Lead the Charge Automaker Supply Chain Scorecard - 2025 Edition

The aim of this scorecard is to establish a new expectation – and competitive advantage – for what a clean car really is. Not just an EV, but an EV that is manufactured:
- Equitably – respecting and advancing the rights of Indigenous Peoples, workers, and local communities throughout the supply chain.
- **Sustainably** – preserving and restoring environmental health and biodiversity across supply chains, whilst reducing primary resource demand through efficient resource use and increased recycled content.
- **Fossil free** – 100% electric and made with a fossil fuel-free supply chain.

The indicator development for the scorecard was led by Pensions & Investment Research Consultants (PIRC), Europe's largest independent corporate governance and shareholder advisory firm, whose work was guided by members of the Lead the Charge coalition. Please refer to the accompanying methodology document for more information on the indicator development and research process.

This document contains the scores obtained by each automaker for each indicator of the scorecard, as well as explanations for why they were awarded these scores and information on the thresholds and benchmarks used for each indicator.

Navigating this document
This document has several worksheets which present the data from the scorecard with differing levels of detail:

		Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Supply Chains						Human rights and Responsible Sourcing					
Auto	Total score	General	Steel	Aluminium	Batteries	Total	Total x IM~	General	Transition minerals	Indigenous rights	Workers' rights	Total	BEV % of total vehicle sales^
Ford	42%	45%	21%	35%	19%	30%	33%	69%	89%	20%	28%	52%	
Tesla	43%	42%	22%	33%	36%	33%	40%	60%	69%	26%	27%	46%	
Mercedes	41%	54%	24%	24%	37%	35%	38%	68%	40%	21%	50%	45%	
BMW	29%	60%	11%	1%	15%	22%	20%	64%	42%	12%	39%	39%	
Volkswagen	32%	51%	15%	4%	30%	25%	27%	69%	42%	6%	33%	37%	
Volvo	38%	32%	57%	44%	15%	37%	45%	62%	35%	4%	26%	32%	
Stellantis*	23%	36%	3%	4%	24%	17%	15%	68%	33%	0%	21%	31%	
GM	23%	28%	18%	21%	7%	19%	21%	47%	25%	11%	19%	25%	
Hyundai*	21%	44%	12%	4%	9%	17%	19%	48%	27%	0%	20%	24%	
Renault*	23%	47%	9%	9%	35%	25%	22%	44%	19%	6%	24%	23%	
Kia*	16%	29%	8%	0%	8%	11%	12%	39%	19%	0%	20%	20%	
Geely	18%	34%	16%	16%	11%	19%	19%	40%	14%	2%	12%	17%	
Honda	10%	15%	0%	0%	1%	4%	4%	32%	21%	0%	11%	16%	
Toyota	10%	15%	0%	0%	6%	5%	5%	22%	23%	0%	17%	16%	
Nissan*	12%	20%	11%	11%	4%	12%	12%	28%	9%	0%	12%	12%	
BYD	6%	5%	0%	0%	9%	3%	4%	17%	6%	0%	6%	7%	
GAC	4%	13%	0%	0%	10%	6%	6%	4%	2%	0%	0%	2%	
SAIC	1%	1%	0%	0%	7%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

*EV Volumes groups sales by of Hyundai-Kia and the Renault-Nissan-Mitsubishi alliance. They have been evaluated separately as they have different supply chain practices and policies and for ease, their EV Aug YTD sales were evenly split between them

~InfluenceMap scores were applied as a multiplier on the C&E section. Autos with a C or above received positive multiplier; below received negative, and autos not evaluated by InfluenceMap received no change. See the Climate & Environment review sheet for details. https://automotive.influencemap.org/

^ EV-Volumes OEM Share tracker. All figures are cumulative annual values from January 2023 up to and including July 2023. The data covers passenger vehicles only and includes Europe, China, Korea, Japan, the United States and Canada.

LINKED DATA

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
1. Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Supply Chains (General)	**1.1. Disclosure of emissions, water and deforestation management**	1.1.1. The company discloses total scope 3 GHG emissions due to purchased goods and services.	2	2
		1.1.2. The company discloses "significant emissions" in its supply chain.	1	0
		1.1.3. The company discloses water usage by key suppliers in its supply chain.	1	0
		1.1.4. The company discloses deforestation and conversion-free commodity volumes from its supply chain	1	0
		DISCLOSE TOTAL	**5**	**2**
		DISCLOSE NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**0.4**
		DISCLOSE %		**40%**
	1.2. Target-setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable supply chains	1.2.1. The company has set and disclosed a scope 3 SBT (must include reference to upstream/purchased goods & not only 'Well to Wheel')	2	0
		1.2.2. The company commits to having suppliers provide science-based targets for GHG emissions.	1	0.25
		1.2.3. The company discloses the current percentage of suppliers providing science-based targets.	1	0
		1.2.4. The company requires all significant suppliers to set water reduction targets and disclose their water usage.	1	1
		1.2.5. The company has programs in place to monitor suppliers for compliance with GHG emissions targets and other environmental impacts.	1	0.5
		1.2.6. The company commits to eliminate deforestation and the conversion of all natural ecosystems from their supply chains.	1	0
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS TOTAL	**7**	**1.75**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**0.4**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS %		**25%**
	1.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable supply chains	1.3.1. The company incentivises suppliers to reduce GHG and other significant air emissions.	1	0.5
		1.3.2. The company implements incentives and control systems to improve water management by suppliers	1	0.6
		1.3.3. The company implements incentives and control systems to eliminate deforestation from its supply chain	1	0.6
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS TOTAL	**3**	**1.7**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**1.1**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS %		**57%**
	GENERAL CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT - TOTAL NORMALIZED		4.5	**1.9**
	GENERAL CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**42%**
2. Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Steel	**2.1. Disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to steel supply chains**	2.1.1. The company discloses disaggregated GHG emissions for their steel supply chains.	1	1
		DISCLOSE TOTAL	**1**	**1**
		DISCLOSE NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**1.0**
		DISCLOSE %		**100%**

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
Steel	**2.2. Target setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable steel supply chains**	2.2.1. The company has set targets for the use of fossil free and environmentally sustainable steel.	2	0
		2.2.2. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of low-CO2 steel in their annual production cycle.	1	0
		2.2.3. The company has a target for the use of secondary/ scrap steel by 2030.	2	0
		2.2.4. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of recycled steel used in its annual production cycle.	1	0
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS TOTAL	**6**	**0**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**0.0**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS %		**0%**
	2.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable steel supply chains	2.3.1. The company participates in multi-stakeholder procurement initiatives to collaborate with other buyers to incentivise investment in and production of fossil free steel at scale.	1	0
		2.3.2. The company participates in multi-stakeholder standard / certification initiatives to drive investment in and production of socially and environmentally sustainable steel at scale.	1	0
		2.3.3. The company has entered into formal arrangements with suppliers to incentivise investment in and greater production of fossil free steel.	2	0
		2.3.4. The company integrates improved recyclability of steel into automobile design and manufacture.	2	0
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS TOTAL	**6**	**0**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**0.0**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS %		**0%**
	STEEL - TOTAL NORMALIZED		4.5	**1.0**
	STEEL - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**22%**
3.Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Aluminium	3.1. Disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to aluminium	3.1.1. The company discloses disaggregated GHG emissions for their aluminium supply chains.	1	1
		DISCLOSE TOTAL	**1**	**1**
		DISCLOSE NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**1.0**
		DISCLOSE %		**100%**
	3.2. Target setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable aluminum supply chains	3.2.1 The company has set targets for the use of fossil free and environmentally sustainable aluminium	2	0
		3.2.2. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of low-co2 aluminium in their annual production cycle	1	0
		3.2.3. The company has a target to increase use of secondary/scrap aluminium by 2030.	2	0
		3.2.4. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of recycled aluminium used in its annual production cycle	1	0
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS TOTAL	**6**	**0**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**0.0**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS %		**0%**

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
	3.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable aluminium supply chains	3.3.1. The company participates in multi-stakeholder procurement initiatives to collaborate with other buyers to incentivise investment in and production of fossil free aluminium at scale.	1	0
		3.3.2. The company participates in multi-stakeholder standard / certification initiatives to drive investment in and production of socially and environmentally sustainable aluminium	1	0.4
		3.3.3. The company has entered into formal arrangements with suppliers to incentivise investment in and greater production of fossil free aluminium	2	0
		3.3.4. The company integrates improved recyclability of aluminium into automobile design and manufacturing process.	2	1
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS TOTAL	**6**	**1.4**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**0.5**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS %		**23%**
	ALUMINIUM - TOTAL NORMALIZED		4.5	**1.5**
	ALUMINIUM - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**33%**
4. Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Batteries	4.1. Disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to battery supply chains	4.1.1. The company discloses disaggregated scope 3 emissions for their battery supply chains, including a total for the whole battery and disaggregated emissions for key battery minerals (cathode / anode active materials)	1	0.5
		DISCLOSE TOTAL	**1**	**0.5**
		DISCLOSE NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**0.5**
		DISCLOSE %		**50%**
	4.2. Target setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable battery supply chains	4.2.1. The company has set a target to produce fossil free and environmentally sustainable batteries.	1	0
		4.2.2. The company has set a target to reduce reliance on energy intensive minerals in battery production.	1	0.25
		4.2.3. The company has set collection and/or recovery targets for high intensity battery metals.	1	0
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS TOTAL	**3**	**0.25**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**0.1**
		TARGET-SETTING & PROGRESS %		**8%**
	4.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable battery supply chains	4.3.1. The company requires all battery manufacturers to use 100% renewable electricity	2	0
		4.3.3. Company enters into formal agreements (inclusive of joint ventures and investments) with extractives and other value chain companies to reduce the environmental impact of lithium sourcing.	1	0.5
		4.3.4. Company enters into formal agreements (inclusive of joint ventures and investments) with extractives and other value chain companies to reduce the environmental impact of nickel sourcing.	1	0.5
		4.3.5. Company enters into formal agreements (inclusive of joint ventures and investments) with extractives and other value chain companies to reduce the environmental impact of cobalt sourcing.	1	0.5
		4.3.6. The company participates in multi-stakeholder initiatives to collaborate with other buyers to incentivise investment in and production of fossil free and environmentally sustainable batteries at scale.	1	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
		4.3.7. The company invests in the development of new battery chemistries & technologies that reduce their overall material and carbon footprint by reducing the use of emissions-intensive minerals and toxic materials (such as persistent organic pollutants (POPs))	2	2
		4.3.8. The company invests in the development of new battery designs, technologies, systems and/or processes to maximize the recyclability of EV batteries	1	0.5
		4.3.9. The company has established processes for battery repair, reuse and repurposing in order to maximize the usable lifespan of its EV batteries.	1	0.25
		4.3.10. The company has established closed-loop processes in order to maximize the recycling of end-of-life EV batteries	1	0.25
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS TOTAL	**11**	**5.5**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**1.0**
		SUPPLY CHAIN LEVERS %		**50%**
	BATTERIES - TOTAL NORMALIZED		4.5	**1.6**
	BATTERIES - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**36%**
Climate	Influence Map	Multiplier applied:		1.2

CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT - TOTAL NORMALIZED	18.0	**6.0**
CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)		**33%**
CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT - TOTAL NORMALIZED + IM MULTIPLIER		**7.2**
CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED) + IM MULTIPLIER		**40%**

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
1. Responsible Sourcing and Human Rights Due Diligence: General Indicators	**1.1. Commit**	1.1.1. The company has a public commitment to human rights.	1	1
		1.1.2. The company extends their human rights commitments to their Tier 1 suppliers and beyond.	2	1.5
		COMMIT TOTAL	**3**	**2.5**
		COMMIT NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**0.8**
		COMMIT %		**83%**
	1.2. Identify	1.2.1. The company has a process in place to assess salient human rights risks in their supply chain.	1	1
		1.2.2. The company discloses the salient human rights risks in their supply chain and where they are located.	1	0.5
		1.2.3. The company has a process for identifying high risk supplier categories in their supply chain.	1	1
		IDENTIFY TOTAL	**3**	**2.5**
		IDENTIFY NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**1.3**
		IDENTIFY %		**83%**
	1.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	1.3.1. The company assesses the risk of adverse human rights impacts with suppliers prior to entering into any contracts.	2	0.5
		1.3.2. The company discloses how it monitors suppliers for compliance with the SCoC during the contract period.	2	1.2
		1.3.3. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds non-conformances with the SCoC	1.5	1
		1.3.4. The company discloses how they verify the implementation of corrective actions.	1	1
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT TOTAL	**6.5**	**3.7**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**1.1**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT %		**57%**
	1.4. Remedy	1.4.1. The company has put in place a formal mechanism whereby workers, suppliers, suppliers' workers (in any tier) and other external stakeholders can raise grievances regarding adverse human rights impacts in their supply chain to an impartial entity.	2	1
		1.4.2. The company discloses data about the practical operation of their grievance mechanism, such as the number of grievances filed, addressed, and resolved, their type, severity and outcome.	1	0.25
		1.4.3. The company has put in place a remedy process.	2	0.5
		REMEDY TOTAL	**5**	**1.75**
		REMEDY NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**0.7**
		REMEDY %		**35%**
	GENERAL HUMAN RIGHTS - TOTAL NORMALIZED		**6.5**	**3.9**
	GENERAL HUMAN RIGHTS - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**60%**
2. Responsible	**2.1. Commit**	2.1.1. The company has a commitment to responsible metals and minerals sourcing.	1	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
Sourcing of Transition Minerals		2.1.2. The company requires its suppliers to undertake due diligence in accordance with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High Risk Areas (CAHRAs)	2	2
		COMMIT TOTAL	**3**	**3**
		COMMIT NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**1.0**
		COMMIT %		**100%**
	2.2. Identify	2.2.1. The company has a process in place to map transition minerals (e.g. nickel, lithium, cobalt, copper, manganese, zinc) in their supply chains to the point of extraction.	2	2
		2.2.2. The company discloses transition minerals risks in their supply chain and where they are located.	1	1
		2.2.3. The company publishes a list of smelters or refiners (SoR) in its supply chain	1	1
		2.2.4. The company discloses which of the SoRs in its supply chain are conformant with the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI).	1	0
		IDENTIFY TOTAL	**5**	**4**
		IDENTIFY NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**1.2**
		IDENTIFY %		**80%**
	2.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	2.3.1. The company discloses how it monitors suppliers for compliance with the transition minerals due diligence requirements.	2	1.2
		2.3.2. The company formally engages SoRs to build their capacity to conduct due diligence of their own supply chains.	2	0.5
		2.3.3. The company formally engages extractives companies and includes human rights clauses in any contractual arrangements.	2	2
		2.3.4. The company is a member of IRMA and actively engages their suppliers with regards to IRMA mining audits. Note: IRMA does not excuse companies from doing their own supply chain due diligence	2	1.2
		2.3.5. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds non-conformances associated with its responsible minerals sourcing policy occurring in its operations or supply chains.	1.5	1
		2.3.6. The company discloses how they verify the implementation of corrective actions.	1	1
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT TOTAL	**10.5**	**6.9**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**1.3**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT %		**66%**
	2.4. Remedy	2.4.1. The company has put in place a formal mechanism whereby grievances can be raised about SoR facilities.	1	0.5
		REMEDY TOTAL	**1**	**0.5**

