**Corporate Human Rights Benchmark 2019 Company Scoresheet**

**Company Name**  
Keyence Corp.

**Industry**  
ICT (Supply Chain only)

**Overall Score (\(\ast\))**  
0.9 out of 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Score</th>
<th>Out of</th>
<th>For Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. Governance and Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F. Transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\ast\) 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: The Company states "KEYENCE respect human rights, aims to create a workplace for employees to gain satisfaction from their jobs, and makes efforts to ensure that our business activities do not contribute to human rights violations, such as forced labor, child labor and human trafficking, including in our supply chain." [Compliance, Not available: keyence.com]  
  - Not met: UNGC principles 1 & 2  
  - Not met: UDHR  
  - 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 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  - Not met: ILO Core  
  - Not met: UNGC principles 3-6  
  - Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: Keyence discloses that clarify its policies and rules to its subcontractors. Although the Company explicitly mention that forced labor, child labor and discriminatory practices are prohibited, there is no mention to the right of freedom of association and collective bargain. [Annual Report 2019, 20/03/19: keyence.com]  
  Score 2  
  - Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.1.3.ICT.a    | Commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals | 0 | • Not met: Respect H&S of workers: The Company discloses that provides ‘products that help improve safety at production sites. This also reduces the load on health and safety management. Specifically, we are promoting the improvement of on-site safety by developing safety equipment that maintains productivity while securing the safety of workers from hazardous elements, such as machinery and robots used at production sites’. However, there is no mention to a commitment to respect health and safety of workers. [Sustainability, 2019: keyence.com]
  • Not met: H&S applies to ICT suppliers
  • Not met: working hours for workers
  • Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers |
| A.1.3.ICT.b    | Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (ICT) | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
  Score 1
  • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing in conflict areas: The Company define what conflict minerals are and their origins in the following statement: ‘Conflict minerals originating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) or an adjoining country (hereinafter called “the covered countries”) have become a source of funding for armed groups, leading to human rights violations and environmental destruction while threatening to promote further conflict’. Also, the Company states that "It is KEYENCE policy to refrain from the purchase of any parts, components, and materials that are recognized to contain conflict minerals. Furthermore, KEYENCE has no intention to benefit from or finance the armed groups responsible for human-rights violations in the covered countries. KEYENCE is engaging in efforts to eliminate conflict minerals while cooperating with suppliers, such as investigating supply chains using tools provided by the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI, formerly CFSI), an organization that promotes the responsible procurement of minerals.’ However, no commitment to responsibly source from conflict affected and high-risk areas could be found. [Sustainability, Compliance, 2019: keyence.com]
  • Not met: Based on OECD Guidance
  • Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers
  Score 2
  • Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals
  • Not met: Suppliers expected to make similar requirements of their suppliers |
| A.1.4          | Commitment to engage with stakeholders | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
  Score 1
  • Not met: Committed to stakeholder engagement
  • Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement
  Score 2
  • Not met: Committed to engage stakeholders in design
  • Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement |
| A.1.5          | Commitment to remedy | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:
  Score 1
  • Not met: Committed 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 | 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  
• Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs  
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 |

