



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Van Puijenbroek Textiel

PUBLICATION DATE: DECEMBER 2015

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2014 to 31-12-2014

ABOUT THE BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Fair Wear Foundation believes that improving conditions for apparel factory workers requires change at many levels. Traditional efforts to improve conditions focus primarily on the factory. FWF, however, believes that the management decisions of 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. They evaluate the parts of affiliate supply chains where clothing is assembled. This is the most labour intensive part of garment supply chains, and where brands can have the most influence over working conditions.

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.

The Brand Performance Check system is designed to accommodate the range of structures and strengths that different companies have, and reflects the different ways that brands can support better working conditions.

This report is based on interviews with affiliate employees who play important roles in the management of supply chains, and a variety of documentation sources, financial records, supplier data. The findings from the Brand Performance Check are summarized and published at www.fairwear.org. The online [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators.

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Van Puijenbroek Textiel

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2014 to 31-12-2014

AFFILIATE INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Goirle, Netherlands
Member since:	01-02-2004
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where FWF is active:	Macedonia, the former Yugoslav Republic of, Tunisia, Viet Nam
Production in other countries:	Laos, Serbia
BASIC REQUIREMENTS	
Workplan and projected production location data for upcoming year have been submitted?	Yes
Actual production location data for evaluation period was submitted?	Yes
Membership fee has been paid?	Yes
All suppliers have been notified of FWF membership?	Yes
SCORING OVERVIEW	
% of own production under monitoring	82%
Benchmarking score	75
Category	Good

Summary:

In 2014, Van Puijenbroek met most of FWF's management system requirements. With a score of 75, it is within the minimum required score for a Leader classification. Its monitoring threshold, however, remained similar to last year and is below the required percentage for a member who has been a member for more than three years. For this reason, Van Puijenbroek is awarded the Good category.

The continued lower-than-required monitoring percentage is related to Van Puijenbroek doing test production in two production locations in different countries. Even though there was due diligence on a factory level with factory visits and reports, there was unclear due diligence on a country level, including becoming familiar with the unique social compliance challenges of sourcing in Laos and Serbia. In 2015, Van Puijenbroek is taking steps to return to the required monitoring percentage of 90%.

Audit reports in 2014, however, showed improvement. Its new production facility in Macedonia was also audited, and the conditions at that factory were seen as very good. Most production locations have active trade unions, and overtime is not a relevant issue. In terms of wages, there is still room for improvement.

FWF encourages Van Puijenbroek to work towards attaining the required monitoring percentage. It also encourages Van Puijenbroek to conduct WEP training sessions at a number of its factories and, if necessary, conduct due diligence processes on a country level when commencing new production.

PERFORMANCE CATEGORY OVERVIEW

Leader: This category is for affiliates who are doing exceptionally well, and are operating at an advanced level. Leaders show best practices in complex areas such as living wages and freedom of association.

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	90%	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.	4	4	0

Comment: Approximately 90% of Van Puijenbroek's production volume came from suppliers where it buys at least 10% of capacity, with a number of production locations with 100% leverage.

1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years	76%	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
--	-----	--	---	---	---	---

Comment: Approximately 76% of Van Puijenbroek's production volume came from suppliers where it has had a business relationship with for at least five years, a reduction from last year due to production that took place in new production locations.

1.3 All new suppliers are required to sign and return the Code of Labour Practices before first orders are placed.	Yes	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.	2	2	0
--	-----	---	---------------------------	---	---	---

1.4 Company conducts human rights due diligence at all new suppliers before placing orders.	Yes	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.	4	4	0
---	-----	---	---	---	---	---

Recommendation: FWF recommends Van Puijenbroek to standardize its due diligence processes.

FWF recommends Van Puijenbroek to assess the risks associated with operating in specific production areas. FWF advises to use information from FWF country studies and wage ladders. Van Puijenbroek can cooperate with local stakeholders to further investigate the situation in a specific country

Comment: Van Puijenbroek does conduct due diligence before placing orders at new suppliers by visiting the production location, discussing social compliance and reporting on this. This happened at different production locations in 2014, but as far as FWF could tell, there was no analysis of the risk level associated with a certain region or country.

For new production in Laos, the factory was owned by a person who known to Van Puijenbroek. For Serbia, the production location was chosen by someone with local knowledge and contacts.

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: Van Puijenbroek has a strong system of improving and maintaining supplier compliance with FWF Code of Labour Practices. It has local people in all of its production countries that visit factories on at least a weekly basis. During factory visits, reports are written that systematically include social compliance elements.

Improved supplier compliance with Code of Labour Practices is currently not rewarded in any quantifiable way.

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: Van Puijenbroek has a weekly planning system that is based on the known weekly capacity of the factory as calculated including available hours and number of workers. If a factory shows that it produces more than planned, it will be rewarded with more orders. The opposite is also true, if a factory falls behind in its production, the weekly production order will be reduced (with a lag of a few weeks) in order to allow the factory to catch up to the orders.

1.7 Degree to which affiliate mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Advanced 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.	6	6	0
--	------------------	--	---	---	---	---

Comment: As mentioned in the previous indicator, Van Puijenbroek has a weekly planning system that is adjusted according to actual production. This means that it consistently takes specific actions to prevent or mitigate overtime.

Previous audits have also shown that excessive overtime occurrence at production facilities has been reduced.

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

Recommendation: As an advanced step, increased transparency in costing and productivity gives insight in the labour costs per product. This forms the basis for ensuring enough is paid to cover at least minimum wage and for making steps towards living wages.