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
		REMEDY NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**1.0**
		REMEDY %		**50%**
	TRANSITION MINERALS - TOTAL NORMALIZED		**6.5**	**4.5**
	TRANSITION MINERALS - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**69%**
3. Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)	**3.1. Commit**	3.1.1. The company explicitly commits to respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).	1	0
		3.1.2. The company has a public commitment to FPIC.	1	1
		3.1.3. The company extends their commitment on Indigenous Peoples' rights to their Tier 1 suppliers	2	0
		3.1.4. These commitments are translated into the languages used by the impacted Indigenous Peoples.	1	0
		COMMIT TOTAL	**5**	**1**
		COMMIT NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**0.2**
		COMMIT %		**20%**
	3.2. Identify	3.2.1. The company has a process in place to assess risks to Indigenous Peoples' rights in their supply chain to the point of extraction.	1	0.5
		IDENTIFY TOTAL	**1**	**0.5**
		IDENTIFY NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**0.8**
		IDENTIFY %		**50%**
	3.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	3.3.1. The company provides additional discussion regarding the practices by which suppliers must obtain FPIC	1	1
		3.3.2. The company is a member of a multi-stakeholder group (e.g. IRMA) that includes the participation of Indigenous Peoples to ensure respect of Indigenous Peoples' rights at the point of extraction.	2	1.2
		3.3.3. The company has a formal process in place to engage critical upstream suppliers on FPIC (e.g. extractives companies)	2	0
		3.3.4. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds FPIC breaches in its supply chain.	1	0
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT TOTAL	**6**	**2.2**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**0.7**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT %		**37%**
	3.4. Remedy	3.4.1. The company's grievance mechanism has a process for investigating and remedying breaches of FPIC that includes a formal role for impacted Indigenous Peoples.	1	0
		REMEDY TOTAL	**1**	**0**
		REMEDY NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**0.0**
		REMEDY %		**0%**
	INDIGENOUS RIGHTS - TOTAL NORMALIZED		**6.5**	**1.7**
	INDIGENOUS RIGHTS - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**26%**

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
4. Respect for Workers' Rights	**4.1. Commit**	4.1.1. The company has a commitment to workers' rights	1	0.5
		4.1.2. The company extends their workers' rights commitments to their Tier 1 suppliers and beyond. Note: only the specific worker rights commitments are evaluated here. Whether or not these commitments are extended beyond tier 1 suppliers is evaluated in the "General" human rights section.	2	1.5
		COMMIT TOTAL	**3**	**2**
		COMMIT NORMALIZED	**1.0**	**0.7**
		COMMIT %		**67%**
	4.2. Identify	4.2.1. The company consults trade unions and/or workers' representatives in their assessment of salient workers' rights risks in their supply chain.	1	0
		4.2.2. The company discloses the salient workers rights risks in their supply chain and where they are located.	1	1
		IDENTIFY TOTAL	**2**	**1**
		IDENTIFY NORMALIZED	**1.5**	**0.8**
		IDENTIFY %		**50%**
	4.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	4.3.1. The company actively collaborates with workers and the representative organisation(s) of workers' own choosing to promote respect for workers' rights in its supply chain.	2	0
		4.3.2. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds non-conformances associated with its workers' rights policy occurring in its operations or supply chains.	1.5	1
		4.3.3. The company works with the relevant trade union and/or worker representative organisation to verify the implementation of corrective actions pertaining to workers' rights.	2	0
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT TOTAL	**5.5**	**1**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**0.4**
		PREVENT, MITIGATE & ACCOUNT %		**18%**
	4.4. Remedy	4.4.1 Workers and the representative organisations of workers' own choosing are formally included in the remedy process.	1	0
		REMEDY TOTAL	**1**	**0**
		REMEDY NORMALIZED	**2.0**	**0.0**
		REMEDY %		**0%**
	WORKERS' RIGHTS - TOTAL NORMALIZED		**6.5**	**1.8**
	WORKERS' RIGHTS - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**27%**

HUMAN RIGHTS - TOTAL NORMALIZED	26.0	**11.9**

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Tesla Points
	HUMAN RIGHTS - TOTAL % SCORE (WEIGHTED)			**46%**

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
1. Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Supply Chains (General)	**1.1. Disclosure of emissions, water and deforestation management**	1.1.1. The company discloses total scope 3 GHG emissions due to purchased goods and services.	2	The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** The company discloses scope 3 GHG emissions due to purchased goods and services. **25%:** The company includes scope 3 GHG emissions including purchased goods and services in overall disclosure, but does not disaggregate. Note: the company may achieve additional points under each of the supply chain areas below, if they provide disaggregated emissions against each supply chain.	Tesla discloses its scope 3 GHG emissions by category, including due to purchased goods and services (Impact Report 2023, p. 147). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	2
		1.1.2. The company discloses "significant emissions" in its supply chain.	1	Based on GRI 305-7, significant emissions include: i. NOx ii. SOx iii. Persistent organic pollutants (POP) iv. Volatile organic compounds (VOC) v. Hazardous air pollutants (HAP) vi. Particulate matter (PM) vii. Other standard categories of air emissions identified in relevant regulations The following scores are absolute not cumulative: **100%:** the company discloses significant emissions in their supply chain against all of the above categories. **50%:** the company discloses significant emissions in their supply chain against some of the above catetories.	Not disclosed.	0
		1.1.3. The company discloses water usage by key suppliers in its supply chain.	1	According to GRI 303, water usage includes: - water withdrawn - water consumed - water discharged Companies will need to define "key suppliers" and: **50%:** provide data against some of the above indicators **100%:** provide data against all of the above indicators	Tesla discloses water withdrawal for manufacturing in its 2023 Impact Report (p. 148). But the data only covers Tesla's own manufacturing plants, and does not cover key suppliers. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0
		1.1.4. The company discloses deforestation and conversion-free commodity volumes from its supply chain	1	**50%:** The company discloses the percentage of high-risk hard commodity volumes sourced that are compliant with the company's requirements or policies on deforestation and conversion. OR **25%:** The company discloses deforestation and conversion-free commodity volumes from at least one of its key high-risk hard commodities **50%:** The company discloses the percentage of high-risk soft commodity volumes sourced that are compliant with the company's requirements or policies on deforestation and conversion. OR **25%:** The company discloses deforestation and conversion-free commodity volumes from at least one of its key high-risk soft commodities High-risk commodities are identified with the SBTN's High Impact Commodities List. Relevant commodities for automotive supply chains include Copper, Iron, Lithium, Nickel, Bauxite/Aluminum, Zinc and Manganese (hard commodities), and Leather and Rubber (soft commodities).	Not disclosed.	0

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
	1.2. Target-setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable supply chains	1.2.1. The company has set and disclosed a scope 3 SBT (must include reference to upstream/purchased goods & not only 'Well to Wheel')	2	**100%:** the company discloses a verified science-based scope three target that includes upstream/purchased goods, including 2050 and interim year target(s). **50%:** the company discloses a lifecycle target that includes upstream/purchased goods, including 2050 and interim year target(s) and/or does not indicate if it has been verified as science-based. **25%:** the company only discloses 2050 zero emissions target with no interim target and/or it does not specify upstream/purchased goods.	Not disclosed.	0
		1.2.2. The company commits to having suppliers provide science-based targets for GHG emissions.	1	The following scores are absolute not cumulative. **100%:** the company requires all its tier 1 suppliers, and their suppliers to set science-based targets. They also require tier 2 suppliers to set science-based targets. **75%:** the company requires all its tier 1 suppliers set science-based targets. **50%:** the company commits to having at least 70% of its key suppliers by emissions setting science-based targets by 2025. **25%:** company commits to having suppliers setting science-based emissions targets, but does not provide a target date or target date is after 2025. **0%:** Company does not have a commitment.	Tesla does not have a commitment or requirement across its tier 1 suppliers. But it states that it "began requiring battery suppliers to provide GHG reduction plans and progress updates, with science-aligned reduction targets set at the cell, cathod, and refining smelting levels" in 2023 and will work closely with suppliers in the battery supply chain to develop GHG reduction targest and roadmaps in 2024 (2023 Impact Report, p. 108). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.25
		1.2.3. The company discloses the current percentage of suppliers providing science-based targets.	1	**25%:** they disclose the current percentage of tier 1 suppliers providing science-based targets. **25%:** they disclose the current percentage of tier 2 suppliers providing science-based targets. **25%:** additional points for over 50% of tier 1 suppliers providing science-based targets **25%:** additional points for all tier 1 suppliers providing science-based targets.	Tesla discloses that 9 suppliers in its battery supply chain set science-aligned GHG reduction targets (2023 Impact Report, p. 108). However, this is not enough for Tesla to get credit for this indicator. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0
		1.2.4. The company requires all significant suppliers to set water reduction targets and disclose their water usage.	1	**50%:** the company requires tier 1 suppliers to set water reduction targets **50%:** the company requires tier 1 suppliers to disclose their water usage. According to GRI 303, water usage includes: - water withdrawn - water consumed - water discharged	Tesla requires supliers to "implement a water management program that documents, characterizes, and monitors water sources, use and discharge" and "supply the data for all products and related services to Tesla upon request" (Supplier Code of Conduct, p. 6). Suppliers are also expected to "adopt or establish a management system" that includes setting up targets. Supplier Code of Conduct https://digitalassets.tesla.com/tesla-contents/image/upload/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		1.2.5. The company has programs in place to monitor suppliers for compliance with GHG emissions targets and other environmental impacts.	1	**25%:** The company has a process that includes reducing GHGs and other environmental impacts, but lacks targets as a basis for compliance. or **50%**: The company has a process that includes reducing GHGs and other environmental impacts, and includes targets as a basis for compliance. plus **25%:** the company provides quantitative information of the number of suppliers audited and the tiers that are audited. **25%:** the company provides qualitative case studies of how they have engaged suppliers on their targets.	The Supplier Code of Conduct (p. 6) has a requirement for suppliers to "improve energy efficiency and to minimize their energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions", and states that Tesla may conduct audits or assessments to ensure compliance with the Code. However the company does not include targets as a basis for compliance. Tesla collects GHG datapoints through its GHG survey or LCAs provided by suppliers (2023 Impact Report, p. 107) and discloses the number of audits that it conducted in 2023, including those on the environment aspect (2023 Impact Report, p. 140). Supplier Code of Conduct https://digitalassets.tesla.com/tesla-contents/image/upload/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5
		1.2.6. The company commits to eliminate deforestation and the conversion of all natural ecosystems from their supply chains.	1	The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** The company has time-bound targets to eliminate deforestation and the conversion of natural ecosystems from their supply chain. OR **100%:** The company has time-bound targets to eliminate sourcing of high-risk commodities from areas of High Carbon Stock (HCS) and High Conservation Value (HCV). **75%:** The company has time-bound targets to eliminate deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems in the supply chain of at least one of its high-risk hard commodities, and at least one soft-commodity. OR **75%:** The company has time-bound targets to eliminate sourcing from areas of High Carbon Stock (HCS) and High Conservation Value (HCV) for at least one of its high-risk hard commodities, and at least one soft-commodity. **50%:** The company has time-bound targets to eliminate deforestation and conversion of natural ecosystems in the supply chain of at least one of its high-risk commodities. OR **50%:** The company has time-bound targets to eliminate sourcing from areas of High Carbon Stock (HCS) and High Conservation Value (HCV) for at least one of its high-risk commodities. **25%:** The company has a general commitment or policy to halt deforestation and the conversion of natural ecosystems in its supply chains, which extends beyond illegal deforestation or conversion.	Not disclosed.	0
	1.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable supply chains	1.3.1. The company incentivises suppliers to reduce GHG and other significant air emissions.	1	**50%:** the company specifies that sustainability and/or ESG are included as factors for choosing a preferred supplier. **25%:** the company specifies that GHG emissions are included in the tender and contracting process. **25%**: the company specifies that "other significant air emissions" targets are included in the tender and contracting process. As companies are unlikely to publish their contract information, references may be found in sustainability reports, procurement policies, etc.	Tesla states that "In 2023, we added responsible sourcing due diligence to Tesla's internal Global Procurement Policy supplier selection guidelines to include social and environmental criteria in sourcing decisions before awarding business to any supplier", with criteria including GHG emissions, CSR audit scores and SAQ results. It is unclear if GHG targets and other significant emissions targets are included in the tender and contracting process. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		1.3.2. The company implements incentives and control systems to improve water management by suppliers	1	**20%:** The company's Supplier Code of Conduct and / or Responsible Sourcing Policy includes specific requirements for suppliers with regards to water management and conservation (e.g. having in place a water management plan). **40%:** The company implements purchase control systems to incentivize improved water management by (potential) new suppliers (e.g. water management is explicitly taken into account in the tender process and is a factor in selecting suppliers) **40%:** The company provides evidence of policies, systems and/or processes it has operationalized to manage risks and address impacts of water depletion/pollution by (existing) suppliers (e.g. the company provides detail of specific water risks it has identified as part of its supply chain risk assessment process; the company provides evidence of how they have engaged with, or suspended, noncompliant suppliers on water management, etc.).	Tesla includes water management requirement in its Supplier CoC (p. 6). It also mentions "improving water quality" as a standalone priority engagement area for its supply chain in its 2023 Impact Report (p. 106). It does not mention how it incentivizes improved water management by (potential) new suppliers. Supplier Code of Conduct (2021) https://digitalassets.tesla.com/tesla-contents/image/upload/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.6
		1.3.3. The company implements incentives and control systems to eliminate deforestation from its supply chain	1	**20%:** The company's Supplier Code of Conduct and / or Responsible Sourcing Policy includes specific requirements for suppliers with regards to deforestation and land conversion. **40%:** The company implements purchase control systems to incentivize compliance on deforestation and land conversion by (potential) new suppliers (e.g. deforestation is explicitly taken into account in the tender process and is a factor in choosing a preferred supplier) **40%:** The company provides evidence of policies, systems and/or processes it has operationalized to manage risks and address impacts of deforestation and land conversion by existing suppliers (e.g. the company provides detail of specific deforestation risks it has identified as part of its supply chain risk assessment process; the company provides evidence of how they have engaged with, or suspended, noncompliant suppliers on deforestation, etc.).	Tesla mentions deforestation among "salient responsible sourcing issues" in its Responsible Sourcing Policy. In its 2023 Impact Report, it includes "Protecting forests and biodiversity" as a standalone engagement area (p. 106) and provides a case study of engaging with gold supplier/refiner with alleged deforestation practice that led to an outcome of "Encouraged removal of certain actors from Tesla's upstream supply chain "(p. 136). Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/en_eu/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.6
2. Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Steel	**2.1. Disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to steel supply chains**	2.1.1. The company discloses disaggregated GHG emissions for their steel supply chains.	1	The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** The company discloses scope 3 GHG emissions for purchased goods and services, disaggregated for their steel supply chains **50%:** The company discloses a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) for at least one electric vehicle model that includes disaggregated data on the embodied GHG emissions from the steel used in that vehicle.	Tesla discloses that steel accounts for 6.48% of its commodity supply chain emissions (2023 Impact Report, p. 107). Although there is no disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to steel supply chains in absolute quantity, it could be calculated based on the disclosure of the Category 1 of scope 3 emissions (purchased goods and services). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
	2.2. Target setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable steel supply chains	2.2.1. The company has set targets for the use of fossil free and environmentally sustainable steel.	2	The scores below are not additive. They indicate specific thresholds for getting that percentage of points: **100%:** the company has a commitment to source 100% fossil free steel by 2050 and 50% fossil free steel by 2030. **80%:** the company has a commitment to source 100% Responsible Steel Level 4 certified steel by 2040 and 50% automotive steel that is ResponsibleSteel level 3 or 4 by 2030 (targets that align with ResponsibleSteel's emissions thresholds for these levels will also be awarded points). **60%:** the company has set a target that is aligned with First Movers Coalition guidance of 10% "low-CO2" primary steel by 2030 AND/OR aligns with SteelZero Commitment to source 100% net zero steel by 2050, with an interim commitment of using 50% Lower Emission Steel by 2030 **40%:** the company has an emissions reduction target for steel that is aligned with IEA Heavy Industry Guidance (27% emissions reduction by 2030 and 95% by 2050) **20%:** the company has a commitment to net zero steel by 2050 and/or a 2030 emissions reduction target for steel that is below the IEA Heavy Industry Guidance	Not disclosed.	0
		2.2.2. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of low-CO2 steel in their annual production cycle.	1	**50%:** The company discloses the current percentage of low-C02 steel in their production cycle (definition of low-CO2 steel taken from SteelZero / ResponsibleSteel, specifically < 2 tons CO2e/ton for primary steel with 0% scrap through to < 0.35 tons CO2e/ton for secondary steel with 100% scrap). **50%:** the company discloses the current percentage of Responsible Steel certified steel in their supply chain. Note: depending on the level of certification, companies may score points under the first category. MODIFIER: Half points will be awarded if a company discloses information that meets either, or both, of the above criteria but only for some elements in its annual production cycle.	Not disclosed.	0
		2.2.3. The company has a target for the use of secondary/ scrap steel by 2030.	2	**100%:** the company discloses a target for the use of recycled steel that is aligned with IEA Guidance for Heavy Industry has recycling, re-use: scrap as share of input in steel production as 54% by 2030 **50%:** the company discloses a target for the use of recycled steel.	Not disclosed.	0

