

**Company Name** TE Connectivity  
**Industry** ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)  
**Overall Score (\*)** 4.8 out of 100

Theme Score	Out of	For Theme
0.9	10	A. Governance and Policies
0.2	25	B. Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence
1.7	15	C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms
0.4	20	D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices
1.0	20	E. Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations
0.6	10	F. Transparency

(\*) 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)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: General HRs commitment: The Company states that it respects all applicable civil rights, human rights and labour laws in the locations where it operates. [Guide to Ethical Conduct: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>Met: UNGC principles 1 &amp; 2: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact since 2011.</li> <li>Not met: UDHR</li> <li>Not met: International Bill of Rights</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: UNGPs</li> <li>Not met: OECD</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: ILO Core: The Company only mentioned forced labour, child labour, and discrimination. [Guide to Ethical Conduct: <a href="#">te.com</a> &amp; Guide to Ethical Conduct: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>Met: UNGC principles 3-6: The Company is a signatory to UN Global Compact since 2011. [UN Global Compact: <a href="#">unglobalcompact.org</a> &amp; 2018 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2019: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Company has policy on forced labour, child labour, anti-discrimination, and freedom of association in it Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility. However, the Company does not have</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>policy on collective bargaining. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core</li> <li>• Met: Respect H&amp;S of workers: The Company states that it is committed to providing a safe working environment for all employees. It does this by following strict safety and security rules and practices. Its Health and Safety principles and practices include occupational safety, occupational injury and illness reporting and investigation, industrial hygiene, and etc. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: H&amp;S applies to ICT suppliers: The Company states that it also requires its suppliers to follow its Health and Safety principles and practices. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: working hours for workers: The Company states that it supports the principles that work weeks are not to exceed the maximum allowable hours set by local law. A work week should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be allowed at least one day off per seven-day week. However, no evidence found of references to standard weekly hours or the Company explicitly committing to respect ILO conventions on working hours. In addition, it is not clear what 'exceptional or unusual situations would be [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: The Company states that it also requires its suppliers to follow its Labour and Human Rights related principles, including working hours. However, no evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.3.ICT.a	Commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing in conflict areas: The Company states that it supports the goal of Sec. 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to discourage companies from using “conflict minerals” and strives to have a Conflict Free supply chain, and is committed to sourcing products and materials from non-conflict sources. However, it is not clear if the company has a commitment to responsible sourcing of minerals. [Conflict Minerals Policy, 24/07/2018: <a href="#">te.com</a> &amp; Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Based on OECD Guidance</li> <li>• Not met: Requires responsible mineral sourcing from suppliers: The Company asks that suppliers identify the source of their conflict minerals to the greatest extent possible and avoid of sourcing from “conflict mines”. However, it is not enough to be awarded. The Company has not mentioned following OECD Guidance. [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="#">te.com</a> &amp; Conflict Minerals Policy, 24/07/2018: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals</li> <li>• Not met: Suppliers expected to make similar requirements of their suppliers: The Company states that it expects that its suppliers have due diligence processes in place to identify the source of the Conflict Minerals contained in their products, and that those sources do not support conflict and violations of human rights. However, it is not clear if this applies to all minerals. [Conflict Minerals Policy, 24/07/2018: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.3.ICT.b	Commitment to respect human rights particularly relevant to the industry (ICT)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Women's Rights</li> <li>• Not met: Children's Rights</li> <li>• Not met: Migrant worker's rights</li> <li>• Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: CEDAW/Women's Empowerment Principles</li> <li>• Not met: Child Rights Convention/Business principles</li> <li>• Not met: Convention on migrant workers</li> <li>• Not met: Expecting suppliers to respect these rights</li> </ul>
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: The Company states that it engages with its stakeholders, including customers, community leaders, employees, commercial partners and investors, to gather their views and interests</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>about the Company, its performance, culture and community engagement. However, we could not found a commitment to stakeholder engagement on the company's documents. [2017 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: <a href="#">te.com</a> &amp; 2018 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2019: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement [2018 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2019: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design</li> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement</li> </ul>
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to remedy</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies</li> <li>• Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives</li> <li>• Met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts: The Company states that its remediation of instances of non-compliance can include a number of activities, such as the Company and suppliers working together to create a corrective action plan for achieving compliance in a clearly defined and reasonable time frame, encouragement for improvement through regular communications with non-compliant suppliers, defining a roadmap for gradually increasing standards and expectations; and termination of a supplier relationship when serious compliance issues are not remedied in spite of repeated notifications. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.6	Commitment to respect the rights of human rights defenders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Zero tolerance attacks on HRs Defenders (HRDs)</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to reflect company HRD commitments</li> </ul>

