



## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

---

ROOTS for Safety B.V.

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](http://www.fairwear.org). The [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators and is available for download.

## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

ROOTS for Safety B.V.

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

AFFILIATE INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Hoogvliet, Netherlands
Member since:	01-07-2013
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where FWF is active:	China, Poland
Production in other countries:	
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	74%
Benchmarking score	42
Category	Good

### Summary:

In its first year of FWF membership, Roots has met most of FWF's management system requirements. With a monitoring percentage of 74%, it also meets the required monitoring percentage.

Roots has relatively few suppliers, allowing it to focus its monitoring and remediation efforts on these suppliers. Although it made a good start in 2013, FWF encourages Roots to continue in its efforts to integrate social compliance into its standard business practices.

## 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	74%	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

Comment: Roots currently buys at least 10% of production capacity for 74% of its production.

1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years	0%	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.	0	4	0
--	----	--	---	---	---	---

Recommendation: FWF recommends Roots to maintain stable business relationships with suppliers. Long term relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give factories a reason to invest in improving working conditions.

Comment: Currently, all of Roots' production volume comes from suppliers where a business relationship has lasted less than 5 years.

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
--	------------------	---	---------------------------	-----	---	---

Requirement: Roots needs to ensure that new suppliers sign and return the questionnaire before first orders are placed.

Comment: In 2013, Roots did not place orders at any new suppliers.

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
---	------------------	---	---	-----	---	---

**Requirement:** A formal process should exist to evaluate the risks of labour violations in the production areas the affiliate is operating. This evaluation should influence the decision on whether to place orders, how to prevent and mitigate risks, and what remediation steps may be necessary.

**Recommendation:** A risk analysis as part of the decision-making process of selecting new suppliers is an important step to mitigate risk and prevent potential problems. FWF recommends [FWF affiliate] to assess the risks associated with operating in specific production areas. FWF advises to use information from FWF country studies and wage ladders.

**Comment:** In 2013, Roots did not place orders at any new suppliers.

1.5 Supplier compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	No	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.	0	2	0
--	----	--	---	---	---	---

**Requirement:** A systematic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decision-making. The approach needs to ensure that the affiliate consistently evaluates the entire supplier base and includes information into decision-making procedures.

**Recommendation:** Affiliates are encouraged to develop an evaluation/grading system for suppliers where compliance with labour standards is a criterion for future order placement. Part of the system can be to create an incentive for rewarding suppliers for realised improvements in working conditions.

**Comment:** In 2013, Roots did not yet have a system in place to evaluate supplier compliance to Code of Labour Practices in a systematic manner. Audits and WEPs for its factories located in China are arranged by Roots' agent who is located in China.

1.6 The affiliate's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	General or ad-hoc system.	Affiliate production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at factories.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	2	4	0
---	---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

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

**Comment:** Roots works to make the production planning process as smooth as possible for the production locations. A relatively large buffer stock is maintained to allow on-time delivery and avoid rush orders as much as possible. The production flow starts with forecasting; forecasting is based upon historical sales figures and Roots maintains a lead time of 4 months for the standard collection. This relatively short lead time is made possible as significant fabric stock is maintained at the factory, eliminating the time needed for the arrival of fabrics. Special orders have a lead time of 6 months.

Roots' agent in China monitors production planning with production locations.

Recently, Roots rolled out forecasting software to more accurately predict upcoming orders and also introduced software that better tracks the production process. This allows Roots to better anticipate potential production and delivery delays.

Nevertheless, rush orders sometimes place pressure on the suppliers' ability to deliver garments according to schedule.

1.7 Degree to which affiliate mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	No production problems documented.	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.	N/A	6	0
--	------------------------------------	--	---	-----	---	---

**Requirement:** Roots should investigate to what extent its current buying practices has an effect on the working hours at supplier level. A root cause analysis of excessive overtime should be done to investigate which steps can be most effective to reduce overtime.