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points	
		2.2.4. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of recycled steel used in its annual production cycle.	1	The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** the company discloses the percentage of recycled steel in their annual production cycle including volumes of both pre- and post-consumer steel. **75%:** the company discloses the percentage of recycled steel in their annual production cycle. **50%:** The company partially discloses the percentage of recycled steel for some elements within their annual production cycle. NB: Total recycled/scrap steel volume is sufficient if total steel volume is disclosed.	Not disclosed.	0	
	2.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable steel supply chains	2.3.1. The company participates in multi-stakeholder procurement initiatives to collaborate with other buyers to incentivise investment in and production of fossil free steel at scale	1	**50%:** the company is a member of SteelZero. **50%:** the company is a member of the First Movers Coalition's sector group on steel	Tesla is not a member of SteelZero or the First Movers Coalition's sector group on steel. https://www.theclimategroup.org/steelzero-members https://initiatives.weforum.org/first-movers-coalition/community	0	
		2.3.2. The company participates in multi-stakeholder standard / certification initiatives to drive investment in and production of socially and environmentally sustainable steel at scale	1	**25%:** the company is a member of ResponsibleSteel. **50%:** the company actively engages their steel suppliers regarding ResponsibleSteel certification. **25%:** the company has disclosed purchasing commitments for ResponsibleSteel certified steel. Note: 0.6 points modifier applied due to multistakeholder initiative assessment. See sheet 8.	Tesla is not a member of ResponsibleSteel. https://www.responsiblesteel.org/members-and-associates	0	
		2.3.3. The company has entered into formal arrangements with suppliers to incentivise investment in and greater production of fossil free steel.	2	**50%:** the company states that it has entered into a formal arrangement with at least one steel supplier to invest in and scale-up production of low-CO2 steel. **25%:** at least one purchase agreement signed by the company with a steel supplier for the provision of low-CO2 steel is a binding contract for which timelines and scale of supply (e.g. volume of steel to be purchased per year) are publicly disclosed. **25%:** at least one purchase agreement signed by the company is for the provision of steel produced with new technologies for fossil-free steelmaking.	Not disclosed.	0	
		2.3.4. The company integrates improved recyclability of steel into automobile design and manufacture.	2	**25%:** the company discloses that it is implementing a closed-loop process for steel (no reference to post-consumer scrap). **OR** **50%:** the company provides detail on a closed-loop process it is implementing for steel (must include reference to post-consumer scrap). **PLUS** **50%:** the company provides detail of how it uses automotive and/or component design to improve the recyclability of steel.	Not disclosed.	0	

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points	
3.Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Aluminium	**3.1. Disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to aluminium**	3.1.1. The company discloses disaggregated GHG emissions for their aluminium supply chains.	1	The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** The company discloses scope 3 GHG emissions for purchased goods and services, disaggregated for their aluminum supply chains **50%:** The company discloses a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) for at least one electric vehicle model that includes disaggregated data on the embodied GHG emissions from the aluminum used in that vehicle.	Tesla discloses that aluminium accounts for 11.45% of its commodity supply chain emissions (2023 Impact Report, p. 107). Although there is no disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to steel supply chains in absolute quantity, it could be estimated based on the disclosure of the Category 1 of scope 3 emissions (purchased goods and services). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1	
	3.2. Target setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable aluminum supply chains	3.2.1 The company has set targets for the use of fossil free and environmentally sustainable aluminium	2	The scores below are not additive. They indicate specific thresholds for getting that percentage of points: **100%:** The company has a commitment to source 100% fossil free Aluminium by 2050 and 50% fossil free Aluminium by 2030. **80%:** the company has set a target that is aligned with Mission Possible 1.5 scenario all primary aluminium being produced with low-carbon power by 2035 **60%:** the company has set a target that is aligned with First Movers Coalition guidance of 10% "low-CO2" primary aluminium by 2030 (definition of low-CO2 taken from First Movers Coalition, specifically < 3 tons CO2e/ton). **40%:** the company has an emissions reduction target for aluminum that is aligned with IEA Heavy Industry Guidance (27% emissions reduction by 2030 and 95% by 2050) **20%:** the company has a commitment to net zero aluminum by 2050 and/or a 2030 emissions reduction target for aluminum that is below the IEA Heavy Industry Guidance	Not disclosed.	0	
		3.2.2. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of low-co2 aluminium in their annual production cycle	1	The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** the company discloses the percentage of "low-CO2" aluminium in their supply chain (low-CO2 defined as either aluminum with a carbon footprint of less than 4 CO2e/t Al or aluminum that is produced with renewable electricity). **50%:** The company partially discloses the percentage of low-co2 aluminum for some elements within their annual production cycle.	Not disclosed.	0	
		3.2.3. The company has a target to increase use of secondary/scrap aluminium by 2030.	2	These scores are not cumulative, they are thresholds for achieving a particular score. **100%:** the company discloses a target for use of secondary or scrap aluminium that is aligned with IEA Net Zero 42% secondary/scrap by 2030. **50%:** the company discloses a target for use of secondary or scrap aluminium that is less than IEA Net Zero 42% secondary/scrap by 2030.	Not disclosed.	0	
		3.2.4. The company publishes progress towards their target by disclosing the current percentage of recycled aluminium used in its annual production cycle	1	**100%:** the company discloses the percentage of recycled aluminium in their annual production cycle including volumes of both pre- and post-consumer aluminium. **75%:** the company discloses the percentage of recycled aluminium in their annual production cycle. **50%:** the company partially discloses the percentage of recycled aluminium for some elements with their annual production cycle. NB: Total recycled/scrap steel volume is sufficient if total steel volume is disclosed.	Not disclosed.	0	

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
	3.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable aluminium supply chains	3.3.1. The company participates in multi-stakeholder procurement initiatives to collaborate with other buyers to incentivise investment in and production of fossil free aluminium	1	**100%:** the company is a member of First Movers Coalition sector group on aluminum	Tesla is not a member of First Movers Coalition sector group on aluminum. https://initiatives.weforum.org/first-movers-coalition/community	0
		3.3.2. The company participates in multi-stakeholder standard / certification initiatives to drive investment in and production of socially and environmentally sustainable aluminium	1	**25%:** the company is a member of the Aluminum Stewardship Initiative (ASI). **50%:** the company actively engages their aluminum suppliers regarding ASI certification. **25%:** the company has disclosed purchasing commitments for ASI certified aluminum. Note: 0.4 points modifier applied due to multistakeholder initiative assessment. See sheet 8.	Tesla is a member of ASI. Tesla states that "as a pre-requisite for being awarded new business, Tesla continues to ask its suppliers to certify to the Aluminium Stewardship Initiative's (ASI) Performance Standard" (2023 Impact Report, p. 127). Tesla commits to work with ASI, suppliers, and stakeholders to address and reduce risks in its aluminum supply chain. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf https://aluminium-stewardship.org/about-asi/members	0.4
		3.3.3. The company has entered into formal arrangements with suppliers to incentivise investment in and greater production of fossil free aluminium	2	**50%:** the company states that it has entered into a formal arrangement with at least one aluminum supplier to invest in and scale-up production of low-CO2 aluminium. **25%:** at least one purchase agreement signed by the company with a aluminum supplier for the provision of low-CO2 aluminium is a binding contract for which timelines and scale of supply (e.g. volume of aluminium to be purchased per year) are publicly disclosed. **25%:** at least one purchase agreement signed by the company is for the provision of aluminum produced with new technologies for fossil-free aluminum production.	Not disclosed.	0
		3.3.4. The company integrates improved recyclability of aluminium into automobile design and manufacturing process.	2	**25%:** the company discloses that it is implementing a closed-loop process for aluminum (no reference to post-consumer scrap). **OR** **50%:** the company provides detail on a closed-loop process it is implementing for aluminum (must include reference to post-consumer scrap). **PLUS** **50%:** the company provides detail of how it uses automotive and/or component design to improve the recyclability of aluminum. Note: this could include the development of new alloys.	Tesla discusses its in-house aluminium alloy development, "which allows for recycled inputs to be utilized in high-performance applications," (2022 Impact Report, p. 178). Tesla states that it "supports the use of recycled aluminium" but with no further indication that there is a closed-loop process for auminium.	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points	
4. Fossil Free and Environmentally Sustainable Batteries	**4.1. Disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to battery supply chains**	4.1.1. The company discloses disaggregated scope 3 emissions for their battery supply chains, including a total for the whole battery and disaggregated emissions for key battery minerals (cathode / anode active materials)	1	The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** the company provides scope 3 GHG emissions their battery supply chain, disaggregated for cell production / manufacturing and key cathode / anode active materials (i.e. individual minerals) used in the battery **75%:** the company provides scope 3 GHG emissions their battery supply chain, disaggregated for cell production / manufacturing and cathode and anode active materials (as a total) **50%:** The company discloses scope 3 GHG emissions for purchased goods and services, disaggregated for their battery supply chain. **25%:** The company discloses a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) for at least one electric vehicle model that includes disaggregated data on the embodied GHG emissions from the battery used in that vehicle.	Tesla discloses that battery accounts for 23.26% of its commodity supply chain emissions (2023 Impact Report, p. 107). Although there is no disclosure of scope 3 GHG emissions due to battery supply chains in absolute quantity, it could be calculated based on the disclosure of the Category 1 of scope 3 emissions (purchased goods and services). However, there is no disclosure of disaggregates GHG emissions for cell production and battery minerals. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5	
	4.2. Target setting and progress towards fossil free and environmentally sustainable battery supply chains	4.2.1. The company has set a target to produce fossil free and environmentally sustainable batteries.	1	The scores below are not additive. They indicate specific thresholds for getting that percentage of points: **100%:** the company has a commitment to produce 100% fossil free batteries by 2050 and 50% fossil free batteries by 2030. **50%:** Alignment with IEA Heavy Industry Guidance (27% emissions reduction by 2030 and 95% by 2050) **25%:** Commitment below IEA Heavy Industry Guidance.	Not disclosed	0	
		4.2.2. The company has set a target to reduce reliance on energy intensive minerals in battery production.	1	**25%:** statement of intent to reduce high intensity minerals in battery production (which may include a commitment to producing smaller batteries). **25%:** the company has set a disaggregated target for the reduction of primary sources of **nickel** in their supply chain. **25%:** the company has set a disaggregated target for the reduction of primary sources of **lithium** in their supply chain. **25%:** the company has set a disaggregated target for the reduction of primary sources of **cobalt** in their supply chain. Note: The final three scoring criteria can also be met by setting targets for increasing the % recycled nickel/lithium/cobalt used in new batteries.	Tesla explains how it is increasing their use of iron-based batteries in order to reduce its reliance on cobalt: "While our nickelbased cathodes will continue to need cobalt, they contain less cobalt than similar cathode chemistries in the industry, and we are increasing our use of cobalt free iron-based batteries, particularly for energy storage and standard range products. " (2023 Impact Report, p.117) 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.25	
		4.2.3. The company has set collection and/or recovery targets for high intensity battery metals.	1	**100%:** the company has a medium term target of 95% recovery for cobalt & nickel with 70% lithium by 2030 (equal to that proposed by the EU) and a short term target of 90% recovery rate for cobalt & nickel and 35% lithium by 2025. **25%:** the company has set collection and/or recovery targets for high intensity battery metals that are lower and/or not disaggregated.	Not disclosed	0	