## A.2 Policy Commitments (5% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.2.1	Commitment from the top	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: CEO or Board approves policy</li> <li>• Not met: Board level responsibility for HRs</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Speeches/letters by Board members or CEO</li> </ul>
A.2.2	Board discussions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Board/Committee review of salient HRs</li> <li>• Not met: Examples or trends re HR discussion</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both examples and process</li> </ul>
A.2.3	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Incentives for at least one board member</li> <li>• Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&amp;S</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Performance criteria made public</li> </ul>

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

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions</li> <li>• Not met: Senior responsibility for HR</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility</li> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain</li> </ul>
B.1.2	Incentives and performance management	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Senior manager incentives for human rights</li> <li>• Not met: At least one key ICT HR risk, beyond employee H&amp;S</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			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 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 • Not met: Communicating policy down the whole ICT supply chain • Not met: Requiring ICT suppliers to communicate policy down the chain Score 2 • Not met: How HR commitments made binding/contractual • Not met: Including on ICT suppliers
B.1.5	Training on Human Rights	0.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 • Not met: Scores at least 1 on A.1.2 • Met: Trains all workers on HR policy commitments: The Company states that every its employee is required to participate annually in a training session on the Guide to Ethical Conduct, to commit to embrace and utilize the Guide's principles in their daily work activities, and to report any activity that may be deemed a violation of the Guide. The Guide includes the Company's commitment to human right. [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a> ] • 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
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 Human Rights Due Diligence (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in own operations</li> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Ongoing global risk identification</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with HR experts</li> <li>• Not met: Triggered by new circumstances</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Salient risk assessment (and context)</li> <li>• Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks</li> <li>• Not met: Including in ICT supply chain</li> <li>• Not met: Example of Actions decided</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: System to check if Actions are effective</li> <li>• Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks</li> <li>• Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans</li> <li>• Not met: Including ICT suppliers</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns</li> <li>• Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications</li> </ul>

## C. Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms (15% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company maintains an Office of the Ombudsman, an independent, impartial and confidential resource for its employees, suppliers, investors and customers to report and/or discuss possible violations of laws, policies, rules, regulations of the Guide to Ethical Conduct. In addition, the Company also has an independently managed 24-hour reporting hotline and website to provide a safe and anonymous means for employees and external stakeholders to report any possible violations of laws, policies, rules, regulations or the Guide. [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved: The Company states that "In fiscal year 2018, the Office of Ombudsman received approximately 900 cases. Of cases closed during fiscal year 2018, approximately 42 percent were substantiated and appropriate actions were taken to address those matters. Of the unsubstantiated allegations, approximately 12 percent led to additional corrective actions even though unsubstantiated, " However, it is not clear how many of them addressed human rights issues. [2017 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2017: <a href="#">te.com</a> &amp; 2018 Corporate Responsibility Report, 2019: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages</li> <li>• Not met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems</li> <li>• Met: Opens own system to ICT supplier workers: See above. The office of the Ombudsman is open to suppliers.</li> </ul>
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Grievance mechanism for community</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes accessibility and local languages</li> <li>• Not met: Expects ICT supplier to have community grievance systems</li> <li>• Not met: ICT supplier communities use global system</li> </ul>
C.3	Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Engages users to create or assess system</li> <li>• Not met: Description of how they do this</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Engages with users on system performance</li> <li>• Not met: Provides user engagement example on performance</li> <li>• Not met: ICT suppliers consult users in creation or assessment</li> </ul>
C.4	Procedures related to the mechanism(s)/channel(s) are publicly available and explained	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response timescales</li> <li>• Not met: How complainants will be informed</li> <li>• Not met: Who is handling the complaint</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Escalation to senior/independent level</li> </ul>
C.5	Commitment to non-retaliation over complaints or concerns made	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Public statement prohibiting retaliation: The Company has a non-retaliation policy, which states that an employee who, in good faith, seeks advice, raises a concern or reports misconduct is following its Guide of Ethical Conduct and doing the right thing. It takes claims of retaliation seriously. However, no evidence found of this commitment being extended to external stakeholders. [Guide to Ethical Conduct: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Practical measures to prevent retaliation: Allegations of retaliation will be investigated, and any retaliatory acts against individuals who report suspected misconduct will be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination. The Company also states that its 24-hours reporting hotline and website guarantee reporters' anonymity. [Guide to Ethical Conduct: <a href="#">te.com</a> &amp; Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Has not retaliated in practice</li> <li>• Not met: Expects ICT suppliers to prohibit retaliation</li> </ul>
C.6	Company involvement with State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Won't impede state based mechanisms</li> <li>• Not met: Complainants not asked to waive rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Will work with state based or non judicial mechanisms</li> <li>• Not met: Example of issue resolved (if applicable)</li> </ul>
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
	incorporating lessons learned		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition</li> <li>• Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</li> </ul>