**Comment:** A FWF audit took place in 2013 but the audit report was only received by Roots in 2014.

1.8 Affiliate's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.	No policy in place	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.	0	4	0
--	--------------------	--	--	---	---	---

**Requirement:** Roots needs to develop a pricing policy where the affiliate knows the labour cost of garments and which allows the payment of at least legal minimum wages in production countries.

**Comment:** Most pricing discussions are done by Roots' agent in China. These discussions are not (yet) related to allowing workers to pay at least the legal minimum wages. Having said that, audits for its most important factory show that legal minimum wages were being paid.

In discussions with factory management, payment levels for workers are discussed.

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.	Basic approach	Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to affiliates' policies.	Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages.	2	8	0
---	----------------	---	--	---	---	---

**Requirement:** Roots is expected to take an active role in discussing living wages with its suppliers. The FWF wage ladder can be used as a tool to implement living wages. Most relevant wage estimates, such as local minimum wage, Asia Floor Wage, collective bargaining wage and industrial best practice wages are provided in the wage ladder. The wage ladder is included in FWF's audit reports. It demonstrates the gaps between workers' wages at a factory and living wages demanded by major stakeholders. The wage ladder can be used to document, monitor, negotiate and evaluate the improvements at its suppliers.

**Comment:** As mentioned above, Roots has had discussions on wage levels with its most important factory.

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
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---

**Comment:** Roots sources from a FWF factory member.

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: 29

Earned Points: 10

## 2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	74%	
% of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented	4%	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	74%	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

Comment: Within Roots, one staff person has been designated to monitor the supply chain.

2.2 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans	No Caps Active	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.	N/A	8	-2
---	----------------	---	---	-----	---	----

Comment: In 2013, there were no CAPs active for Roots.

2.3 Percentage of production volume from suppliers that have been visited by the affiliate in the past financial year	100%	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
---	------	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: All production locations were visited in 2013.

2.4 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	Yes	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.	1	3	0
--	-----	---	--	---	---	---

Comment: Roots did have an existing audit report when it joined FWF.

2.5 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner	No Corrective Action Plans active	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.	N/A	2	-1
--	-----------------------------------	---	--	-----	---	----

Comment: In 2013, there were no CAPs active.

2.6 High risk issues specific to the affiliate's supply chain are identified and addressed by the monitoring system.	Insufficient 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.	0	6	0
--	-----------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Requirement: Roots' monitoring system should identify and address high risk issues that are specific to the affiliates' sourcing practices. FWF provides policies and country-specific requirements to affiliates. Priorities in remediation efforts are guided by these policies.

Recommendation: Knowing the country specific risks facilitates the starting point for discussing this with suppliers. Affiliates can agree on additional commitments that are required to mitigate risks. The affiliate can provide additional measures for support and integrate that in the monitoring system.

**Comment:** Roots has made a deliberate choice in sourcing only from China and staying with its suppliers for a relatively long period of time. This means that it has chosen not to source from other countries that Roots is less familiar with.

Having said that, Roots does not have a structured system in place yet to identify and mitigate high risk issues specific to the country of China.

2.7 Affiliate cooperates with other customers in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers	No CAPs active or no shared suppliers.	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.	N/A	2	-1
---	--	---	--	-----	---	----

**Comment:** In 2013, there were no CAPs active for Roots.

2.8 Monitoring requirements are fulfilled for production in low-risk countries	No	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.	0	2	0
--	----	---	---	---	---	---

**Requirement:** Monitoring requirements need to be fulfilled for production in low-risk countries in order for it to be counted towards the monitoring threshold. All production sites in low-risk countries must:

- Be visited at least annually by affiliate representatives;
- Be informed of FWF membership and return the completed CoLP questionnaire before production orders are placed;
- Post the FWF Worker Information Sheet in local languages.