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
	4.3. Use of supply chain levers to achieve fossil free and environmentally sustainable battery supply chains	4.3.1. The company requires all battery manufacturers to use 100% renewable electricity	2	**100%:** the company discloses a requirement that all battery manufacturers are required to use 100% renewable electricity. **50%:** the company discloses agreements/requirements for 100% renewable energy with some battery manufacturers **25%:** the company discloses agreements/requirements for reduced emissions with some battery manufacturers or **50%:** the company discloses a requirement that all battery manufacturers are required to be "carbon neutral", "net zero" or similar but does not define how they are using the term.	Not disclosed	0
		4.3.3. Company enters into formal agreements (inclusive of joint ventures and investments) with extractives and other value chain companies to reduce the environmental impact of lithium sourcing.	1	**25%:** the company has entered into contractual agreements for the purchase of low CO2 lithium. These agreements may include purchasing commitments, and/or other forms of investment, including R&D. **25%:** the company has entered into contractual agreements to reduce other environmental impacts of lithium sourcing, including by incorporating environmental conditions into contracts with suppliers. **25%:** the company discloses the specific areas or requirements that such environmental conditions included in contracts cover. This may include requirements regarding water usage, biodiversity, tailings management, etc. but the company must explain how these conditions address specific environmental risks associated with lithium sourcing. **25%:** The company engages in multi-stakeholder initiative(s) to reduce impacts on sourcing (e.g. emissions, water, biodiversity etc.). Any such initiatives must be specific to lithium mining / refining.	Tesla sources more than 75% of its lithium directly from mines and refiners in 2023 (2023 Impact Report, p. 125). Tesla states in its 2022 Impact Report (p. 153) that “all contracts (for direct sourcing) include binding environmental and social requirements” but does not specify what these are for lithium. Tesla also chairs the Lithium Working Group in the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) (p. 126). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5
		4.3.4. Company enters into formal agreements (inclusive of joint ventures and investments) with extractives and other value chain companies to reduce the environmental impact of nickel sourcing.	1	**25%:** the company has entered into contractual agreements for the purchase of low CO2 nickel. These agreements may include purchasing commitments, and/or other forms of investment, including R&D. **25%:** the company has entered into contractual agreements to reduce other environmental impacts of nickel sourcing, including by incorporating environmental conditions in contracts with suppliers. **25%:** the company discloses the specific areas or requirements that such environmental conditions included in contracts cover. This may include requirements regarding water usage, biodiversity, tailings management, etc. but the company must explain how these conditions address specific environmental risks associated with nickel sourcing. **25%:** The company engages in multi-stakeholder initiative(s) to reduce impacts on sourcing (e.g. emissions, water, biodiversity etc.). Any such initiatives must be specific to nickel mining / refining.	Tesla sources more than 50% of nickel directly from mines and refiners in 2023 Impact Report (p. 122). Tesla states in its 2022 Impact Report (p. 153) that “all contracts (for direct sourcing) include binding environmental and social requirements” but does specify what these are for nickel. Tesla chairs the Nickel Working Group in the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf 2022 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2022-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points	
		4.3.5. Company enters into formal agreements (inclusive of joint ventures and investments) with extractives and other value chain companies to reduce the environmental impact of cobalt sourcing.	1	**25%:** the company has entered into contractual agreements for the purchase of low CO2 cobalt. These agreements may include purchasing commitments, and/or other forms of investment, including R&D. **25%:** the company has entered into contractual agreements to reduce other environmental impacts of cobalt sourcing, including by incorporating environmental conditions into contracts with suppliers **25%:** the company discloses the specific areas or requirements that the environmental conditions included in contracts cover. This may include requirements regarding water usage, biodiversity, tailings management, etc. but the company must explain how these conditions address specific environmental risks associated with cobalt sourcing. **25%:** The company engages in multi-stakeholder initiative(s) to reduce impacts on sourcing (e.g. emissions, water, biodiversity etc.)	Tesla discloses that more than 55% of its cobalt is sourced directly from mines or smelters in 2023 (2023 Impact Report, p. 119). Tesla states in its 2022 Impact Report (p. 153) that "all contracts (for direct sourcing) include binding environmental and social requirements". Tesla continues to co-fund the Fair Cobalt Alliance (FCA) working with artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) communities in the DRC (p. 118). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf 2022 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2022-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5	
		4.3.6. The company participates in multi-stakeholder initiatives to collaborate with other buyers to incentivise investment in and production of fossil free and environmentally sustainable batteries at scale.	1	**100%:** the company is a member of the Global Battery Alliance.	Tesla is a member of the Global Battery Alliance. https://www.globalbattery.org/about/members/	1	
		4.3.7. The company invests in the development of new battery chemistries & technologies that reduce their overall material and carbon footprint by reducing the use of emissions-intensive minerals and toxic materials (such as persistent organic pollutants (POPs))	2	**25%:** the company provides examples of R&D that they are conducting to develop new battery chemistries / technologies that reduce the use of emissions-intensive minerals and/or toxic pollutants. R&D could be done in house or via formal partnerships with battery manufacturers. **25%:** the company provides examples of the systems and processes it is developing to scale this R&D to commercial production. **50%:** the company has brought to market electric vehicles that utilize battery chemistries / technologies that meet the above criteria.	Tesla states that its nickel-based cathodes contain less cobalt than similar cathode chemistries in the industry, and it is increasing the use of cobalt-free iron-based cathodes (LFP)/batteries, particularly for energy storage and standard range products (2023 Impact Report, p. 117). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	2	

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Score Attribution (Scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified)	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		4.3.8. The company invests in the development of new battery designs, technologies, systems and/or processes to maximize the recyclability of EV batteries	1	**25%:** the company provides examples of R&D that they are conducting in-house or in partnership with value chain partners to improve the safe and effective recycling of batteries (for example direct recycling). **25%:** the company provides examples of the systems and processes it is developing to scale this R&D to commercial production. **50%:** the company provides examples of battery recycling processes it has developed in-house or in partnership with value chain partners that have achieved recovery rates of at least 95% cobalt/nickel & 70% lithium. Note disclosed recovery rates achieved at the pilot / R&D stage are valid for points here. Disclosure of recycling rates achieved at commercial scale is evaluated in indicator 4.3.10.	Tesla discloses that there is development of scalable battery recycling technologies as well as a reverse logistics system to recover batteries from sold products in its 2022 Impact Report (p. 162). No additional details are disclosed. 2022 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2022-tesla-impact-report.pdf 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5
		4.3.9. The company has established processes for battery repair, reuse and repurposing in order to maximize the usable lifespan of its EV batteries.	1	**25%:** the company indicates that there are processes in place (such as inspection, design, access to battery information, collection and transportation, etc.) for **repairing, reusing and/or repurposing** batteries. **25%:** the company provides qualitative information about processes (including the establishment and operation of collection points) to increase the % of batteries being collected for reuse, repurposing and/or recycling **50%**: the company provides quantitative information about the collection of batteries (i.e total numbers and / or percentages of batteries collected)	Tesla states that "to enhance our collection of end-of-life products for recycling, we expanded the Tesla Operating System to include recovery of end-of-life vehicles and battery packs", indicating a process to increase the % of batteries being collected (2023 Impact Report, p. 110). Tesla indicates (p. 112) that "650MWh of battery materials processed at our battery shredding facility, which is enough for 9,000+ Model Y RWD vehicles". However, it is unclear how many batteries were collected. There is no disclosure about battery reuse or repurposing - just on the recover of raw materials. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf 2022 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2022-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.25
		4.3.10. The company has established closed-loop processes in order to maximize the recycling of end-of-life EV batteries	1	**25%:** the company indicates that there is a closed-loop process in place for **recycling** batteries (that involves recovering raw materials). **25%:** the company provides detail on the battery recycling process / method(s) used and discloses that they do not use incineration / high-temperature combustion processes. **50%:** the company provides quantitative information about the % of batteries currently being recycled (at commercial scale).	Tesla has an in-house recycling process for retrieving battery minerals. Tesla also discloses the quantitative of information about the tonnage of materials recovered (nickel, cobalt, copper and lithium) and that none of its batteries goes to landfill. It also discloses the amount of materials recovered from returned or end-of-life products and manufacturing scrap (which is more than 90%) (2023 Impact Report, p. 112; 2022 Impact Report, p. 162). However, specific data on the % of batteries currently being recycled is not disclosed. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.25
5. Climate Lobbying		Performance Band (A+ to F) is a full measures of a company's climate policy engagement, accounting for both its own engagement and that of its industry associations.	Multiplier of total category score	A=1.3 B=1.2 C=1.1 N/D = 1 D=0.9 E= 0.8 F=0.7	B https://lobbymap.org/company/Telsa-Motors	1.2

