



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Haglöfs Scandinavia AB

PUBLICATION DATE: JULY 2014

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2013 to 31-12-2013

ABOUT THE BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Fair Wear Foundation believes that improving conditions for apparel factory workers requires change at multiple levels. Traditional efforts to improve conditions focus primarily on the factory. FWF, however, believes that the management decisions of the clothing brands have an enormous influence for good or ill on factory conditions.

FWF's Brand Performance Check is a tool to evaluate and report on the activities of FWF's affiliate members. The Checks examine how affiliate management systems support FWF's Code of Labour Practices.

In most apparel supply chains, clothing brands do not own factories, and most factories work for many different brands. This means that in most cases FWF affiliates have influence, but not direct control, over working conditions. As a result, the Brand Performance Checks focus primarily on verifying the efforts of affiliates. Outcomes at the factory level are assessed via audits and complaint reports, however the complexity of the supply chains means that even the best efforts of FWF affiliates cannot guarantee results.

Even if outcomes at the factory level cannot be guaranteed, the importance of good management practices by affiliates cannot be understated. Even one concerned customer at a factory can have significant positive impacts on a range of issues like health and safety conditions or freedom of association. And if one customer at a factory can demonstrate that improvements are possible, other customers no longer have an excuse not to act. The development and sharing of these types of best practices has long been a core part of FWF's work.

Improvement of supply chains is a step-by-step process, through which affiliates must address many different issues. FWF affiliates vary greatly in management structures, and have different strengths. The Performance Benchmarking system is designed to reflect these differences, and the many different ways that a company can support better working conditions.

During the Brand Performance Check, FWF staff speak to various employees at the affiliate who have important roles to play in the management of supply chains. FWF verifies the actions of affiliates based on several sources including documentation of activities, financial records, the affiliate's supplier register and staff interviews. Following the Brand Performance Check, FWF summarizes findings in this report, which is made public via www.fairwear.org. The [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators and is available for download.

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Haglöfs Scandinavia AB

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2013 to 31-12-2013

AFFILIATE INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Avesta, Sweden
Member since:	18-04-2012
Product types:	Outdoor
Production in countries where FWF is active:	China, Portugal, Romania, Turkey, Viet Nam
Production in other countries:	Estonia, Indonesia, Sweden
BASIC REQUIREMENTS	
Workplan for this evaluation period was submitted?	Yes
Actual supplier register for this evaluation period has been submitted?	Yes
Membership fee has been paid?	Yes
All suppliers have been notified of FWF membership?	Yes
SCORING OVERVIEW	
% of own production under monitoring	79%
Benchmarking score	72
Category	Good

Summary:

Haglöfs meets most of FWFs management system requirements.

In its second of FWF membership, it has achieved a monitoring percentage of 79%, which is significantly higher than the required 60%.

In terms of sourcing, Haglöfs has a relatively steady and longterm relationship with its suppliers. In 2013, the brand continued efforts to reduce overtime at its suppliers through its production planning system. Haglöfs is working on having an open costing sheet for all its suppliers in order to have a better understanding of labour costs in its products.

Haglöfs actively cooperates with other FWF brands in organizing audits, conducting follow-up, and resolving complaints.

PERFORMANCE CATEGORY OVERVIEW

Leader: This category is for affiliates who are doing exceptionally well, and are operating at an advanced level.

Good: It is FWF's belief that affiliates who are making a serious effort to implement the Code of Labour Practices—the vast majority of FWF affiliates—are 'doing good' and deserve to be recognized as such. They are also doing more than the average clothing company, and have allowed their internal processes to be examined and publicly reported on by an independent NGO. The majority of affiliates will receive a 'Good' rating.

Needs Improvement: Affiliates are most likely to find themselves in this category when major unexpected problems have arisen, or if they are unable or unwilling to seriously work towards CoLP implementation. Affiliates may be in this category for one year only after which they should either move up to Good, or will be moved to suspended.

Suspended: Affiliates who either fail to meet one of the Basic Requirements, have had major internal changes which means membership must be put on hold for a maximum of one year, or have been in Needs Improvement for more than one year. Affiliates may remain in this category for one year maximum, after which termination proceedings will come into force.