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

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

<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 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions  
• Not met: Senior responsibility for HR  
Score 2  
• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility  
• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain |
| B.1.2          | Incentives and performance management | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights  
• Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&S  
Score 2  
• Not met: Performance criteria made public |
| 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  
• Not met: Audit Ctte or independent risk assessment |
| B.1.4.a        | Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) within Company's own operations | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions  
• Not met: Communicates its policy to all workers in own operations: According to the Company’s Compliance webpage, all workers must comply with the Corporate Policy and Business Guideline, which allegedly contains policies against abuse and harassment. This, however, does not meet minimum requirements to qualify it as a policy concerning human rights, nor is it available for public access. [Compliance, Not available: keyence.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions  
• Not met: Communication of policy commitments to stakeholder  
• Not met: How policy commitments are made accessible to audience |
| B.1.4.b        | Communication /dissemination of policy commitment(s) to business relationships | 0 | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Commits to all 4 ILO core conventions for suppliers: The Company only mentioned child labor, forced labor and non discrimination when it listed human rights requirements for suppliers. [Procurement Guidelines, Not available: keyence.com]  
Score 2  
• Not met: Communicating policy down the whole ICT supply chain  
• Not met: Requiring ICT suppliers to communicate policy down the chain  
• Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual  
• Not met: Including on ICT suppliers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.1.5          | Training on Human Rights | 0              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2  
• Not met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments  
• 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 |
| B.1.6          | Monitoring and corrective actions | 0              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2  
• Not met: Monitoring implementation of HR policy commitments  
• Not met: Monitoring ICT suppliers  
Score 2  
• Not met: Score of 2 on A.1.2  
• Not met: Describes corrective action process  
• Not met: Example of corrective action  
• Not met: Discloses % of ICT supply chain monitored |
| B.1.7          | Engaging business relationships | 0              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: HR affects ICT selection of suppliers  
• Not met: HR affects on-going ICT supplier relationships  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met  
• Not met: Working with ICT suppliers to improve performance: The Company states, in its Compliance webpage, that it works with suppliers to eliminate the usage of conflict minerals. This, however, does not convey an overall collective effort in favor of human rights. "KEYENCE is engaging in efforts to eliminate conflict minerals while cooperating with suppliers, such as investigating supply chains using tools provided by the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI)(formerly CFSI), an organization that promotes the responsible procurement of minerals."  
(Procurement Guidelines, Not available: keyence.com) |
| B.1.8          | Approach to engagement with potentially affected stakeholders | 0              | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1  
• Not met: Stakeholder process or systems  
• Not met: Frequency and triggers for engagement  
• Not met: Workers in ICT SC engaged  
• Not met: Communities in the ICT SC engaged  
Score 2  
• Not met: Analysis of stakeholder views and company’s actions on them |
| 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  
• Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context)  
• Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks  
Score 2  
• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met |
| B.2.3          | Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and | 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.2.4         | 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 | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Channel accessible to all workers  
Score 2  
• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved  
• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages  
• Not met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems  
• Not met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers |
| C.2           | Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Grievance mechanism for community  
Score 2  
• Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages  
• Not met: Expects ICT supplier to have community grievance systems  
• Not met: ICT supplier communities use global system |
| C.3           | Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s) | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• 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 |
| C.4           | Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained | 0               | 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 |
| C.5           | Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
Score 1  
• Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation  
• Not met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation  
Score 2  
• Not met: Has not retaliated in practice  
• Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to prohibit retaliation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score (out of 2)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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: 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)                                                                                                           |
| C.7            | Remediing adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned                       | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided  
  • Not met: Says how it would 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                                                                                                              |

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>
</table>
| D.4.1.b        | Living wage (in the supply chain)                                              | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts  
  • Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers  
  Score 2  
  • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met  
  • Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress                                                                                             |
| 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                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 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  
  Score 2  
  • Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why                                                                                       |
| 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 explicitly states in its Compliance webpage that it "makes efforts to ensure that our business activities do not contribute to human rights violations, such as forced labor, child labor and human trafficking, including in our supply chain (The contract with suppliers includes the clause of elimination of discriminatory employment)." However, the Company did not explicitly state this is a binding arrangement that is usually included in suppliers contracts in its Procurement Guideline webpage, or in supplier code of conduct (which also would need to include age verification and remediation programmes). [Compliance, Not available: keyence.com & Procurement Guidelines, Not available: keyence.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.b        | Prohibition on forced labour: Debt bondage and other unacceptable financial costs (in the supply chain) | 0               | The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:  
  Score 1  
  • Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts  
  • 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.d</td>
<td>Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (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: Free movement rules in codes or contracts • 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.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 • Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB Score 2 • Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.7.b</td>
<td>Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (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: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements • 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&amp;S • Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.8.b</td>
<td>Women's rights (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: Women's rights in codes or contracts • 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.9.b</td>
<td>Working hours (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: Working hours in codes or contracts • 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.10.a</td>
<td>Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Arrangements with Suppliers and Smelters/Refiners in the Mineral Resource Supply Chains</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing due diligence in supplier contracts: The Company states it refrains from purchasing conflict minerals, as it believes they have become a source of funding for armed groups, leading to human rights violations and environmental destruction while threatening to promote further conflict. &quot;It is KEYENCE policy to refrain from the purchase of any parts, components, and materials that are recognized to contain conflict minerals.&quot; Nonetheless, the lack of evidence that this is included in supplier contracts and lack of a requirement to conduct due diligence aligned with OECD Guidance means the Company failed to meet criteria. [Annual Report 2019, 20/03/19: keyence.com] • 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.10.b</td>
<td>Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Identification in Mineral Supply Chain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4.10.c</td>
<td>Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Management in the Mineral Supply Chain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E(1).0</td>
<td>Serious allegation No 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 0.72 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D &amp; F has been applied to produce a score of 0.18 out of 20 points for theme E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Transparency (10% of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Code</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.1</td>
<td>Company willingness to publish information</td>
<td>0.09 out of 4</td>
<td>Out of a total of 44 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, Keyence Corp. made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 1 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.09 out of 4 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.2</td>
<td>Recognised Reporting Initiatives</td>
<td>0 out of 2</td>
<td>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2, • Not met: Company reports on GRI, Not met: Company reports on SASB, Not met: Company reports on UNGPFR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.3</td>
<td>Key, High Quality Disclosures</td>
<td>0 out of 4</td>
<td>Keyence Corp. met 0 out of the 8 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: Remedying 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.</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 snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and
governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise
score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We
also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a
company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote
continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the
UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.