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
1. Responsible Sourcing and Human Rights Due Diligence: General Indicators	**1.1. Commit**	1.1.1. The company has a public commitment to human rights.	1		**100%:** the company has a standalone human rights policy or other formal commitment that it will respect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Bill of Rights, or commit to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs).	Tesla has a Global Human Rights Policy (GHRP) in which the company commits to upholding and respecting human rights, recognises the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and commits to implementing the UNGPs. Global Human Rights Policy (GHRP) https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy	1
		1.1.2. The company extends their human rights commitments to their Tier 1 suppliers and beyond.	2		**50%:** the company has a Supplier Code of Conduct (SCoC) or equivalent that is easily accessible from their website. The SCoC explicitly references the company's human rights policy or states that suppliers are required to respect and/or uphold all human rights. **OR** **25%:** the company has a Supplier Code of Conduct (SCoC) or equivalent that is easily accessible from their website. The SCoC explicitly references human rights but only requires suppliers to respect a limited selection of human rights listed by the company. **PLUS** **50%:** the company "requires" or otherwise mandates their suppliers to apply the requirements of the SCoC to their own suppliers. **OR** **25%:** the company "expects" or "encourages" their suppliers to apply these standards to their own suppliers.	Tesla's SCoC entitled "Mission: to accelerate the world's transition to sustainable energy" explicitly references the company's GHRP and Responsible Sourcing Policy (first page). The company's GHRP also outlines requirements for suppliers: "The [Global Human Rights] Policy outlines the core standards and expectations we have established for our… suppliers … in the area of human rights." "It is also embedded in our Supplier Code of Conduct, and we expect our suppliers and business partners to implement effective systems to adhere to this Policy." It is not clear weather suppliers are required or just expected to apply the same requirements to their own suppliers. The SCoC states: "We expect our suppliers to not just conduct business consistent with this Code, but also to set similar expectations with their own supply chain." "Supplier Responsibility: A process to communicate Code requirements to suppliers and to monitor supplier compliance to the Code." (last page). The language used does not denote a mandatory character. In addition, "communicate Code requirements" could mean ensuring suppliers' own suppliers are made aware of the requirements direct suppliers are under. There do not appear to be other aspects which would denote a mandatory character such as clear steps or consequences for infringements. Supplier Code of Conduct https://www.tesla.com/sites/default/files/about/legal/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf Global Human Rights Policy (GHRP) https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy	1.5
	1.2. Identify	1.2.1. The company has a process in place to assess salient human rights risks in their supply chain.	1		**25%:** the company states that there is a process in place for identifying salient human rights risks. **25%:** the company explains its methodology for identifying risks (e.g. desktop review) and prioritising them. **25%:** the company specifies how often they repeat this risk assessment. **25%:** the company specifies if and how they engage with external human rights experts. Note: this engagement must be specific to the company and its supply chains to be scored here. Simply participating in a multistakeholder initiative that includes human rights experts is not sufficient, unless the company has articulated how it applies the information gained via these initiatives to their own supply chain. Finally, effective risk identification involves consultation with potentially impacted stakeholders. We have included additional indicators under each section below to reflect this.	Tesla describes its human rights risk identification process in its Impact Report. The company states that in 2023 they conducted a broad sustainability assessment which included salient human rights risks. The process is described broadly, with a suggestion that this is an ongoing effort: "we will continue to evaluate the saliency of these risks and opportunities periodically to inform our overall strategy" (p. 8). The company also describes its human rights-specific risk assessment process, which it considers "a foundational pillar of Tesla's Responsible Sourcing framework to understand human rights and environment-related risks and violations in its supply chain." The report contains some details about methodology and prioritisation criteria both in generic terms (p. 132-3), and in relation to specific risks or materials (p. 113-130). The company also describes this as "an ongoing effort" (p. 12). The company indicates that its broad sustainability assessment included "surveying global stakeholders", and its human rights risk assessment "involves engaging with and incorporating input from external stakeholders" (p. 8, 12). Tesla's Global Human Rights Policy also points out that "assessing and addressing human rights risks … involves engaging with and incorporating input from external stakeholders of potential impact, including stakeholders impacted by our operations and our supply chain…". In its Impact Report, the company provides examples of instances in which they considered feedback on human rights from NGOs (e.g. in the context of forced labour risk assessments, p. 113, in relation to cobalt human rights issues, p. 119, and nickel human rights issues, p. 120, 122) and solicited feedback from NGOs on specific human rights concerns (e.g. DRC NGOs on IPs' rights, p. 130). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf Global Human Rights Policy (GHRP) https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy "	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		1.2.2. The company discloses the salient human rights risks in their supply chain and where they are located.	1		The following scores are absolute not cumulative: **25%:** the company names the generic, salient risks in their supply chain (e.g. conflict minerals, forced labour, water security, etc.). **50%:** the company discloses where in their supply chain these risks occur, by reference to geographical location, material type, and/or tier. Note: greater level of specificity on all these elements is expected under indicator 2.2.2 on transition minerals risks. **100%:** the company provides additional description of these risks. Note: to score here, the description must be based on findings from the company's due diligence measures, and not constitute a generic description.	Tesla's GHRP names the generic, salient risks they have identified in their operations and supply chain. These include health and safety, forced labour, child labour, the right of workers to form and join trade unions and collective bargaining, non-discrimination and equal opportunities, etc. Tesla's Responsible Sourcing Policy also names salient responsible sourcing issues, including health and safety in the trade, handling and transport of materials, "serious human rights abuses associated with the production/extraction, transport, or trade of materials, particularly, but not limited to, materials from CAHRAs", child labour, disrespecting indigenous rights, war crimes, etc. Tesla's Impact Report discloses where in the supply chain some of these risks occur, including by reference to material type, tier, or location. The company does not provide additional description of these risks based on findings from their due diligence measures. Global Human Rights Policy (GHRP) https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5
		1.2.3. The company has a process for identifying high risk supplier categories in their supply chain.	1		**50%:** the company outlines the process for how they identify high risk supplier categories in Tier 1 in order to prioritise differential assurance actions. This may include taking into account the leverage that the automotive company has to affect change (e.g. their annual spend, whether they are a primary or majority buyer, etc.), the geography of suppliers, and the severity of the risks that have been identified. **25%:** the company outlines how this process extends beyond tier 1. Note: this does not necessarily have to involve a process that extends to the point of extraction, as this is covered below in the transition minerals section. **25%:** the company outlines the types of differential assurance actions it uses to manage those risks. Note: to score here, it must do more than indicate that there are differential assurance actions, it must specify what those are.	Tesla outlines the process for identifying high risk suppliers in its Impact Report. The company uses a Supplier Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) for "each unique location providing production parts, materials or services to Tesla". The company also uses audits and the Integrity Line to identify risks. In relation to high-risk suppliers, the company explains that "When the likelihood and severity of an adverse impact is high, then due diligence is more extensive." Responses to the SAQ "enables Tesla teams to proactively prioritize more extensive due diligence for high-risk suppliers based on the extent of potential impact on workers' health, safety or fundamental human rights and number of workers/ employees impacted at the supplier site." (Impact Report, p. 132-3). In addition, Tesla's Responsible Sourcing Policy indicates that, "where a reasonable risk exists" the company will identify "priority engagement areas and immediately devise, adopt, and implement a risk management/mitigation plan with reasonable timescales in the view of continuous improvement". Tesla provides further detail about its supplier risk assessment process in relation to certain risks (e.g. forced labour), and certain critical minerals (cobalt, nickel, 3TG, etc.) in its Impact Report. This includes how and when the process extends beyond Tier 1, and extensive detail about mitigation actions (p. 113-130). Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1
	1.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	1.3.1. The company assesses the risk of adverse human rights impacts with suppliers prior to entering into any contracts.	2		**25%:** the company outlines the process to assess risks at individual suppliers. This may include supplier questionnaires, audits, etc. Note: it is not enough for companies to state that they assess suppliers prior to entering into any contracts, they must outline how this assessment occurs. Secondly, a requirement that suppliers sign a statement confirming their compliance is not sufficient risk assessment. Similarly, companies must outline how they verify information provided in supplier self-assessment questionnaires. **25%:** the company provides quantitative information of the number of potential new suppliers assessed, and the tier that they belong to. **25%:** the company provides quantitative information on the number of potential new suppliers where non-conformances were found. Note: the action taken to respond to these findings is addressed by indicators below. **25%:** this process extends beyond tier 1 to tier 2 at a minimum.	Tesla's SCoC states that the company "will take steps to ensure that our suppliers' business practices are consistent with the Code. This applies both in our selection of new suppliers and in our on-going relationships with our existing suppliers" (first page). The company explains that in 2023, they added responsible sourcing due diligence to Tesla's internal Global Procurement Policy supplier selection guidelines to include social and environmental criteria in sourcing decisions before awarding business to any supplier, including CSR audit scores, SAQ results, and complaints submitted via Tesla's Integrity Line (Impact Report, p. 132). Tesla discloses that in 2023, 13,018 suppliers were screened using industry leading third-party tools. It also discloses that 984 supplier facilities were surveyed through Tesla's SAQ (Impact Report, p. 114, 134). However, the company does not specify which of these were potential new suppliers. The company does not disclose whether their risk identification process prior to awarding contracts extends beyond tier 1. Supplier Code of Conduct https://www.tesla.com/sites/default/files/about/legal/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		1.3.2. The company discloses how it monitors suppliers for compliance with the SCoC during the contract period.	2		**20%:** the company indicate that there is a process in place to monitor compliance. **20%:** the company provides details on the process (e.g. tools, technologies and sources of information they use, auditing practices, how they select suppliers to audit, how often these audits take place, etc). **20%:** the company provides quantitative information on the number of suppliers assessed for compliance and the tiers that are assessed. Note: this indicator refers to quantitative assessment tools (e.g. surveys). **20%:** the company provides quantitative information of the number of suppliers audited and the tiers that are audited. Note: this indicator refers to on-site audits. **20%:** the company provides quantitative information on non-conformances found. Note: the action taken to respond to these findings is addressed by indicators below. Notes: Quantitative information on assessments and audits can be provided as a percentage of suppliers assessed / audited or as a number. If the company provides a number of suppliers assessed / audited, they must also provide the total number of suppliers. For due diligence to be effective, it must involve potentially impacted stakeholders and/or their representatives. This is scored under each of the sections listed below.	Tesla explains that they use the Supplier Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ), Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) audits and the Tesla Integrity Line to monitor alignment with the SCoC as well as the company's GHRP and Responsible Sourcing Policy (Impact Report, p. 132). Decisions on what Tier 1 suppliers to audit are based on country risk, SAQ results, spend, product and supplier impact (p. 140). The company provides additional detail in relation to certain risks, such as forced and child labour (p. 113, 117). The company discloses that all direct suppliers were sent Tesla's Supplier Self-Assessment Questionaire, and that they achieved a 68% response rate (Impact Report, p. 134). The company also discloses that, in 2023, 156 suppliers completed initial audits (Impact Report, p. 114) and 73 completed closure audits (p. 139). The company also provides information about the number of suppliers audited, and tiers they belong to, in relation to its cobalt, nickel, and lithium supply chains. However, the company does not disclose what percentage of total suppliers these numbers amounts to, or the total number of suppliers. The company does not provide clear or complete information about the number of non-conformances found. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1.2
		1.3.3. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds non-conformances with the SCoC	1.5		This indicator relates to the contractual relationship between suppliers and the auto-manufacturer. It applies to all tiers to the point of extraction where there is, or there might be, a direct relationship between the auto manufacturer and the supplier. **33%:** the company discloses that suppliers will be subject to corrective action plans if non-conformances are identified. **33%:** the company discloses specific actions it will take in response to adverse human rights impacts and/or other human rights related contractual breaches by suppliers (for example, stop-work notices, warning letters, supplementary training, policy revision and termination of the contract). **33%:** the company discloses the number of corrective action plans or equivalent issued during the reporting year. Note: this is distinct from providing remedy to impacted stakeholders.	Tesla discloses that suppliers will be subject to corrective action plans if non-conformances are identified. The company follows up with suppliers who have responded to a SAQ by communicating "risks identified and best practices along with development of supplier specific improvement plans, such as guidance on how to close policy gaps and building supply chain mapping capabilities." (Impact Report, p. 133). Tesla's Responsible Sourcing Policy indicates that, to manage non-compliance, the company will "first engage our suppliers, business partners, central or local government authorities, international organizations, civil society, affected stakeholders, and third parties to drive corrective actions that help address the underlying issues and build capacity". "Where direct engagement does not lead to meaningful progress and/or where there is insufficient evidence or lack of viability for the immediate and appropriate mitigation of serious abuses, consider all appropriate forms of leverage, including the reduction and/or termination of supply agreement and/or suspension or discontinued engagement with suppliers." The company will also collaborate "with other companies and industry initiatives where collective approaches to risk identification and/or mitigation are appropriate". Tesla's GHRP provides additional detail about the company's actions in response to findings of forced and child labour, including reviewing root causes, approving improvement/remediation plans, and disengagement in certain cases. Tesla does not disclose the number of corrective or improvement plans issued in the year. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies Global Human Rights Policy (GHRP) https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		1.3.4. The company discloses how they verify the implementation of corrective actions.	1		The following scores are absolute, not cumulative: **100%:** the company discloses the types of actions that it undertakes across its whole supply chain to verify whether corrective actions have occurred. **25%:** the company only a subset of the types of actions that it undertakes to verify whether correction actions have occured (e.g. audits) and/or only discloses the types of actions that it undertakes for certain supply chains and/or materials to verify whether corrective actions have occurred. Note: successful corrective measures involve impacted stakeholders and/or their representatives. Their involvement is scored under each section below.	Tesla states that when suppliers do not achieve an initial audit score of 60% or above, improvement plans are verified through a "complete re-audit of their facility within one year." (Impact Report, p. 139). In previous years, Tesla has explained this verification process in a bit more detail. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1
	1.4. Remedy	1.4.1. The company has put in place a formal mechanism whereby workers, suppliers, suppliers' workers (in any tier) and other external stakeholders can raise grievances regarding adverse human rights impacts in their supply chain to an impartial entity.	2		**10%:** if the company only has an in-house mechanism **20%:** the company has put in place an independent, formal mechanism to report a grievance to an impartial entity regarding human rights in the company's supply chains. **20%:** The mechanism is available to its workers, suppliers, suppliers' workers (in any tier) and other external stakeholders (e.g. whistleblower hotline). **50%:** the company communicates how the existence of the mechanism is communicated to its suppliers' workers and other impacted stakeholders. Note: simply posting it on the website is not enough. The involvement of impacted stakeholders and their legitimate representatives (e.g. workers, indigenous communities, etc.) in the design, review, operation and ongoing improvement of grievance mechanisms is central to their efficacy. As such, additional indicators have been included under each focus area regarding the specific integration of feedback from different stakeholder groups.	Tesla has put in place an Integrity Line reporting system that is third-party-managed, and is available to "employees, contractors, and third parties including suppliers, their employees, community members, and other stakeholders." The company states that the "Tesla Integrity Line was added to the Tesla Supplier Portal in 2023 to make it more accessible to supply chain workers with access to the Portal." (Impact Report, p. 135). However, the company does not explain how the existence of the Integrity Line is communicated to its suppliers' workers and other impacted stakeholders. Tesla's Integrity Line https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#tesla-integrity-line 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1
		1.4.2. The company discloses data about the practical operation of their grievance mechanism, such as the number of grievances filed, addressed, and resolved, their type, severity and outcome.	1		**25%:** The company provides quantitative information about the total number of grievances raised during the reporting year. **50%:** The company provides disaggregated information about the total number of supply chain grievances raised, with detail as to their type, severity and tier **25%:** the company provides information about the number of supply chain grievances resolved. The indicator below seeks greater detail as to the concrete measures of reparation offered.	Tesla reports that a total of 4 concerns related to responsible sourcing were raised during the year. However, the company does not disclose details about these complaints. The company describes two human rights-related concerns as illustrative examples (Impact Report, p. 136). While these provide greater level of detail, they are provided as examples, and are nevertheless insufficient to meet the level of information required under the second and third sub-indicators. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.25

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		1.4.3. The company has put in place a remedy process.	2		**50%:** the company discloses the process for determining remedy. This should indicate in general terms: **- 25%:** how they investigate an issue that is raised and escalate the issue within the company **- 25%:** how they determine appropriate remedy **50%:** the company discloses information on the the measures of reparation for human rights abuses provided through its remedy process: **- 25%:** The company discloses information about the number of confirmed human rights grievances in its supply chain that resulted in measures of reparation to those affected, or in a request for suppliers to provide reparation. **- 25%:** The company provides one or more qualitative case studies to illustrate reparations in action (where there have been no cases resulting in measures of reparation that year, case studies from previous years to illustrate the process will suffice). Note: this information can be anonymised, to protect the identity of those involved.	Tesla provides insufficient information. It gives an indication of steps once a report has been submitted (e.g. that people submitting reports "may be asked to provide additional information after submission") and informs that "all matters are promptly and appropriately investigated by the appropriate team of professionals" (Tesla's Integrity Line). However, the company does not explain their approach or key steps or stages of either its investigation or escalation process. Tesla's Impact Report also provides a sketch of the investigation process (p. 93), but this is also limited. The company does not explain how they determine appropriate remedy, or whether rightsholders are involved in this determination, beyond stating that "as applicable, we work with stakeholders to address or improve conditions raised", and "there is follow-up in the Integrity Line system so the reporter is made aware that their concern was appropriately addressed and closed." (Tesla's Integrity Line). Regarding reparations, Tesla does not disclose quantitative information about the number of confirmed human rights grievances that resulted in measures of reparation, and what these measures were. The company does provide a description of two cases that illustrate reparations in action. The cases concern the payment of recruitment fees to access employment and other prohibited labour practices (e.g. wage deductions, passport retention, etc.). One of the cases resulted in a termination of contract with the relevant labor broker, "while giving contract workers the option to continue working for the supplier under new management", a reimbursement of all recruitment-related fees to workers, as well as improved processes to avoid repetition (Impact Report, p. 115). The second resulted in the immediate return of all 10 workers' passports, "a company-wide investigation to understand root causes of fees paid by workers, fee repayment, an end to involuntary wage deduction and management and employee trainings." (Impact Report, p. 116). Tesla's Integrity Line https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#tesla-integrity-line	0.5
2. Responsible Sourcing of Transition Minerals	**2.1. Commit**	2.1.1. The company has a commitment to responsible metals and minerals sourcing.	1		The following scores are not cumulative, they are absolute: **100%:** the company has a standalone responsible minerals sourcing policy or their human rights policy includes a section on the responsible sourcing of minerals and metals that applies to all minerals and metals. **75%:** the company has a standalone responsible minerals sourcing policy or their human rights policy includes a section on the responsible sourcing of minerals and metals that goes beyond "conflict minerals" to include some other minerals or metals (e.g. includes cobalt). **50%:** the company has a standalone responsible minerals sourcing policy or their human rights policy includes a commitment to the responsible sourcing of "conflict minerals" only.	Tesla has a Responsible Sourcing Policy which is "applicable for all materials and all sourcing regardless of sourcing location…" Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies	1

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		2.1.2. The company requires its suppliers to undertake due diligence in accordance with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High Risk Areas (CAHRAs)	2		**50%: Implementation of the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from CAHRAs:** - **50%:** the SCoC requires suppliers to undertake due diligence in accordance with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from CAHRAs in relation to all salient metals and minerals from anywhere. OR -**25%:** the SCoC requires suppliers to undertake due diligence in accordance with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from CAHRAs in relation to all metals and minerals from CAHRAs. OR - **10%:** the SCoC requires suppliers to undertake due diligence in accordance with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from CAHRAs in relation to tin, tungsten, tantalum, and gold (3TGs) from CAHRAs. **50%: Implementation of Due Diligence:** **- 25%:** the company requires suppliers to have a due diligence process in place to identify raw materials sources, specifically, conducting due diligence on Smelter or Refiners (SoRs) in their supply chain (this may include the use of third party certification, etc). **- 25%:** the company requires suppliers to disclose smelter/refiner information.	Tesla requires its suppliers to establish policies, due diligence frameworks, and management systems consistent with the OECD's Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct, and the OECD's Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas. The company indicates that "suppliers are required to use reasonable efforts to ensure that products supplied to Tesla do not contribute to armed conflict, human rights abuses, or environmental degradation, regardless of sourcing location." (Responsible Sourcing Policy) Tesla's SCoC also specifies: "Suppliers shall adopt a policy and exercise due diligence on the source and chain of custody of the cobalt, tantalum, tin, tungsten, and gold in the products they manufacture to reasonably assure that they are sourced in a way consistent with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict Affected and High-Risk Areas or an equivalent and recognized due diligence framework." Tesla requests 3TG suppliers to fill in information about SoR through a Tesla-specific CMRT request (Conflict Minerals Report, section 4). Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies Supplier Code of Conduct https://www.tesla.com/sites/default/files/about/legal/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf Conflict Minerals Report https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1318605/000110465924067119/tm2415702d1_ex1-01.htm	2
	2.2. Identify	2.2.1. The company has a process in place to map transition minerals (e.g. nickel, lithium, cobalt, copper, manganese, zinc) in their supply chains to the point of extraction.	2		**25%**: the company discloses that they have a process in place to map transition minerals supply chains back to the point of extraction. **25%:** the company provides detail on the processes that they have put in place to map their transition minerals supply chains to the point of extraction. **25%:** the company discloses the portion of the transition minerals supply chain that they have mapped to the point of extraction. Note: this could be by specifying which supply chains they have mapped, a percentage of total suppliers mapped, etc. **25%:** the company discloses concrete information from their mapping (e.g. primary country of origin). MODIFIER: In order to achieve full credit the mapping must cover at least the three focus minerals that are of significant industry and stakeholder focus given outsized volume and/or impacts: cobalt, nickel & lithium. Companies that map two of fewer minerals will receive half scores.	Tesla's Responsible Sourcing Policy describes a commitment to conducting "supply chain mapping, tracing, and due diligence on parties in Tesla's upstream supply chain for evidence of complicity in human rights abuses." The company describes their mapping of transition minerals supply chains to the point of extraction in the context of efforts to address potential forced labour (Impact Report, p. 113), and in relation to some of their critical raw materials, such as aluminium, cobalt, nickel, lithium (Impact Report, p. 116-117, 120, 123). The company discloses detailed information about the results of their cobalt, nickel, and lithium supply chain mapping, including a good level of detail about major suppliers and their activities (e.g. mining, refining, etc.), location, tier, raw material country of origin and mine site/s (Impact Report, p. 117-126). Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	2