Categories are calculated based on a combination of benchmarking score and the percentage of own production under monitoring. The specific requirements for each category are outlined in the Brand Performance Check Guide.

1. PURCHASING PRACTICES

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.1 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where affiliate buys at least 10% of production capacity	51%	Affiliates with less than 10% of a factories' production capacity generally have limited influence on factory managers to make changes.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	3	4	0
1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years	91%	Stable business relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give factories a reason to invest in improving working conditions.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	4	4	0
1.3 All new suppliers are required to sign and return the Code of Labour Practices before first orders are placed.	No new suppliers	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between factories and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	N/A	2	0
1.4 Company conducts human rights due diligence at all new suppliers before placing orders.	No new suppliers	Due diligence helps to identify, prevent and mitigate potential human rights problems at new suppliers.	Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments.	N/A	4	0

Comment: In 2013, Haglöfs did not place any orders at new suppliers. It has, however, set up a system for conducting due diligence when this will take place in the future. This guideline outlines the various steps that a potential new factory as well as Haglöfs will take to mitigate any outstanding social compliance risks. This guidelines includes, if necessary, the step of conducting a FWF audit before placing any orders.

1.5 Supplier compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	Yes	A systemic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decisionmaking.	Documentation of systemic approach: rating systems, checklists, databases, etc.	1	2	0
--	-----	--	---	---	---	---

Comment: Haglofs evaluates Code of Labour Practices compliance in a systematic manner by keeping track of audits, following up on them and including social compliance aspects in factory visits.

It has decided against rewarding social compliance performance because the decision to source more or less at a factory depends on more than just social compliance aspects.

1.6 The affiliate's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	Strong, integrated systems in place.	Affiliate production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at factories.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	4	4	0
---	--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: Haglofs continues to work on making progress on issues regarding reasonable working hours. In 2013, it offered incentives to country subsidiaries to order early, leading to an increase of 50% in early orders. In addition to this, Haglofs worked with partial shipments and reduced sales periods.

Haglofs also does not make any changes after order is placed, and prebooks materials and fabrics well before order deadline so that all materials should be in the factory when production is scheduled to begin.

1.7 Degree to which affiliate mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Intermediate efforts	Some production delays are outside of the control of affiliates; however there are a number of steps that can be taken to address production delays without resorting to excessive overtime.	Documentation of root cause analysis and positive steps taken to manage production delays or improve factory processes.	3	6	0
--	----------------------	--	---	---	---	---

Recommendation: Haglofs could discuss with factory management on the causes of excessive overtime and provide support to manage overtime. If necessary, Haglofs could hire local experts to analyse root cause of excessive overtime in cooperation with the supplier. FWF could recommend qualified persons upon request.

A good production planning system needs to be established based on the production capacity of the factory for regular working hours.

Comment: Based on audit reports and CAPs, Haglofs worked to address excessive overtime issues with factories. This is, however, not easy as suppliers are not always clear about issues related to production capacity and overtime.

In terms of production capacity, all production plans are done in partnership with the factory. This does not mean, however, that the factory plans production in a manner that avoids excessive overtime.

1.8 Affiliate's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.	Country-level policy	The first step towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages - and towards implementation of living wages - is to know the labour costs of garments.	Formal systems to calculate labour costs on per-product or country/city level.	2	4	0
--	----------------------	--	--	---	---	---

Comment: Haglofs is working on gaining insight into a cost breakdown of its products. This is an important starting point for working towards ensuring living wages as it shows per product what the labour input is.

This is an ongoing project with the first costing sheets completed in the fall of 2013. For this reason, full points cannot (yet) be awarded.

1.9 Affiliate actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages.	No minimum wage problems reported	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage, FWF affiliates are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, FWF audit reports or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	2	2	-2
1.10 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by affiliate.	No	Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on factories and their ability to pay workers on time. Most garment workers have minimal savings, and even a brief delay in payments can cause serious problems.	Based on a complaint or audit report; review of factory and affiliate financial documents.	0	0	-1
1.11 Degree to which affiliate assesses root causes of wages lower than living wages with suppliers and takes steps towards the implementation of living wages.	Factory-level approach	Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to affiliates' policies.	Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages.	4	8	0

Recommendation: FWF encourages the affiliate to assess the hypothetical cost effects of increasing wages towards benchmarks that are included in the wage ladder. To support companies in this process FWF has developed a calculation model that estimates the effect on FOB and retail prices under different pricing models.