**Comment:** Roots did not fulfill the monitoring requirements for its production site in Poland.

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: 17

Earned Points: 7

### 3. COMPLAINTS HANDLING

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
Number of worker complaints received since last check	0	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		
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check		

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	No	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.	0	2	0

**Requirement:** The affiliate must ensure that the Code of Labour Practices, including contact information of the local complaints handler of FWF, is posted in factories in a location that is accessible to workers. Affiliate should check by means of a visit whether the CoLP is posted in the factories.

**Comment:** In 2013, Roots did not have a system in place to check that the Worker Information Sheets were posted.

3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	0%	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.	-2	4	-2
--	----	--	--	----	---	----

**Recommendation:** Roots can stimulate its suppliers to participate in WEP trainings, to raise awareness about the existence and the functioning of FWF's worker hotline. In addition to sending the worker information sheet, affiliates can use the worker information cards available for download on FWF's website.

**Comment:** In 2013, a FWF audit was conducted at Roots' most important supplier. Roots did not have access to this audit report in 2013. The finding from that audit for this criterion, however, is still relevant.

At audited factory, workers are not (yet) aware of FWF, the Code of Labour Practices and the complaints mechanism.

3.4 All complaints received from factory workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure	No complaints received	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.	N/A	6	-2
--	------------------------	---	---	-----	---	----

3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers	No complaints or cooperation not possible / necessary.	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.	N/A	2	-2
--	--	--	--	-----	---	----

---

## COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: -1

---

## 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: Management informed Roots staff of FWF membership. Roots has hired an external CSR consultant to help with the process of further developing a CSR program.

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: The person responsible for FWF requirements attended a FWF training session.

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
--	-----	---	---	---	---	----

Requirement: Roots needs to ensure agents are aware of FWF requirements and actively support the implementation of the CoLP.

Comment: Roots makes use of an agent for its production in China. This agent is aware of Roots' FWF membership, but has not (yet) actively supported implementation of the CoLP.

4.4 Factory participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume)	0%	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.	0	6	0
---	----	--	--	---	---	---

**Recommendation:** In order to ensure awareness and enhance understanding of the relevant labour standards, grievance mechanisms and the importance of a good mechanism for communication between employers and workers in the workplace, FWF developed the Workplace Education Programme. This programme is offered in the 4 priority countries. The affiliate should motivate its main supplier(s) to join WEP trainings.

**Comment:** In 2013, Roots did not enroll its suppliers in the FWF Workplace Education Program.

4.5 Factory participation in trainings (where WEP is not offered; by production volume)	All production is in WEP areas.	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.	N/A	4	0
---	---------------------------------	--	---	-----	---	---

## TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 11

**Earned Points: 4**

## 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

**Recommendation:** Affiliates are advised to develop a systematic approach to complete the supplier list. Part of the approach can be:

- 1) automatically include information from audit reports and complaints
- 2) Business relationships with agents include transparency of production locations.
- 3) Agreements with factories on the use of subcontractors stating clearly that when subcontractors are used, they are included in the monitoring system and information is shared on the subcontracted production process.

**Comment:** Roots was able to identify all production locations.

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:** Roots has an internal server where FWF information can be found that is accessible to everyone.

---

## 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

**Recommendation:** FWF recommends Roots 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.

**Comment:** In 2013, Roots did not engage in any advanced reporting activities.

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:** In 2013, Roots did not yet need to submit a Social Report due to it joining in the second half of the year.

---

## 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: FWF membership is discussed and evaluated regularly with the involvement of top management.

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

## SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	10	29
Monitoring and Remediation	7	17
Complaints Handling	-1	7
Training and Capacity Building	4	11
Information Management	7	7
Transparency	3	4
Evaluation	2	2
Totals:	32	77

**BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS ÷ POSSIBLE POINTS)**

42

**PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY**

Good

## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

11-11-2014

Conducted by:

Kees Gootjes

Interviews with:

Marco Kremers, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Manager

Theo de Vliegh, Managing Director

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.