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		2.2.2. The company discloses transition minerals risks in their supply chain and where they are located.	1		**50%:** the company describes the risks of sourcing from CAHRAs in their supply chains, specifying the minerals and countries of origin (potentially) involved. **50%:** the company discloses broader risks from transition minerals in their supply chains and where these are located, by reference to material type, tier, and geographical location.	Tesla discusses the risks of sourcing from CAHRAs in it Conflict Minerals Report, but does not disclose whether they source transition minerals from CAHRAs. The company goes as far as stating that 3TG contained in their products may come from the DRC and adjoining countries (the "Covered Countries" or "DRC region" under US SEC Conflict Minerals Disclosure Rule) (Conflict Minerals Report, section 5), but is not is a position to confirm this. The company mentions some risks associated with 3TG from CAHRAs, but does so in a generic manner and not as they relate to its own supply chain due diligence findings. Tesla's 2023 impact report identifies broader risks related to transition mineral sourcing (p106) and a detailed description of child labor-related risks of sourcing cobalt from the DRC (p117-118). Risks for other minerals are identified, but with minimal detail. However, information on countries of origin and tiers is provided. Conflict Minerals Report https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1318605/000110465924067119/tm2415702d1_ex1-01.htm 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1
		2.2.3. The company publishes a list of smelters or refiners (SoR) in its supply chain	1		**100%:** the company publishes a complete list of smelters/refiners in their supply chain for at least 3TG minerals. **50%:** the company publishes a partial list of smelters/refiners in their supply chain. Note: to score here, the company must disclose a significant number of SoRs.	Annex II of Tesla's Conflict Minerals Report provides a list of smelters and refiners that may be in Tesla's supply chains based on 2023 supplier CMRT responses received. Tesla also discloses a number of SoR in their cobalt, nickel, and lithium supply chains (Impact Report, p. 119, 122, and 126 respectively). Conflict Minerals Report https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1318605/000110465924067119/tm2415702d1_ex1-01.htm 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1
		2.2.4. The company discloses which of the SoRs in its supply chain are conformant with the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI).	1	0.4	**100%:** the company discloses information on RMI conformance for all of the SoRs identified in their supply chain. **50%:** the company only discloses information on RMI conformance for some of the SoRs in its supply chain or only discloses information on RMI conformance on an aggregate / percentage basis	Tesla discloses that 234 of 506 3TG SoR identified through suppliers responses were engaged with the RMI or conformant (Conflict Minerals Report, Annex II). However, the company does not provide an exact number for how many were conformant. Tesla discloses a partial list of SoR in their cobalt, nickel, and lithium supply chains that have undergone RMI's RMAP assessment (Impact Report, p. 119, 122, and 126 respectively), but does not disclose the results of the audits. Conflict Minerals Report https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1318605/000110465924067119/tm2415702d1_ex1-01.htm 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0
	2.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	2.3.1. The company discloses how it monitors suppliers for compliance with the transition minerals due diligence requirements.	2		See general HR indicators	See general HR indicators	1.2
		2.3.2. The company formally engages SoRs to build their capacity to conduct due diligence of their own supply chains.	2		**25%:** the company discloses that it participates in industry wide schemes that engage with smelters/refiners on their compliance with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from CAHRAs. **25%:** the company specifies that it engages directly with SoRs to build their capacity to conduct due diligence. **50%:** the company provides detail on how it engages with SoRs to build their capacity	Tesla is a member of RMI and engages with SoR through the initiative's RMAP assessment process. (Conflict Minerals Report, section 5). The company states that in 2023, a member of Tesla's Responsible Sourcing team served as Co-Chair of the RMI's Gold Team Working Group. Tesla also participated in the Smelter Engagement Team and the Due Diligence Practices Team . Tesla's Responsible Sourcing Policy indicates that the company expects suppliers of 3TG-containing products to "source from smelters or refiners that have engaged in the Responsible Minerals Assurance Program (RMAP) and set similar expectations with their suppliers". The company describes some of its activities with, or as member of RMI, but does not specify if/how it engages with SoR directly to build their capacity. Conflict Minerals Report https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1318605/000110465924067119/tm2415702d1_ex1-01.htm Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies	0.5

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		2.3.3. The company formally engages extractives companies and includes human rights clauses in any contractual arrangements.	2		**100%:** the company discloses that it has entered into direct agreements with extractives companies for the sourcing of transition minerals and that these contracts include human rights clauses.	Tesla states that they "source the critical minerals needed for our products directly from mines, refiners and smelters." (Impact Report, p. 105). The company noted in its 2022 Impact Report (Page 153) that notes that all contracts include binding environmental and human rights requirements Tesla discloses the name of a number of cobalt, nickel, and lithium extractive companies it has entered into direct agreement with, as well as the name and location of the mines (Impact Report, p. 119, 122, 126). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf 2022 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2022-tesla-impact-report.pdf	2
		2.3.4. The company is a member of IRMA and actively engages their suppliers with regards to IRMA mining audits. Note: IRMA does not excuse companies from doing their own supply chain due diligence	2	0.8	**25%:** The company is a member of IRMA. **50%:** The company actively engages their suppliers regarding suppliers' certification by IRMA. **25%:** the company discloses a commitment to source a percentage of metals from IRMA certified mines by a certain date.	Tesla has been an IRMA member since 2021 (Impact Report, p. 124). It states that their "goal is to encourage the uptake of IRMA across [their] supply chain." The company actively engages with suppliers regarding IRMA certification: "Two of our direct lithium suppliers also completed or are in the process of completing an independent third party audit against the Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA) Standard, Tesla's preferred mining standard." "5 mines completed or committed to date to an IRMA audit across our lithium, nickel and graphite supply chains" (p. 124). The company does not disclose a commitment to source a percentage of metals from IRMA certified mines by a certain date. 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1.2
		2.3.5. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds non-conformances associated with its responsible minerals sourcing policy occurring in its operations or supply chains.	1.5		See general HR indicators	See general HR indicators	1
		2.3.6. The company discloses how they verify the implementation of corrective actions.	1		See general HR indicators	See general HR indicators	1
	2.4. Remedy	2.4.1. The company has put in place a formal mechanism whereby grievances can be raised about SoR facilities.	1		**50%:** the company has put in place an independent, formal grievance mechanism that applies specifically to SoRs. This mechanism may be run in conjunction with other auto manufacturers. Note: this is in addition to any generic grievance mechanism that can be accessed by external stakeholders. **50%:** the company discloses how they review and investigate grievances raised through this mechanism.	Tesla participates in the Responsible Business Alliance's Grievance Mechanism (the RMI Grievance Mechanism), which can receive concerns regarding SoR (Conflict Minerals Report, section 6). The RMI Grievance Mechanism investigation process is described in detail in the document "The RMI Grievance Mechanism" available on RMI's website. Tesla is not involved in the investigation. Member companies are "kept informed of in-scope grievances received and their status" (p. 5). Tesla does not explain whether, and if so, how they review and follow up or investigate grievances raised through the RMI Grievance Mechanism. Conflict Minerals Report https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1318605/000110465924067119/tm2415702d1_ex1-01.htm The RMI Grievance Mechanism https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/RMI_Grievance%20Mechanism_v4.pdf	0.5
3. Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Free Prior and Informed	**3.1. Commit**	3.1.1. The company explicitly commits to respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).	1		**100%:** the company has an explicit commitment to the UNDRIP in their human rights policy and/or in a standalone Indigenous Peoples' rights policy.	Tesla does not include an explicit commitment to the UNDRIP in their human rights policy, and it does not have a standalone Indigenous Peoples' rights policy. Global Human Rights Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy	0

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
Informed Consent (FPIC)		3.1.2. The company has a public commitment to FPIC.	1		**100%:** the company has an explicit commitment to FPIC in their human rights policy and/or in a standalone Indigenous Peoples' rights policy. Note: to score full points, the commitment must be unqualified. **25%:** the company has an explicit commitment to FPIC in their human rights policy and/or in a standalone Indigenous Peoples' rights policy, but it is qualified (e.g. it allows for only consultation in practice, it is expected only in certain circumstances, it applies only to certain parts of the supply chain, etc.)	Tesla commits to FPIC in its GHRP. Global Human Rights Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy	1
		3.1.3. The company extends their commitment on Indigenous Peoples' rights to their Tier 1 suppliers	2		The SCoC or responsible sourcing policy explicitly references the UNDRIP (**50%)** and FPIC (**50%**). MODIFIER: Points will be halved if the policy is qualified.	Neither the SCoC nor the Responsible Sourcing Policy reference the UNDRIP or FPIC. Supplier Code of Conduct https://www.tesla.com/sites/default/files/about/legal/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf Responsible Sourcing Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#responsible-sourcing-policies	0
		3.1.4. These commitments are translated into the languages used by the impacted Indigenous Peoples.	1		**50%:** the company requires suppliers to translate these commitments to the languages of the impacted Indigenous Peoples. **50%:** the company requires that these translations are actively made available to the impacted Indigenous Peoples.	Not disclosed	0
	3.2. Identify	3.2.1. The company has a process in place to assess risks to Indigenous Peoples' rights in their supply chain to the point of extraction.	1		**25%:** the company discloses that their process for mapping their supply chains to the point of extraction (row 16) explicitly includes FPIC and other indigenous rights issues. **25%**: the company discloses where in the supply chain these risks occur. **25%:** the company discloses how they use this mapping to identify high risk suppliers. **25%:** the company provides case studies of this process in practice	Tesla does not disclose whether their supply chain risk identification process explicitly includes potential FPIC risks. The company discloses risks to Indigenous Peoples' right and FPIC in relation to nickel in Indonesia and lithium in Chile and Argentina (Impact Report, p121, 126). Tesla also briefly mentions risks to Indigenous Peoples' rights in relation to 3TG and gold, although it does not disclose the location of these risks. With regards to risks in Indonesia, the company provides a limited case study how it has engaged with these risks, stating that company "engaged with NGOs, government and suppliers to explore the need for the establishment of a no-go zone for mining to protect indigenous and human rights, particularly those of uncontacted communities, in addition to supplier engagement to reinforce our commitment to protect the right of Indigenous People to grant or withhold Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)" (Impact Report, p121). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	0.5
	3.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	3.3.1. The company provides additional discussion regarding the practices by which suppliers must obtain FPIC	1		**100%:** the company discloses a process. This process must explicitly specify that any FPIC process must reach and engage impacted Indigenous Peoples. **25%:** the company states a process and/or expectation but it is limited in its application.	Tesla's human rights policy states that suppliers involved in raw material extraction and processing must "engage with legitimate representatives of indigenous communities and respect their right to grant or withhold free, prior, and informed consent for their operations." Global Human Rights Policy https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy	1
		3.3.2. The company is a member of a multi-stakeholder group (e.g. IRMA) that includes the participation of Indigenous Peoples to ensure respect of Indigenous Peoples' rights at the point of extraction.	2		Refer to Responsible Sourcing of Transition Minerals indicators.	Refer to Responsible Sourcing of Transition Minerals indicators.	1.2

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		3.3.3. The company has a formal process in place to engage critical upstream suppliers on FPIC (e. g. extractives companies)	2		This score relates to direct engagement by the company with extractives companies. It is in addition to their membership of IRMA. **25%:** the company formally engages significant suppliers regarding FPIC. **25%:** the company states that they formally review company documents (e.g. meeting minutes) to ensure that Indigenous Peoples' FPIC has been provided. **50%:** the company engages directly with representatives of Indigenous Peoples affected by mining operations to review that regular engagement and consultation take place, community needs are responded to, and there continues to be FPIC.	Not disclosed	0
		3.3.4. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds FPIC breaches in its supply chain.	1		The indicators in HR general provide a baseline for this. In addition: **100%:** the company must specify that cutting off sourcing from a particular upstream supplier should only occur if this is sought by the affected indigenous community - it should not be solely determined by the auto manufacturer.	Not disclosed	0
	3.4. Remedy	3.4.1. The company's grievance mechanism has a process for investigating and remedying breaches of FPIC that includes a formal role for impacted Indigenous Peoples.	1		Grievances and remedy are part of FPIC considered as a process not a point in time. **50%:** the company specifies that the process must reach and engage impacted Indigenous Peoples, not just that there is a process for complaints to be raised with remedy determined externally by the automanufacturer. **50%:** the company provides case studies of FPIC-compliant remedy instances in their supply chain	Not disclosed	0

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
4. Respect for Workers' Rights	**4.1. Commit**	4.1.1. The company has a commitment to workers' rights	1		**25%:** The company's human rights policy (or similar) includes a specific commitment to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and/or the ILO Fundamental Conventions. **OR** **50%:** The company identifies and commits to respecting each of the five Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work as established in the ILO Declaration (companies who do not make explicit and unqualified commitments to all five ILO principles will not be scored): 1. freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; 2. the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; 3. the effective abolition of child labour; 4. the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation; and 5. a safe and healthy working environment. **PLUS** **25%:** the company has a commitment to a living wage in their human rights policy or in another formal policy document. **25%:** the company outlines how it calculates a living wage.	Tesla's GHRP does not include a specific commitment to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and/or the ILO Fundamental Conventions. However, it does contain an express commitment to each of the five fundamental principles and rights at work. Tesla does not commit to a living wage. Global Human Rights Policy (GHRP) https://www.tesla.com/legal/additional-resources#global-human-rights-policy	0.5
		4.1.2. The company extends their workers' rights commitments to their Tier 1 suppliers and beyond. Note: only the specific worker rights commitments are evaluated here. Whether or not these commitments are extended beyond tier 1 suppliers is evaluated in the "General" human rights section.	2		**25%:** The SCoC includes a specific commitment to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at work and/or the ILO Fundamental Conventions. **OR** **50%:** The SCoC includes specific requirements on each of the five Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work as established in the ILO Declaration (companies whose SCoCs do not include explicit and unqualified requirements on all five ILO principles will not be scored): 1. freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; 2. the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; 3. the effective abolition of child labour; 4. the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation; and 5. a safe and healthy working environment. **PLUS** **25%:** the SCoC requires suppliers to pay a living wage. **25%:** the SCoC prohibits the payment of recruitment fees.	Tesla's SCoC does not includes a specific commitment to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at work and/or the ILO Fundamental Conventions. It does explicitly mention and require compliance with the five fundamental principles and rights at work. The SCoC explicitly prohibits recruitment fees: "Workers shall not be required to pay employers' agents or sub-agents' recruitment fees or other related fees for their employment" (second page). Tesla does not require the payment of a living wage. Supplier Code of Conduct https://www.tesla.com/sites/default/files/about/legal/tesla-supplier-code-of-conduct.pdf	1.5
	4.2. Identify	4.2.1. The company consults trade unions and/or workers' representatives in their assessment of salient workers' rights risks in their supply chain.	1		Generic supply chain indicators provide a baseline score for this. To get additional points here, companies must specify that they consult with labour unions and/or workers' representatives regarding salient workers' rights in the supply chain. This must expressly include labour unions and/or workers' representatives in the supply chain and/or global union federations (GUFs) Note: workers' representatives are not a substitute for trade unions where trade unions are allowed to operate and not limited in their activities.	Not disclosed	0