Comment: Haglofs is currently working on gaining insight into a cost breakdown of its products. This is an important starting point for working towards ensuring living wages as it shows per product what the labour input is.

After the costing sheets are completed for all suppliers (meaning it is a supply chain approach), Haglofs can work start with living wage engineering. This will lead towards the implementation of living wages.

1.12 Affiliate sources from an FWF factory member.	Yes	When possible, FWF encourages affiliates to source from FWF factory members. On account of the small number of factories this is a 'bonus' indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an affiliate's score.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	1	1	0
1.13 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the affiliate.	None	Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an affiliate's score.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	N/A	2	0

PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 35

Earned Points: 24

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	56%	
% of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented	23%	FWF low risk policy should be implemented. 0 = policy is not implemented correctly. N/A = no production in low risk countries.
Total of own production under monitoring	79%	Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 90% Measured as a percentage of turnover.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.1 Specific staff person is designated to follow up on problems identified by monitoring system	Yes	Followup is a serious part of FWF membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	2	2	-2
2.2 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans	Intermediate	FWF considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that affiliates can do towards improving working conditions.	Documentation of remediation and followup actions taken by affiliate.	4	8	-2

Recommendation: To further facilitate factory and/or brand-level root cause analysis and remediation,

Haglöfs could consider:

- Hire a local consultant to assist factory in developing an action plan and to assist factory management in investigating root causes.
- Organise supplier seminars.
- Provide factory training.
- Share knowledge/material.
- providing financial support to the supplier for implementing improvements

Comment: Haglöfs has formulated a monitoring system in 2013 that keeps track of progress on CAPs and also describes the procedure for factory visits by its representatives.

It has also worked with other FWF brands to meet with supplier representatives at international events and fairs in order to streamline efforts.

Currently, factory and/or brand-level root cause analysis on recurring CAP issues in the supply chain is in development for more difficult issues such as living wage and overtime.

2.3 Percentage of production volume from suppliers that have been visited by the affiliate in the past financial year	81%	Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by affiliate staff or local representatives. They reinforce to factory managers that affiliates are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices.	Affiliates should document all factory visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	4	4	0
2.4 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	Yes, quality assessed and corrective actions implemented	Existing reports form a basis for understanding the issues and strengths of a supplier, and reduces duplicative work.	Audit reports are on file; evidence of followup on prior CAPs. Reports of quality assessments.	3	3	0
2.5 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner	Yes	FWF audit reports should be shared and discussed with suppliers within two months of audit receipt. Timely sharing of information and agreement on corrective actions is essential for improvement. A reasonable time frame should be specified for resolving findings.	Corrective Action Plans, emails; findings of followup audits; brand representative present during audit exit meeting, etc.	2	2	-1

Comment: Haglofs shares its CAPs with its suppliers on a timely basis and meets with the factory to establish improvement timelines.

2.6 High risk issues specific to the affiliate's supply chain are identified and addressed by the monitoring system.	Intermediate Capacity	Different countries and products have different risks associated with them; monitoring systems should be adapted to allow appropriate human rights due diligence for the specific risks in each affiliates' supply chain.	Documentation may take many forms; additional research, specific FWF project participation; extra monitoring activities, extra mitigation activities, etc.	3	6	0
--	-----------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Recommendation: Haglofs is recommended to continue working on mitigating the country-specific high risks.

Comment: Haglofs has worked to identify and begin work on mitigation for a number of high risk issues in the supply chain (eg. overtime, living wage, freedom of association) in the countries that it sources from. The mitigation of these issues is ongoing.

2.7 Affiliate cooperates with other customers in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers	Active cooperation	Cooperation between customers increases leverage and chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the changes of a factory having to conduct multiple Corrective Action Plans about the same issue with multiple customers.	Shared CAPs, evidence of cooperation with other customers.	2	2	-1
---	--------------------	---	--	---	---	----

Comment: Haglofs actively cooperates with other FWF brands in resolving CAP issues.

