 • Not met: Engages with users on system performance • Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance • Not met: ICT suppliers consult users in creation or assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>Procedures related to the channel(s)/mechanism(s) are publicly available and explained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Response timescales • Not met: How complainants will be informed • Not met: Who is handling the complaint Score 2 • Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5</td>
<td>Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: ‘Programs that ensure the confidentiality, anonymity and protection of supplier and employee whistleblowers are to be maintained, unless prohibited by law. Anonymous complaints with clear and specific descriptions of person/time/place/event are to be accepted and protected. Foxconn should have a communicated process for their personnel to be able to raise any concerns without fear of retaliation.’ However, no statement found prohibiting retaliation. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] • Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation Score 2 • Not met: Has not retaliated in practice • Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to prohibit retaliation: See above [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.6</td>
<td>Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Won’t impede state based mechanisms • Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights Score 2 • Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms • Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.7</td>
<td>Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>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 remedy key sector risks Score 2 • Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition • Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts • Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.4.1.a</td>
<td>Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Living wage target timeframe • Not met: Describes how living wage determined Score 2 • Not met: Achieved payment of living wage • Not met: Regularly review definition of living wage with unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.1.b</td>
<td>Living wage (in the supply chain)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Code</td>
<td>Indicator name</td>
<td>Score (out of 2)</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D.4.2          | Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights                                | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs  
• Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.4.3          | Mapping and disclosing the supply chain                                        | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Identifies suppliers back to product source  
• Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why  
Score 2  
• Not met: Remediation if children identified: See above. However, CHRB could not find provisions related with Child labour remediation programmes. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour |
| D.4.4.a        | Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in own production or manufacturing operations) | 0.5             | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Age verification of job applicants and workers: See above. However, CHRB could not find provisions related with age verification of job applicants. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: Remediation if children identified: See above. However, CHRB could not find provisions related with Child labour remediation programmes. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour |
| D.4.4.b        | Prohibition on child labour: Age verification and corrective actions (in the supply chain) | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts: The Company requires its suppliers to comply with its Code of Conduct ‘to the same level of standards which the supply-chain partners and industrial associations set for the ICT industry.’ Its Code of Conduct includes ‘Child Labor Prohibition and Young Workers Protection’ provisions, however there is no reference to age verification of job applicants and remediation programmes. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress |
| D.4.5.a        | Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in own production or manufacturing operations) | 0.5             | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Met: Pays workers in full and on time  
• Met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions: In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: ‘For each pay period, workers shall be provided with a timely and understandable wage statement that includes sufficient information to verify accurate compensation for work performed.’ [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters |
| D.4.5.b        | Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain) | 1               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts: The Company requires its suppliers to with its Code of Conduct ‘to the same level of standards which the supply-chain partners and industrial associations set for the ICT industry.’ In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: ‘Workers shall not be required to pay employers’ or agents’ recruitment fees or other related fees for their employment. If any such fees are found to have been paid by workers, such fees shall be repaid to the worker.[…] Deductions from wages as a disciplinary measure shall not be permitted.’ [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on debt & fees  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made |
<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>D.4.5.c</td>
<td>Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own production or manufacturing operations)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  • Met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement: In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: 'Forced, bonded (including debt bondage) or indentured labor, involuntary or exploitative prison labor, slavery or trafficking of persons shall not be used. [...] There shall be no unreasonable restrictions on workers’ freedom of movement in the facility [...] All work must be voluntary and workers shall be free to leave work at any time or terminate their employment. Employers and agents may not hold or otherwise destroy, conceal, confiscate or deny access by employees to their identity or immigration documents, such as government-issued identification, passports or work permits, unless such holdings are required by law.' [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  • Not met: How sure about agencies or brokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.5.d</td>