### D. Performance: Company Human Rights Practices (20% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
D.4.1.a	Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Living wage target timeframe</li> <li>• Not met: Describes how living wage determined</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Achieved payment of living wage</li> <li>• Not met: Regularly review definition of living wage with unions</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Living wage in supplier code or contracts</li> <li>• Not met: Improving living wage practices of suppliers</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress</li> </ul>
D.4.2	Aligning purchasing decisions with human rights	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Avoids business model pressure on HRs</li> <li>• Not met: Positive incentives to respect human rights</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
D.4.3	Mapping and disclosing the supply chain	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Identifies suppliers back to product source: The Company reports that it has over 25,000 direct and indirect suppliers. However, no more details are available. [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Discloses significant parts of supply chain and why</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Does not use child labour: The Company states that it forbids child labour at its facilities. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Age verification of job applicants and workers</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Remediation if children identified</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Child Labour rules in codes or contracts</li> <li>• Not met: How working with suppliers on child labour</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends demonstrating progress</li> </ul>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Pays workers in full and on time: The Company states that the basis on which workers are being paid is to be provided in a timely manner via pay stub or similar documentation. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Payslips show any legitimate deductions</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Debt and fees rules in codes or contracts</li> <li>• Not met: How working with suppliers on debt &amp; fees</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</li> </ul>
D.4.5.c	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Does not retain documents or restrict movement</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How sure about agencies or brokers</li> </ul>
D.4.5.d	Prohibition on forced labour: Restrictions on workers (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Free movement rules in codes or contracts</li> <li>• Not met: How these practices are implemented and monitored for agencies, labour brokers or recruiters</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</li> </ul>
D.4.6.a	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits not to interfere with union rights and collective bargaining and prohibits intimidation and retaliation</li> <li>• Not met: Discloses % covered by collective bargaining</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
D.4.6.b	Freedom of association and collective bargaining (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: FoA &amp; CB rules in codes or contracts: The Company does not have a policy of collective bargaining for its suppliers. [Guide to Supplier Social Responsibility, 11/2016: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a> &amp; Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: How working with suppliers on FoA and CB</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</li> </ul>
D.4.7.a	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Injury Rate disclosures</li> <li>• Met: Lost days or near miss disclosure: The Company reports that lost time recordable incident rate per 100 employees was 0.14 in 2017. [GRI Index and Data, 2017: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Fatalities disclosures</li> <li>• Not met: Occupational disease rates: The company says that 'We do not currently break down data for injury and rates of injury, occupational diseases, lost days and absenteeism, and number of work-related fatalities by gender and region.' [GRI Index and Data, 2017: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Set targets for H&amp;S performance</li> <li>• Not met: Met targets or explains why not</li> </ul>
D.4.7.b	Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in the supply chain)	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Sets out clear Health and Safety requirements</li> <li>• Not met: Injury rate disclosures</li> <li>• Not met: Lost days or near miss disclosures</li> <li>• Not met: Fatalities disclosures</li> <li>• Not met: Occupational disease rates</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How working with suppliers on H&amp;S</li> </ul>



Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</li> </ul>
D.4.8.a	Women's rights (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Process to stop harassment and violence</li> <li>• Not met: Working conditions take account of gender</li> <li>• Not met: Equality of opportunity at all levels</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Meets all of the requirements under score 1</li> </ul>
D.4.8.b	Women's rights (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Women's rights in codes or contracts</li> <li>• Not met: How working with suppliers on women's rights</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</li> </ul>
D.4.9.a	Working hours (in own production or manufacturing operations)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Respects max hours, min breaks and rest periods in its own operations</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: How it implements and checks this</li> </ul>
D.4.9.b	Working hours (in the supply chain)	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Working hours in codes or contracts: The Company states that a work week should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations, and workers shall be allowed at least one day off per seven-day week. However, no evidence found of references to international standards, standard weekly hours. [Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement, 30/09/2017: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: How working with suppliers on working hours</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> <li>• Not met: Provide analysis of trends in progress made</li> </ul>
D.4.10.a	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Arrangements with Suppliers and Smelters/Refiners in the Mineral Resource Supply Chains	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Responsible mineral sourcing due diligence in supplier contracts: The Company states that it expects that its suppliers have due diligence processes in place to identify the source of the Conflict Minerals contained in their products, and that those sources do not support conflict and violations of human rights. It provides all suppliers identified under the SEC regulations with a Reasonable Country of Origin survey ("RCOI"). However, no evidence found of the Company including the requirements in commercial contracts or agreements nor mentioned following OECD guidance. Evidence is not enough to be awarded. [Conflict Minerals Policy, 24/07/2018: <a href="#">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Builds capacity with smelters/refiners</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Disclosure of smelter information in supplier requirements</li> <li>• Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals</li> </ul>
D.4.10.b	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Identification in Mineral Supply Chain	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Risk identification and disclosure in line with OECD Guidance</li> <li>• Not met: Identification of smelter/refiners and OECD due diligence</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Discloses smelters/refiners judged in line with OECD due diligence</li> <li>• Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals</li> </ul>
D.4.10.c	Responsible Mineral Sourcing: Risk Management in the Mineral Supply Chain	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes mineral risk management plan for supply chain</li> <li>• Not met: Monitoring, tracking and whether better risk prevention/mitigation over time</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Supplier and stakeholders engaged in risk management strategy</li> <li>• Not met: Responsible conflict mineral sourcing covers all minerals</li> </ul>

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

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		No allegations meeting the CHRB severity threshold were found, and so the score of 3.83 out of 80 points scored in themes A-D & F has been applied to produce a score of 0.96 out of 20 points for theme E.

## F. Transparency (10% of Total)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score	Explanation
F.1	Company willingness to publish information	0.62 out of 4	Out of a total of 52 indicators assessed under sections A-D of the benchmark, TE Connectivity made data public that met one or more elements of the methodology in 8 cases, leading to a disclosure score of 0.62 out of 4 points.
F.2	Recognised Reporting Initiatives	0 out of 2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Company reports on GRI: The Company has published GRI index data for 2017, however, it does not include human right issues. [GRI Index and Data, 2017: <a href="http://te.com">te.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Company reports on SASB</li> <li>• Not met: Company reports on UNGPRF</li> </ul>
F.3	Key, High Quality Disclosures	0 out of 4	TE Connectivity 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for A.2.2 : Board discussions</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.1.6 : Monitoring and corrective actions</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.1 : Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.3 : Users are involved in the design and performance of the channel(s)/mechanism(s)</li> </ul> Discussing challenges openly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.2.4 : Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for C.7 : Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned</li> </ul> Demonstrating a forward focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for A.2.3 : Incentives and performance management</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for B.1.2 : Incentives and performance management</li> <li>• Not met: Score 1 for D.4.1.a: Living wage (in own production or manufacturing operations)</li> <li>• Not met: Score 2 for D.4.7.a: Health and safety: Fatalities, lost days, injury rates (in own production of manufacturing operations)</li> </ul>

### 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.