Sub-section	Indicator Category	Indicators	Total Number of Points	Points Modifier (if appliable)	Score Attribution Note: scores are cumulative unless otherwise specified.	Tesla Analysis	Tesla Points
		4.2.2. The company discloses the salient workers rights risks in their supply chain and where they are located.	1		**100%:** the company's saliency assessment explicitly identifies workers' rights risks for at least one material / supply chain and the location/s.	Tesla's saliency assessment includes a number of risks to workers' rights (Impact Report, p. 8). The company discloses where a few specific workers' rights risks are located - e.g. child labour in the DRC's cobalt supply chain, and workers' health and safety in Indonesia's nickel supply chain (Impact Report, p. 117, 120 respectively). Forced labour in the aluminium supply chain is also mentioned, but the location is not provided (Impact Report, p. 116). 2023 Impact Report https://www.tesla.com/ns_videos/2023-tesla-impact-report.pdf	1
	4.3. Prevent, Mitigate and Account	4.3.1. The company actively collaborates with workers and the representative organisation(s) of workers' own choosing to promote respect for workers' rights in its supply chain.	2		**25%:** the company has a collective agreement with the relevant trade union in the headquartered country. **25%:** the company has a global framework agreement with IndustriALL for neutrality across all its operations. **25%**: the company describes the formal mechanisms it has put in place to consult trade unions and/or workers' representatives on the company's workers' rights principles and/or policies. **25%:** IndustriAll was actively involved in the formulation of the company's workers' rights principles and/or policies.	Tesla does not have a collective agreement with the relevant trade union in the headquartered country, or a GFA with IndustriALL. There is no information on any of the other indicators.	0
		4.3.2. The company reports on how it is prepared to respond if it finds non-conformances associated with its workers' rights policy occurring in its operations or supply chains.	1.5		Refer to general HR indicators.	Refer to general HR indicators.	1
		4.3.3. The company works with the relevant trade union and/or worker representative organisation to verify the implementation of corrective actions pertaining to workers' rights.	2		**100%:** the company specifies that it works with the relevant trade union and/or workers representatives to verify implementation of correction actions.	Not disclosed	0
	4.4. Remedy	4.4.1 Workers and the representative organisations of workers' own choosing are formally included in the remedy process.	1		**100%:** the company specifies that trade unions are formally engaged in any remedy process.	Not disclosed	0

Indicator category	% weighting	Normalized weighting
Climate & Environment		
Disclose	100%	1.0
Target setting & progress	150%	1.5
Supply chain levers	200%	2.0
		4.5
Human rights		
Commit	100%	1.0
Identify	150%	1.5
Prevent, Mitigate and Account	200%	2.0
Remedy	200%	2.0
		6.5

Note: Total scores across both categories were taken as an average of the two percentages scored for each one

Assessment has not been updated for the 2025 edition and will be updated later in 2025.