<td>Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  • Met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts: The Company requires its suppliers to with its Code of Conduct ‘to the same level of standards which the supply-chain partners and industrial associations set for the ICT industry.’ In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: ‘Forced, bonded (including debt bondage) or indentured labor, involuntary or exploitative prison labor, slavery or trafficking of persons shall not be used. [...] There shall be no unreasonable restrictions on workers’ freedom of movement in the facility [...] All work must be voluntary and workers shall be free to leave work at any time or terminate their employment. Employers and agents may not hold or otherwise destroy, conceal, confiscate or deny access by employees to their identity or immigration documents, such as government-issued identification, passports or work permits, unless such holdings are required by law.’ [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  • Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters  Score 2  • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.6.a</td>
<td>Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own production or manufacturing operations)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  • Met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation: In its Code of Conduct, the Company states: 'In accordance with local law, Foxconn respects the rights of all workers to associate freely, join labor union, bargain collectively, and engage in peaceful assembly as well as respects the right of workers refrains from such activities. Workers shall be able to communicate openly with management regarding working conditions without fear of discrimination, harassment, intimidation, penalty, or reprisal.' The high rate of employees covered by collective bargaining agreements show measures to guarantee absence of retaliation in practice. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  • Met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining: In its SER 2017, the Company indicates: 'Foxconn signs a collective bargaining agreement with the Labor Union in China every year to ensure that employee rights are protected, and nearly 96% of employees are covered by this agreement.' [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com &amp; Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  Score 2  • Met: Both requirement under score 1 met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.6.b</td>
<td>Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  • Not met: FoA &amp; CB rules in codes or contracts: In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: 'In conformance with local law, Foxconn respects the right of all workers to form and join labor unions of their own choosing, to bargain collectively and to engage in peaceful assembly as well as respect the right of workers to refrain from such activities. Workers and/or their representatives shall be able to openly communicate and share ideas and concerns with management regarding working conditions and management practices without fear of discrimination, reprisal, intimidation or harassment.' Suppliers are required to comply with code of conduct policy. However, it is not clear whether the Company is respecting those rights in all contexts, as it indicates 'in conformance with local law', and no further details found. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Code</td>
<td>Indicator name</td>
<td>Score (out of 2)</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D.4.7.a        | Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations) | 0.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Injury rate disclosures: In its SER 2017, the Company discloses the annual accident rate per thousand employees (0.06‰), however, no information found about injury rate, lost days, fatalities, nor occupational disease rate. [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018: ser.foxconn.com & Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2018, 2019: ser.foxconn.com]  
  • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosure: See above  
  • Not met: Fatalities disclosures: See above  
  • Not met: Occupational disease rates  
  Score 2  
  • Not met: Met targets or explains why not |
| D.4.7.b        | Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain) | 0.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Injury rate disclosures  
  • Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures  
  • Not met: Fatalities disclosures  
  • Not met: Occupational disease rates  
  Score 2  
  • Not met: How working with suppliers on H&S  
  • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made |
| D.4.8.a        | Women’s rights (in own production or manufacturing operations) | 1 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Process to stop harassment and violence  
  • Met: Working conditions take account of gender: In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: ‘Foxconn is committed to protecting female workers’ rights and health. Health protection at work, maternity leave, social benefits, breast-feeding breaks, and protection against dismissal and discrimination based on maternity should be provided. It is unlawful to terminate the employment of a female worker during her pregnancy or absence on maternity leave. Female workers shall be entitled to have a period of maternity leave of no less than the legal requirement. A woman is guaranteed the right to return to the same or equivalent position paid at the same rate at the end of her maternity leave. Reasonable steps must also be taken to remove pregnant women/nursing mothers from working condition with high hazards, remove or reduce any workplace health and safety risks to pregnant women and nursing mothers including those associated with their work assignments, as well as include reasonable accommodations for nursing mothers.’ [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
  • Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels  
  Score 2  
  • Not met: Meets all of the requirements under score 1 |
| D.4.8.b        | Women’s rights (in the supply chain) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts: Although the Code of conduct contains provisions on maternity and health, no evidence found of provisions found related to equal opportunities including remuneration. Suppliers are required to comply with code of conduct policy. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
  • Not met: How working with suppliers on women’s rights  
  Score 2  
  • Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met  
  • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D.4.9.a | Working hours (in own production or manufacturing operations) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations:  