2.8 Monitoring requirements are fulfilled for production in low-risk countries	Yes	Low risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with basic standards.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	2	2	0
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---

2.9 External brands resold by the affiliate who have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire. (% of external sales volume)	No external brands resold	FWF believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of FWF or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	N/A	3	0
2.10 External brands resold by affiliates that are members of another credible initiative. (% of external sales volume)	No external brands resold	FWF believes affiliates who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to stock external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously.	Supplier register; Documentation of sales volumes of products made by FWF or FLA members.	N/A	3	0

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 29

Earned Points: 22

3. COMPLAINTS HANDLING

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
Number of worker complaints received since last check	1	At this point, FWF considers a high number of complaints as a positive indicator, as it shows that workers are aware of and making use of the complaints system.
Number of worker complaints in process of being resolved	0	
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check	1	

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.1 A specific employee has been designated to address worker complaints	Yes	Followup is a serious part of FWF membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	1	1	-1
3.2 System exists to check that the Worker Information Sheet is posted in factories	Yes	The Worker Information Sheet is a key first step in alerting workers to their rights.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from factory visits, etc.	2	2	0
3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	66%	The FWF complaints procedure is a crucial element of verification. If factory-based complaint systems do not exist or do not work, the FWF worker helpline allows workers to ask questions about their rights and file complaints. Factory participation in the Workplace Education Programme also count towards this indicator.	Percentage of audited factories where at least 50% of interviewed workers indicate awareness of the FWF complaints mechanism + percentage of factories in WEP programme.	3	4	-2

3.4 All complaints received from factory workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure	Yes	Providing access to remedy when problems arise is a key element of responsible supply chain management. Affiliate involvement is often essential to resolving issues.	Documentation that affiliate has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process.	3	6	-2
3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers	Active cooperation	Because most factories supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the FWF affiliate can be critical in resolving a complaint at a supplier.	Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc.	2	2	-2

Comment: The complaint regarding excessive overtime was dealt with together with other FWF brands sourcing at the factory.

COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 15

Earned Points: 11

4. TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.1 All staff is made aware of FWF membership requirements	Yes	Preventing and remediating problems often requires the involvement of many different departments; making all staff aware of FWF membership requirements helps to support cross-departmental collaboration when needed.	Emails, trainings, presentation, newsletters, etc.	1	1	-1

Comment: Haglofs organized a training session for its sales staff where a FWF employee presented.

4.2 Ongoing training in support of FWF requirements is provided to staff in direct contact with suppliers.	Yes	Sourcing, purchasing and CSR staff at a minimum should possess the knowledge necessary to implement FWF requirements and advocate for change within their organisations.	FWF Seminars or equivalent trainings provided; presentations, curricula, etc.	2	2	0
--	-----	--	---	---	---	---

Comment: Haglofs hosted a number of training sessions for production and development staff in 2013.

4.3 All sourcing contractors/agents are informed about FWF's Code of Labour Practices.	Yes	Agents have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is the responsibility of affiliate to ensure agents actively support the implementation of the CoLP.	Correspondence with agents, trainings for agents, FWF audit findings.	1	2	-2
--	-----	---	---	---	---	----

Recommendation: Haglofs can use sourcing contractors/agents to follow up on CAPs following audits.

Comment: Haglofs made use of a limited number of agents in 2013. These agents were informed of FWF and its Code of Labour Practices.

4.4 Factory participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume)	28%	Lack of knowledge and skills on best practices related to labour standards is a common issue in factories. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards sustainable improvements.	Documentation of relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education Programme.	4	6	0
---	-----	--	--	---	---	---

Recommendation: Haglofs could use the experience of the WEP trainings done in other factories to motivate other suppliers to enrol in the WEP trainings.

Comment: Haglofs has had two WEP training sessions at factories located in China.