Initiative	Multi-stakeholder governance and civil society co-creation	Points (out of 2)	Credible audits and accreditation: Audit independence and rights-holder participation	Points (out of 1)	Transparency of audit findings	Points (out of 1)	Corrective Action Plans	Points (out of 1)	Effective grievance mechanism	Points (out of 1)	Iseal code compliant member	Points (out of 1)	Credible standard criteria	Points (out of 1)	Total score	Overall Assessment	Point modifier applied
ResponsibleSteel	The ResponsibleSteel Constitution states that the Board will be made up of four directors from business members, up to four from civil society members and up to three independent directors. Currently it includes three business, four civil society and three independent representatives. Resolutions can only be passed if at least 66% of the votes cast are cast in favour of it and at least 1 Director from each of the category votes in favor. Overall the governance of the board does not guarantee affected rights-holders or their representatives equal representation and decision-making power. (https://www.responsiblesteel.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ResponsibleSteel_Constitution.pdf) Civil society members do have equal (50%) decision-making power (voting rights) alongside industry members on the ResponsibleSteel Standard, including new and revised editions of the Standard(s) (Page 13 https://www.responsiblesteel.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/AllAboutUs-2023.pdf) There is evidence that stakeholders were involved involved in process of designing the accreditation scheme (https://www.responsiblesteel.org/standard-development/)	1	The ResponsibleSteel certification standard requires third party audit of processes, including site visits. Rightsholder and broader stakeholder engagement also forms part of the audit process. (https://www.responsiblesteel.org/certification/)	1	ResponsibleSteel publishes summary reports of the audits on its website. These public summary reports provide information on the audit process, including which stakeholders were engaged and how. However, the reports do not disclose explanations regarding the findings of conformance or non-conformance against the standard's criteria. (https://www.responsiblesteel.org/certification/issued-certificates/)	0.5	ResponsibleSteel requires companies to develop corrective action plans for all non-conformances identified during an audit. Certificates are not issued when major major non-conformities are identified, until a special audit verifies that they have been addressed within 6 months of the major non-conformities being raised. ResponsibleSteel's Assurance Manual and Implementation Instructions detail criteria on corrective action plans required in cases of non-conformances. These CAPs have to meet SMART criteria and are therefore time-bound. The results of corrective actions are included in surveillance audit reports, conducted 12 – 18 months after the initial audit and published on Responsible Steel's website. There is no evidence of a requirement for affected rights-holders to be involved in the development, implementation and monitoring of the corrective action plans. https://www.responsiblesteel.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/FINAL-ResponsibleSteel-Assurance-Manual-v2-0.pdf	0.5	ResponsibleSteel has an Issues Resolution System which serves as a grievance / complaints mechanism through which issues with ResponsibleSteel's certification process can be escalated. Issues and complaints can be raised in multiple languages, and ResponsibleSteel states that the complainant can ask for the support of an advisor during the process. The Issues Resolution System requires ResponsibleSteel to publish "a summary of the issues and of the resolutions and the total number of raised and resolved issues" on its website. However, no grievances about ResponsibleSteel's certification process have been made through the mechanism. The complaints process is internally managed. https://www.responsiblesteel.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/ResponsibleSteel-Issues-Resolution-System-v3-0.pdf https://www.responsiblesteel.org/contact-us/	0.5	ResponsibleSteel is an Iseal community member but not listed as code compliant. ((https://www.isealalliance.org/iseal-community-members)	0.5	Criterion 10.1 of the standard requires the site's corporate owner to have defined and be implementing a long- and medium-term strategy to reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to levels that are compatible with the achievement of the goals of the Paris Agreement, with an aspiration to achieve net-zero GHG emissions through work with policy makers and others. (Page 97, https://www.responsiblesteel.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/ResponsibleSteel-Standard-2.0.pdf) The standard has been designed to align with Internationally recognised human rights, as laid out in the International Bill of Human Rights and in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The standard also references alignment with The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Page 79 (https://www.responsiblesteel.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/ResponsibleSteel-Standard-2.0.pdf)	1	5	**Scheme has made notable progress in meeting most of the minimum criteria but has some significant shortcomings**	0.6
The Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA)	IRMA is govered by a Board of Directors with two representatives from each of six sectors: Mining companies; Companies that purchase mined materials to make other products; Non-governmental organizations; Affected communities; Organized labor; Investment and finance. Civil society organizations and rightsholders are therefore guaranteed adequate representation and decision-making power on the governing body of accreditation scheme (https://responsiblemining.net/about/governance/) Rightsholders are involved in the process of designing the scheme. The IRMA stakeholder Forum is an electronic forum open to all interested parties to provide the opportunity to review and comment on the development of the IRMA standard. (Page 5, https://responsiblemining.net/what-we-do/standard/standard-development/)	2	Mines must undergo independent, third-party audits (https://responsiblemining.net/what-we-do/assessment/#achievement-levels) The IRMA audit process the audit process includes participation of impacted rights-holders. (page 29, V1 IRMA standard, https://responsiblemining.net/resources/#full-documentation-and-guidance)	1	IRMA requires the full results of audits, information on the audit processes and findings of noncompliance to be made readily available (https://connections.responsiblemining.net/independently-assessing-mines)	1	The certification scheme standard for corrective action plans (CAPs) affords meaningful involvement of rights-holders in the development, implementation and monitoring of the plans given its overall governance structure. CAPs are also disclosed as part of the standards disclosure requirements (Assessment Manual for Mines, p23, 2022) https://responsiblemining.net/resources/#independent-3rd-party-assessment	1	The IRMA complaints mechanism is not independently facilitated. However the Initiative does plan to engage Assurance Services International (ASI) in 2024 to "provide independent oversight" of their complaint/grievance resolution system, although this is not yet fully operational. The company does allow for complaints to be made in multiple languages and can be registered anonymously. (https://responsiblemining.net/what-you-can-do/complaints-and-feedback/). IRMA's Issue Resolution System states that "summaries of the issues and of the resolutions and the total number of raised and resolved issues shall be published on the IRMA website."	0.5	IRMA is an Iseal member but not Iseal code compliant. (https://www.isealalliance.org/iseal-community-members)	0.5	The IRMA standard is contingent on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) (page 49 V1 IRMA Standard) The IRMA standard is aligned with the ILO Core Conventions (IRMA Standard V1 Page 78 https://responsiblemining.net/resources/#full-documentation-and-guidance) The IRMA standard was designed to align with UNGP. Page 10 V1 IRMA Standard.(https://responsiblemining.net/resources/#full-documentation-and-guidance) The IRMA standard requires a policy (or equivalent) is in place that includes a commitment to manage energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions in a manner that aligns with the goals of the Paris Agreement. (Page 461 (https://responsiblemining.net/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/IRMA-Standard-for-Responsible-Mining-and-Mineral-Processing-2.0-DRAFT-20231026.pdf&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1701509380458738&usg=AOvVaw0HRnTee181AH6LruYD-Kmt)	1	7	**Robust scheme overall that still has some shortcomings but meets nearly all of the minimum criteria for governance, auditing and / or accreditation against its standard**	0.8
Aluminium Stewardship Initiative (ASI)	There is some representation of rights-holders/civil society on the governing board of the ASI. However, the governance of the initiative does not guarantee affected rights-holders and their representatives equal decision-making power, as they make up only 2 out of 8 positions on the board. (https://aluminium-stewardship.org/about-asi/board#1648979219483-ec993cc8-72d2). The ASI also has a multi stakeholder standards committee, responsible for standards governance. The committee is composed of 24 people. Presently the committee affords equal decision-making power between civil society and corporate actors (https://aluminium-stewardship.org/about-asi/standards-committee). However, there are no guarantees for equal decision-making power in the committee: ASI states that it only "aims to have a 50% non-industry (civil society and Indigenous peoples) participation in the Committee." ASI's constitution does not provide any guarantees of equal decision-making power in this committee. Furthermore, the constitution states that civil society members of the ASI only have 30% voting power in General Meetings (https://aluminium-stewardship.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/ASI-Constitution-Consolidated-December2019.pdf) There is evidence that stakeholders were involved in the process of developing the scheme (page 6 https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/performance-standard). The ASI Governance Handbook states that the Board oversees a framework for meaningful engagement with stakeholders. (page 9)	1	The ASI standard requires an independent third-party assessment is conducted by an external Qualified Specialist(s) (page 23 of the ASI performance standard: https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/performance-standard). Provisional Certification requires a site-based Surveillance Audit within six months of previous Audit (page 16, ASI Assurance Manual 2022) The ASI standard requires that the audit process includes participation of impacted rights-holders with an interest in the operation (page 53, ASI Assurance Manual, https://aluminium-stewardship.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/ASI-Assurance-Manual-V2-May2022-3.pdf)	1	The ASI publishes summaries of its audit reports on its website. These reports include explanations for findings of conformance or nonconformance against each of ASI's performance criteria, together with links to supporting evidence. However, the reports do not provide sufficient information on the audit processes, and do not mention which stakeholders were engaged (https://aluminium-stewardship.org/about-asi/members?cert=ps%7Ccoc) The standard additionally requires that a summary of the assessments be shared with Affected Populations and Organisations (page 23 of the ASI performance standard (https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/performance-standard). More detailed or complete audit reports are not provided to impacted rights-holders or other stakeholders.	0.5	ASI requires members to develop CAPs for all non-conformances identified during an audit. In cases of major non-conformances, provisional certifications are issued. ASI's Assurance Manual lists several factors that members should take into account when establishing the proposed corrective actions, but does not require stating an associated timeframe within which the non-conformances should be addressed. The Assurance Manual does not require the results of CAPs to be disclosed publicly and there is no evidence that the ASI standard for CAPs requires rights-holders to be involved in either the development, implementation or monitoring of the plans. https://aluminium-stewardship.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/ASI-Assurance-Manual-V2-May2022-3.pdf	0	The ASI has established mechanisms to receive complaints / grievances via email or via the external EthicsPoint online platform. However, there is no evidence that complainants have access to an independently managed grievance process. Adequate details are provided regarding how the grievance mechanism is made accessible: the mechanism is accessible in multiple languages and ASI states that it will generally waive external costs incurred for Indigenous Peoples organizations, small civil society groups or affected communities. It also states that it may provide financial and technical support to allow complainants to properly prepare and participate in the complaints process. The ASI also commits to disclosing details of any complaints made, as well as outcomes as and when they are made. The ASI publishes on its website information on the grievances received and remedial action taken in response. https://aluminium-stewardship.org/complaints-mechanism	0.5	The Aluminium Stewardship Initiative is Iseal code compliant (https://www.isealalliance.org/iseal-community-members?field_code_compliant=1)	1	The ASI accreditation requires the establishment of a GHG Emissions Reduction Plan and ensure a GHG Emissions Reduction Pathway consistent with a 1.5oC warming scenario, using an ASI endorsed methodology when available. (page 17 of ASI Performance Standard https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/performance-standard) The standard requires FPIC (Page 26 of the ASI Performance Standard) https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/performance-standard) The certifcation is contingent upon adherence to the ILO core Conventions (page 29 ASI Performance Standard https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/performance-standard The standard does not require alignment with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights in its totality. The standard stipulates that adherence is necessary in ways appropriate to its size and circumstances. However, does set a number of minimum aspects of the UNGP's required for alignment. (Page 25, ASI performance standard, https://aluminium-stewardship.org/asi-standards/performance-standard)	0.75	4.75	**Scheme has made progress in some areas but fails to meet multiple criteria for effective governance, auditing and / or accreditation against its standard**	0.4
Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) / Responsible Minerals Assurance Process (RMAP)	The RMI Steering Committee is the overarching governance body of the RMI and consists of consists of 11 voting positions and 3 ex-officio nonvoting positions - including representatives from civil society, downstream companies and upstream auditees. Civil society groups and / or affected rights-holders represent less than 50% of the steering committee (only 3 positions of the 11) and therefore do not maintain equal decision-making power overall with industry. There is however minority representation of civil society on the steering committee. RMI also has a multi-stakeholder Standards Committee, that includes CSO and rights-holder participation. However, there are no requirements for equal representation and / or decision-making power between civil society and industry on this committee. https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/about/governance/ https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/standards/RMI%20Standards%20Development%20Procedure_Final_September%201_2021.pdf RMI also has a multi-stakeholder Standards Committee, that includes CSO and rights-holder participation. However, there are no requirements for equal representation and / or decision-making power between civil society and industry on this committee. https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/about/governance/ https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/standards/RMI%20Standards%20Development%20Procedure_Final_September%201_2021.pdf	**1**	The RMAP certification does initially require third party audit of practices, including site-level verification. Annual audits are also required unless the audit company is accepted into the Risk-Based Audit Program, in which case the frequency decreases (RMAP Assessment Procedure: https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/RMAP%20Assessment%20Procedure_Revised_January%202024.pdf). The company does have a mechanism to engage external stakeholders in the development and oversight of the scheme (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/minerals-due-diligence/standards/public-consultation/). However, it is unclear if the certification process requires the participation of affected rights-holders.	0.5	The RMI has an audit platform, which makes assessment summary audit reports readily available to external stakeholders (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/facilities-lists/active-conformant-facilities-list/). However, this platform does not make the detailed results of audits, information on the audit processes and findings of noncompliance readily available to impacted rights-holders and other stakeholders. RMI also requires RMAP auditees to publish auditor validated OECD Step 5 due diligence reports, including relevant information regarding RMAP assessment and company sourcing practices.	0.5	The status of all CAPs are disclosed, along with a description of the non-conformances needing to be addressed. (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/responsible-minerals-assurance-process/extended-corrective-action-plan/) However, there is no evidence that the CAPs developed to address instances of non-conformance identified by an independent third party RMAP assessment require rights-holders to be involved in the development, implementation or monitoring of the plans (RMAP Assessment Procedure: Corrective Action Plan Review Process - https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/RMAP%20Assessment%20Procedure_Revised_January%202024.pdf) More broadly RMI requires affected stakeholders to be involved in the development and implementation of company-level risk management plans, but this is outside the scope of this criteria (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/standards/ResponsibleMineralsAssuranceProcess_Standard_AllMinerals_EN_121422.pdf)	0.5	The RMI has its own grievance mechanism (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/minerals-due-diligence-container/risk-management/rmi-grievance-mechanism/) and also jointly facilitates the Mineral Grievance Platform (https://mineralsgrievanceplatform.org/) for grievances related to smelters and refiners, including those that have participated in the Responsible Minerals Assurance Process. Both mechanisms are internally facilitated, however there is an Independent Review Committee, made up of three independent experts from academia, a consulting firm, and the auditing and assurance sector. This committee is responsible for overseeing grievances when they relate to RMI's operations and program, and/or when there is potential or actual conflict of interest. RMI provides a summary of grievances received in its annual report, including information on the number of grievances received, whether they relate to RMAP-participating smelters or refiners, and the types of issues raised. However, the scheme does not disclose information on the specific remedial actions taken or the outcomes of the grievances raised. The Minerals Grievance Platform also hosts public statements related to grievances received by the platform, but these have not been updated since 2020 - despite RMI's annual report stating that this platform received seven new grievances in 2022. No additional information is provided regarding the measures taken to ensure the grievance mechanism is accessible or to ensure aggrieved parties have access to information, advice or expertise. (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/RMI_Grievance%20Mechanism_Rev2017_Final_v2.pdf)	0.5	The RMI is an initiative of the the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA). The RBA is an ISEAL subscriber, and through this subscription the RMI is working toward achieving full ISEAL membership. https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/about/governance/	0.5	There is evidence that the RMI and associated certification has been developed to align with the UNGP's https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/minerals-due-diligence/cobalt/ However, the RMAP Standard was designed to focus on the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Minerals Annex II risks, and so does not reference the ILO Decalaration, UNDRIP or the Paris agreement. Separately, RMI has an ESG Standard (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/media/docs/RMI%20ESG%20procedure_07_2022.pdf) and a Risk Readiness Assessment standard (https://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org/minerals-due-diligence/risk-management/risk-readiness-assessment-(rra)/) which are broader in scope and have criteria on human rights, environmental issues and GHG emissions, workers' rights and indigenous rights. However, conformance with these criteria are not a requirement for RMAP smelter/refiner conformance and so they have not been incorporated into this analysis on the RMAP Standard. They may be included as separate assessments in future editions.	0.25	3.75	**Scheme has made progress in some areas but fails to meet multiple criteria for effective governance, auditing and / or accreditation against its standard**	0.4
CopperMark	The Board of Directors of the Copper Mark includes three industry representatives, three non-industry representatives and the Copper Mark Executive Director. However, there are no guarantees in CopperMark's governance documents that non-industry representatives must include representatives from civil society and / or rights holders (https://coppermark.org/about/governance/) Copper Mark also maintains an Advisory Council, that includes but does not guarantee representation from civil society, which advises the Copper Mark Board of Directors by providing recommendations on the implementation of the Copper Mark's vision and mission, but does not have formal decision-making power (https://coppermark.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/The-Copper-Mark-Advisory-Council-Terms-of-Reference-REV-01JUN21.pdf). Beyond the Advisory Council, there is evidence of additional mechanisms for structured stakeholder engagement in the development of the standard. (https://coppermark.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/TheCopperMark_StandardSettingProcedure_22APR2021_FINAL.pdf)	**0.5**	CopperMark requires that all applicable criteria are independently assessed at the site level. (https://coppermark.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/The-Copper-Mark-Assurance-Process_v.4_17OCT2022.pdf) The process includes interviews with relevant stakeholders, such as Indigenous Peoples groups and local communities, NGOs, community organizations, upstream supply chain actors, and government entities (see Annex II, Page 40. https://coppermark.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/The-Copper-Mark-Assurance-Process_v.4_17OCT2022.pdf)	1	CopperMark provides assessment summary reports which are made readily available (https://coppermark.org/participants-home/participants/). The scheme only requires partial disclosure or a summary of audit findings to be made public, indicating the company's performance against key criteria but without further explanation.	0.5	CopperMark discloses details about how Improvement Plans are developed and monitored, included timebound deadlines for alignment (page 23, https://coppermark.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/The-Copper-Mark-Assurance-Process_v.4_17OCT2022.pdf) The audit result summary includes a description of the non-conformances needing to be addressed within an associated time-frame (https://coppermark.org/participants-home/participants/) However, there is no evidence that the standard requires rights-holders to be involved in the development, implementation and monitoring of the plans.	0.5	The grievance mechanism is independently facilitated and independently reviewed if the complaint relates to CopperMark itself, there is adequate disclosure as to how the grievance mechanism is accessible to all stakeholders, including an explanation that grievances may be submittted in the local language of the complainant. CopperMark also specifies that access to support, advice or expertise may be provided to complainants and that "it may cover all reasonable costs where costs would prohibit the complainant from utilizing the Grievance Mechanism, for example when the complainant is an individual, community group, or NGO." (https://secure.ethicspoint.eu/domain/media/en/gui/107757/index.html) However, there is inadequate disclosure regarding the operation of this grievance mechanism: although CopperMark states that it will publish annually "an aggregated summary of grievances," its 2020, 2021 and 2022 annual reports simply state that CopperMark has received one grievance per year but provides no additional information.	0	The Copper Mark is an ISEAL Community Member (https://www.isealalliance.org/sustainability-news/copper-mark-joins-iseal-community-member)	0.5	Participating sites in the CopperMark initiative are assessed against the RMI's Risk Readiness Assessment Criteria (https://coppermark.org/standards/criteria/) . The RRA Criteria references alignment with The United Nations Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights, The International Labour Organization's (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (each of the five principles are included and the Declaration is also mentioned) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, with specific references to respecting the right to free, prior and informed consent. There is also a requirement for sites to reduce greenhouse gas emissions "at a pace and scale consistent with mitigation pathways that meet the goals of the Paris Agreement to curb global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels" https://coppermark.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/RRA-v3.0-Criteria-Guide_2023.pdf	1	4	**Scheme has made progress in some areas but fails to meet multiple criteria for effective governance, auditing and / or accreditation against its standard**	0.4 (note: no indicator in the Leaderboard specifically mentions this scheme)
Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM)	Each TSM partner must establish an independent, multi-interest advisory body, made up of 12 to 15 individuals from Indigenous groups, communities where the industry is active, to support the governance and implementation of TSM. (https://tsminitiative.com/assets-images/SPARK-MAC-TSM-PRIMER-2022-ENG.pdf). However, as this is an advisory body – not a formal governance body – it does not meet the criterion of multi-stakeholder governance. The Board of Directors is composed only of representatives from the mining sector. There is evidence of structured stakeholder engagement in the development of the standard. The development of TSM protocols includes members of the national mining association and the multi-interest advisory body working collaboratively to develop a new protocol or revise an existing one (TSM Primer page 9: https://tsminitiative.com/assets-images/SPARK-MAC-TSM-PRIMER-2022-ENG.pdf)	**0.5**	TSM requires third party audit of practices, including site-level verification.. (https://tsminitiative.com/about) The assessment process includes interviews with the facility Community of Interest Advisory Panel (COI) and therefore it is considerd the audit process includes participation of impacted rights-holders. (page 8, https://mining.ca/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2021/12/TSM-Verification-Guide.pdf)	1	The scheme only requires partial disclosure or a summary of audit findings to be made public, indicating the company's performance against key criteria but without further explanation. (page 12, chttps://mining.ca/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2021/12/TSM-Verification-Guide.pdf)	0.5	Insufficient. Currently mining associations in Canada and Finland disclose their TSM performance reports (https://mining.ca/towards-sustainable-mining/tsm-progress-report/company-performance/), while TSM Canada now publishes verification reports (for example: https://mining.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/PAS-Lake-Shore-Gold-TSM-Verification-Report-2022-ver.2.pdf). However, this does not appear to be a requirement for all TSM Partners and these summary reports do not provide an adequate description of the non-conformances needing to be addressed within an associated time-frame	0	TSM has an internally facilitated "Issues Resolution Policy and Process" which serves as the grievance mechanism for the scheme. The policy states that an annual summary of grievances received through this mechanism, "including data on the number, type, and status of issues submitted" will be published on the Mining Association Canada website. However, no data is currently provided as no grievances have been received through the mechanism to date. There is no additional information provided on accessibility measures for the grievance process. https://mining.ca/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2021/12/TSM-Issues-Resolution-Policy.pdf	0.5	TSM is not an ISEAL community member or a code compliant member.	0	The TSM includes a climate change protocol which requires companies to make commitments to climate action consistent with the ambitions of the Paris Agreement (https://tsminitiative.com/protocols-frameworks#climate-change) The standard includes a protocol referencing ILO 29, 138 and 182 only. The standard's Indigenous and Community Protocol references UNDRIP and FPIC, providing a series of progressive requirements on shared decision-making processes with Indigenous Peoples. However, the overall requirement is only for mines to aim to obtain and maintain FPIC, and the minimum (level B) assessment criteria of the TSM does not include sufficient provisions to ensure effective community participation or FPIC. (https://tsminitiative.com/protocols-frameworks#indigenous-and-community-relationships) The standard does include reference to UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (page 31, https://mining.ca/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2021/12/TSM-Verification-Guide.pdf)	0.5	3	**Scheme has made progress in some areas but fails to meet multiple criteria for effective governance, auditing and / or accreditation against its standard**	0.4 (note: no indicator in the Leaderboard specifically mentions this scheme)
Global Steel Climate Council (GSCC)	Insufficient. The Global Steel Climate Council (GSCC) is a non-profit association organized to advance climate strategy by establishing standards and advocating for carbon emissions reductions by members of the steel industry. The GSCC includes more than 30 international producing members and supporters who are steel manufacturers, trade associations, end users, scrap metal suppliers and non-governmental organizations. Participation is almost entirely by industry groups. The description mentions the inclusion of NGO's but there is not formal process of stakeholder engagement.	**0**	Insufficient. The certification process is achieved through self-assessment with third-party verification, however no additional details are provided regarding the third party verification process. There is no evidence certification requires site-level verification (https://globalsteelclimatecouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/GSCC-Standard-August2023.pdf - page15)	0	The scheme has no requirements with regards to transparency of audit / certification results.	0	There is no public disclosure relating to Corrective Action Plans necessary to achieve certification and no assessment of whether CAPs have been implemented.	0	There is no evidence of a functioning grievance, complaints or issue resolution mechanism	0	GSCC is not an ISEAL community member or a code compliant member	0	Steel companies participating in this standard are required to establish science-based emissions targets that align with achieving the 1.5ºC scenario by 2050. (https://globalsteelclimatecouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/GSCC-FactSheet-August2023.pdf) There is no evidence the GSCC standard adheres to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the ILO Core Convention on the Five fundamental principles and rights at work with UNDRIP.	0.25	0.25	**Flawed scheme that fails to meet most of the minimum criteria for governance, auditing and / or accreditation**	No scoring attribution possible
International Council on Mining & Metals (ICMM) - Performance Expectations Validation	Insufficient. Affected rights-holders, their representatives, or civil society organizations are not afforded equal or any meaningful decision making power. The management team is comprised of entirely executive directors (Vhttps://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-story/our-people Additionally, there is no evidence of structured stakeholder engagement in the development of the standard.	**0**	Partial. The ICMM scheme mandates independent, third party audit of practices, including site-level verification. However it is not clear that participation of impacted rights-holder is required as part of the process, although the it is noted that the GRI Principle for Stakeholder Engagement (GRI 101) and disclosures regarding stakeholder engagement (GRI102-40, 102-42 and 102-44) are relevant as input for the determination of material sustainability risks and opportunities. (ICMM Assurance and Validation Procedure 2023 https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-principles/validation/procedure).	0.5	The ICMM does not publish, or require that its members publish, the overall result of the accreditation process.	0	Insufficient. The ICMM standard does not not reference corrective action plans, or equivalent, and therefore includes no requirement that the results of all CAPs must be disclosed publicly (initiatives must mandate the description of the non-conformances needing to be addressed within an associated time-frame in order to be considered sufficient).	0	ICMM provides guidance on developing and implementing a grievance mechanism to its members. Performance expectation 9.3 sets outs requirements for mines undergoing an asessment to maintain an effective grievance mechanism. The expectation describes the mechanism as being aligned with the UN Guiding Principles on Business & Human Rights (Validation Guidance Performance Expectations 2023, p34 https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-principles/validation/guidance). ICMM itself does not maintain a centralized grievance mechanism and there is no disclosure relating to recent grievances raised and the remedial action taken in response.	0	ICMM is not an ISEAL community member or a code compliant member	0	Performance Expectation 6.5, requirees the setting of scope 1 and 2 targets to build pathways to achieving net zero by 2050 ((Validation Guidance Performance Expectations 2023, p28 https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-principles/validation/guidance) Performance expectation 3.1 is for companies to support the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights by developing a policy commitment to respect human rights, undertaking human rights due diligence and providing for or cooperating in processes to enable the remediation of adverse human rights impacts that members have caused or contributed to (Mining Principles 2023, page 6 https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-principles/mining-principles/principle-3) Although the ICMM performance expectations do not explicitly reference the ILO Core Convention on the Five fundamental principles and rights at work, expectation 3.4 includes each of the ILO principles (Mining Principles 2023, page 6 https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-principles/mining-principles/principle-3) Adherence with UNDRIP, ILO 169 and FPIC is not assessed explcitly as part of the certification process. However, principle 3.6 & 3.7 aligns broadly with UNDRIP and FPIC as it relates to indigenous peoples (Mining Principles 2023, page 6 https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-principles/mining-principles/principle-3) . During 2023 the ICMM released a position paper Indigenous Peoples and Mining (2023, page 3) https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/our-principles/position-statements/indigenous-peoples) which references UNDRIP, ILO 169 and FPIC but this is not included in the Mining Principles assessment criteria.	0.75	1.25	**Flawed scheme that fails to meet most of the minimum criteria for governance, auditing and / or accreditation**	No scoring attribution possible