In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: 'Foxconn recognizes that unreasonable overtime for workers will result in reduced productivity, increased turnover, and increased injury and illness rates. Except in emergency under some unusual situations, a workweek shall be restricted to 60 hours including overtime, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off for every six days worked as stipulated in the RBA CoC.' However, no evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. In addition, it not clear what ‘exceptional or unusual situations’ would be. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: How it implements and checks this |
| D.4.9.b | Working hours (in the supply chain) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Working hours in codes or contracts: In its Code of Conduct, the Company indicates: 'Foxconn recognizes that unreasonable overtime for workers will result in reduced productivity, increased turnover, and increased injury and illness rates. Except in emergency under some unusual situations, a workweek shall be restricted to 60 hours including overtime, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off for every six days worked as stipulated in the RBA CoC.' Suppliers are required to comply with code of conduct policy. However, no evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. In addition, it not clear what ‘exceptional or unusual situations’ would be. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made |
| D.4.10.a | Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Arrangements with Suppliers and Smelters/Refiners in the Mineral Resource Supply Chains | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing due diligence in supplier contracts: In its Code of Conduct the Company indicates: 'Foxconn requires suppliers to trace the origin of products potentially containing conflict minerals, including gold (Au), tantalum (Ta), tin (Sn), and tungsten (W), and to provide all relevant information regarding the sources of those minerals to our company. In addition, Foxconn’s downstream suppliers are required to fulfil their due diligence on conflict-free minerals pursuant to the relevant international standards and regulations.' However, there is no specific reference to OECD Guidance, and whether it is included in commercial contracts or written agreements. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: Builds capacity with smelters/refiners  
Score 2  
• Not met: Disclosure of smelter information in supplier requirements  
• Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals |
| D.4.10.b | Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Identification in Mineral Supply Chain | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance  
• Not met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD due diligence  
Score 2  
• Not met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD due diligence  
• Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals |
| D.4.10.c | Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Management in the Mineral Supply Chain | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain  
• Not met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time  
Score 2  
• Not met: Supplier and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy  
• Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals |
### 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                              |                  | • Headline: Foxconn accused by China Labour Watch of non-respect of working conditions  
• Area: Working hours  
• Story: China Labor Watch (CLW) published the report of investigation it conducted at Hengyang Foxconn, a unit of Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd. (Foxconn). The factory manufactures Amazon’s Kindle, Echo Dots and tablets. The report detailed issues of working conditions at the factory between August 2007 and April 2018. The issues identified in the report include excessive working hours (over 100 hours of overtime per month at peak production season) exceeding the legal overtime limit in China. In addition, it was claimed that some workers worked 14 days in a row with no days off.  
• Sources: [The Verge, 11/06/2018: theverge.com] [China Labor Watch, 10/06/2018: chinalaborwatch.org] [Reuters, 10/06/2018: reuters.com] |
| E(1).1         | The Company has responded publicly to the allegation | 1                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Met: Public response available: The Company states that "We are carrying out a full investigation of the areas raised by that report, and if found to be true, immediate actions will be taken to bring the operations into compliance with our Code of Conduct." [Reuters’ article on excessive working hours in China, June 2018: reuters.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: Response goes into detail: The Company did not publish details of the case. |
| E(1).2         | The Company has appropriate policies in place       | 2                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that "The recognized standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) have been used as references in preparing this Code", "Foxconn recognizes that unreasonable overtime for workers will result in reduced productivity, increased turnover, and increased injury and illness rates. Except in 6 emergency under some unusual situations, a workweek shall be restricted to 60 hours including overtime, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off for every six days worked as stipulated in the EICC CoC." [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
Score 2  
• Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "Foxconn’s downstream suppliers are required to comply with this CoC policy to the same level of standards which the supply chain partners and industrial associations set for the ICT industry." [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
• Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company states that "Foxconn recognizes that unreasonable overtime for workers will result in reduced productivity, increased turnover, and increased injury and illness rates. Except in 6 emergency under some unusual situations, a workweek shall be restricted to 60 hours including overtime, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off for every six days worked as stipulated in the EICC CoC." [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] |
| E(1).3         | The Company has taken appropriate action             | 0                | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find the evidence of the Company’s engagement with affected stakeholders.  
• Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: CHRB could not find the evidence of the Company’s encouraging its business partners to engage with the affected stakeholders.  
• Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: The Company stated “If infractions are identified, we work to immediately rectify them”. However, there is no evidence found of the Company’s providing remedies. [Reuters’ article on excessive working hours in China, June 2018: reuters.com]  
• Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company reviewing the system followed by the case.  