4.5 Factory participation in trainings (where WEP is not offered; by production volume)	0%	In areas where the Workplace Education Programme is not yet offered, affiliates may arrange trainings on their own or work with other training-partners. Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator.	Curricula, other documentation of training content, participation and outcomes.	0	4	0
---	----	--	---	---	---	---

Recommendation: Whenever the FWF affiliate contacts a new supplier, this new supplier must also be informed on the implications of FWF membership. Next to that all factory workers should be informed about the labour standards and the process of monitoring and remediation. In order to further communication between employers and workers in the workplace FWF recommends Haglofs to arrange trainings in areas where the Workplace Education Programme is not yet offered.

Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator: top management, supervisors and workers should be included in the trainings, separately. Workplace standards and dispute handling should be included in the training. At least 10-20% of the workforce must be trained, depending on the size of the factory. Worker participations should be balanced and representative.

FWF can help by putting Haglofs in contact with organizations.

TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 15

Earned Points: 8

5. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
5.1 Level of effort to identify all production locations and update supplier information.	Advanced	Any improvements to supply chains require affiliates to first know all of their suppliers and production locations.	Supplier information provided by affiliate. Financial records of previous financial year. Documented efforts by affiliate to update supplier information from its monitoring activities.	6	6	-2

Comment: Haglofs works to maintain and update its supplier information regularly. It also contractually obligates its suppliers not to work with subcontractors.

5.2 A system exists to allow purchasing, CSR and other relevant staff to share information with each other about working conditions at suppliers	Yes	CSR, purchasing and other staff who interact with suppliers need to be able to share information in order to establish a coherent and effective strategy for improvements.	Internal information system; status CAPs, reports of meetings of purchasing/CSR; systematic way of storing information.	1	1	-1
--	-----	--	---	---	---	----

Comment: Haglofs has an internal information sharing system that contains information on audits, factory visits and other relevant information.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 7

6. TRANSPARENCY

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
6.1 Communication about FWF membership adheres to the FWF communications policy	Yes	FWF membership should be communicated in a clear and accurate manner. FWF guidelines are designed to prevent misleading claims.	Logo is placed on website; other communications in line with policy. Affiliates may lose points if there is evidence that they did not comply with the communications policy.	1	1	-2
6.2 Affiliate engages in advanced reporting activities	No	Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of FWF's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Affiliate publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	0	1	0
<p>Recommendation: FWF recommends the affiliate to publish one or more of the following reports on its website: brand performance check, audit reports, supplier information. Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of the affiliate and FWF's work.</p> <p>Comment: Haglöfs currently does not post its Brand Performance Check on its website. In its Annual Report, however, it does provide information on audit report findings.</p>						
6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on affiliate's website	Published on affiliate's website	The Social Report is an important tool for brands to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders.	Report adheres to FWF guidelines for Social Report content.	2	2	-2

Comment: Haglofs has submitted its Social Report to FWF and this report is published as part of its Annual Report.

TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 4

Earned Points: 3

7. EVALUATION

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
7.1 Systemic annual evaluation of FWF membership is conducted with involvement of top management	Yes	An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Sustainability, including FWF, is on the agenda of the Haglöfs Management Team meeting for every monthly meeting.

7.2 Percentage of required changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by affiliate	No requirements were included in previous Check	In each Brand Performance Check report, FWF may include requirements for changes to management practices. Adherence to these requirements is an important part of FWF membership.	Affiliate should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	N/A	8	-4
---	---	---	--	-----	---	----

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 2

Earned Points: 2

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

None.

SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	24	35
Monitoring and Remediation	22	29
Complaints Handling	11	15
Training and Capacity Building	8	15
Information Management	7	7
Transparency	3	4
Evaluation	2	2
Totals:	77	107

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS ÷ POSSIBLE POINTS)

72

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

02-05-2014

Conducted by:

Kees Gootjes

Interviews with:

Lennart Ekberg, Director of Sustainability

Johnny Claus, Production Manager

Katarina Stenman, Development & Sourcing Manager

Audit Summary:

Publication of the audit summary section previously included in Brand Performance Checks has been suspended while Fair Wear Foundation develops a new information system to manage and summarize the data. Future Brand Performance Checks will include improved usability and transparency for audit data.