Score 2  
• Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E(2).0 | Serious allegation No 2 | | • Headline: Workers at CommScope, Foxconn, and others protest sexual harassment, discrimination, and other workplace issues  
  • Area: FoA & CB  
  • Story: In Mexico, workers at large assembly plants owned by CommScope, Eaton, Foxconn (Apple’s supplier) and Lexmark, producing electronics, auto parts and printing supplies for U.S. market, have launched a series of protests against low wages, unsafe working conditions, sexual harassment and discrimination. In several cases, workers have attempted to form independent unions to defend their rights and have a voice at work. According to a press, hundreds of workers are facing unjust dismissals, threats and lawsuits because of these union activities. One of the leaders of the workers' protest, engineer Carlos Octavio Serrano, was one of the workers who were fired following the strike.  
  • Sources: [Truthout, 13/01/16: truthout.org] |
| E(2).1 | The Company has responded publicly to the allegation | 2 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Met: Public response available: The Company stated that "It is unfortunate that a small number of the company's employees have chosen to try to disrupt its operations to promote their personal agendas outside of the law and the approved and recognized channels of communication […] The company has, in the past, dismissed employees for gross violations of the company code of conduct and also taken legal action to address employee violations of Mexican law." [Response to FoA allegation in Mexico, Dec 2015: business-humanrights.org]  
  Score 2  
  • Met: Response goes into detail: The Company discloses the details of the case; "The record will show that the management of Scientific-Atlanta of Mexico has always respected the rights of its employees to express their views and there are clear channels in place for them to register suggestions or complaints regarding all aspects of the operations of that company. All complaints are investigated and, if violations of the company code of conduct are found, disciplinary action is taken even if the employee in question is a member of supervisory or management staff." [Response to FoA allegation in Mexico, Dec 2015: business-humanrights.org] |
| E(2).2 | The Company has appropriate policies in place | 0.5 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Company policies address the general issues raised: The Company states that "Open communication and direct engagement between workers and management are the most effective ways to resolve workplace and compensation issues. Foxconn respects the rights of workers to associate freely, join or not join labor unions, and seek representation from or join workers’ councils in accordance with local laws. " However, it does not clearly present its commitment to respect the right to collective bargaining. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
  • Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company states that "Foxconn's downstream suppliers are required to comply with this CoC policy to the same level of standards which the supply chain partners and industrial associations set for the ICT industry." [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com]  
  Score 2  
  • Not met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Company states that "Workers shall be able to communicate openly with management regarding working conditions without fear of harassment, intimidation, penalty, or reprisal." However, it is not clear if the Company implements the measures for the commitment. [Code of Conduct, 2018: ser.foxconn.com] |
| E(2).3 | The Company has taken appropriate action | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find the evidence of the Company's engagement with affected stakeholders.  
  • Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders: CHRB could not find the evidence of the Company's encouraging its business partners to engage with the affected stakeholders.  
  • Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company providing remedies.  
  • Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence: CHRB did not find evidence of the Company reviewing the system followed by the case. |
### F. Transparency (10% 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>F.1</td>
<td>Company willingness to publish information</td>
<td>1.54 out of 4</td>
<td>Out of a total of 52 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd. (Foxconn) made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 20 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 1.54 out of 4 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.2</td>
<td>Recognised Reporting Initiatives</td>
<td>2 out of 2</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 • Met: Company reports on GRI: In its SER 2017, the Company indicates: 'This report is prepared with reference to the G4 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI).' [Social and Environmental Responsibility Report 2017, Jun 2018; ser.foxconn.com]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.3</td>
<td>Key, High Quality Disclosures</td>
<td>0 out of 4</td>
<td>Hon Hai Precision Industry Co., Ltd. (Foxconn) met 0 of the 10 thresholds listed below and therefore gets 0 out of 4 points for the high quality disclosure indicator. Specificity and use of concrete examples • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions • Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers • Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) Discussing challenges openly • Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts • Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remediating adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned Demonstrating a forward focus • Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management • Not met: Score 1 for D.4.1.a: Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations) • Not met: Score 2 for D.4.7.a: Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 2019 Key Findings report and 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 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 CHRB Ltd, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither CHRB Ltd 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 CHRB Ltd 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 Ltd’s 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 English law and submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of England and Wales.

As CHRB Ltd, 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 snapshot 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.