Comment: Van Puijenbroek works with a minute price for each of its production locations. It relies on FWF audits to get details on the payment of wages, so there is no style-level policy linking working minutes to wage levels.

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: Van Puijenbroek is encouraged to take adequate steps to move towards living wages as estimated by local stakeholders.

Comment: Van Puijenbroek participated in a FWF living wage and productivity project in 2014. A part of this project included assessing the hypothetical costs of increasing wages of living wage benchmark levels, leading to a supply chain approach to implementation of living wages. The results of the project were presented to both Van Puijenbroek and management and trade unions representatives of two of its most important suppliers in Macedonia.

As far as FWF could ascertain, there was no follow-up to this project in terms of moving towards the implementation of living wages.

A factory audit at one of its suppliers in Macedonia did, however, show that wages were relatively high in comparison to other audited factories located in Macedonia.

1.12 Affiliate sources from an FWF factory member.	No	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.	N/A	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: 40

Earned Points: 33

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	82%	
% of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented	0%	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	82%	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	Advanced	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.	8	8	-2

Comment: Audits performed showed good working conditions and effective follow-up in both Macedonia and Tunisia. Overtime was not an issue in any audited factories. Most factories, especially the ones where it has 100% leverage, have active unions in place. Wage levels at one of the factories was relatively high for the Macedonian garment industry.

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

2.4 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	No	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.	0	3	0
--	----	---	--	---	---	---

Recommendation: Existing reports form a basis for understanding the issues and strengths of a supplier, and reduces double work. Existing audits can be counted towards the monitoring threshold if the quality of the report is assessed using the FWF audit quality tool and corrective actions are implemented.

Comment: Only audit certificates were collected, a full audit report was not collected.

2.5 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner	Yes	2 part indicator: FWF audit reports were shared and discussed with suppliers within two months of audit receipt AND a reasonable time frame was specified for resolving findings.	Corrective Action Plans, emails; findings of followup audits; brand representative present during audit exit meeting, etc.	2	2	-1
--	-----	---	--	---	---	----

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

Comment: For the countries where it had existing production in 2014, Van Puijenbroek is well aware of the risks due to its local staff on the ground, regular FWF audits, and participation in a past FWF project related to wage levels.

Van Puijenbroek began production in two countries where it did not produce before. Even though it conducted due diligence on a factory level, visited the (potential) production locations and monitored them, as far as FWF could ascertain, it did not work to identify high risk issues related to sourcing in Laos or Serbia. For this reason, full points cannot be awarded.

2.6a High risk issues specific to Bangladesh are identified and addressed by the monitoring system and remediation activities.	Not sourcing in Bangladesh	Affiliates sourcing in Bangladesh should take additional action to address both building and fire safety and the prevention of violence against women.	Building, electrical and fire safety inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories (Accord signatories and/or FWF affiliates), etc.	N/A	3	0
2.6b High risk issues specific to Myanmar are identified and addressed by the monitoring system and remediation activities.	Not sourcing in Myanmar	Myanmar is still in the process of establishing the legal and civil society infrastructure needed to ensure compliance with labour rights. Extra care must be taken when doing business in Myanmar.	Shared CAPs, Wage Ladders per factory.	N/A	3	0
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

2.8 Monitoring requirements are fulfilled for production in low-risk countries	No production in lowrisk countries	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.	N/A	2	0
2.9 External brands resold by the affiliate who have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire. (% of external sales volume)	100%	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.	3	3	0
2.10 External brands resold by affiliates that are members of another credible initiative. (% of external sales volume)	0%	FWF believes affiliates who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to stock external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously.	External production data in FWF's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by FWF or FLA members.	0	3	0

Comment: Van Puijenbroek had discussions with its external brands about FWF membership and/or improving working conditions.

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 31

Earned Points: 22

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	0	
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check	0	

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: Van Puijenbroek must ensure that the Worker Information Sheet, including contact information of the local complaints handler of FWF, is posted in factories in a location that is accessible to all workers. It should check by means of a visit whether the Worker Information Sheet is posted in the factories.

Recommendation: It is suggested to ask suppliers to submit a photo of the posted Worker Information Sheet with the annual questionnaire and to ask staff visiting a supplier to check if the documents are still posted as indicated on the obtained photo.

Comment: Van Puijenbroek was unable to show that the Worker Information Sheet was posted in the factories located in Laos and Serbia.

3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	67%	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
--	-----	--	--	---	---	----

Comment: Workers at two out of three factories audited in 2014 were aware of the FWF worker helpline.

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: 4

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: Van Puijenbroek staff are informed about FWF and what it means for them in their daily business.

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: Relevant Van Puijenbroek staff are informed about FWF and what it means for them in their daily business.

4.3 All sourcing contractors/agents are informed about FWF's Code of Labour Practices.	Affiliate does not use agents	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.	N/A	2	-2
--	-------------------------------	---	---	-----	---	----

4.4 Factory participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume)	No production in WEP areas	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.	N/A	6	0
---	----------------------------	--	--	-----	---	---

Recommendation: FWF recommends Van Puijenbroek to organize WEP training sessions in 2015.

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

Comment: No training sessions were organized for factories in 2014.

TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 3

5. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
5.1 Level of effort to identify all production locations	Advanced	Any improvements to supply chains require affiliates to first know all of their 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: Van Puijenbroek is aware of where all its production takes place because of its local staff in production countries, and therefore the risk of unauthorized subcontracting is low.

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: There is an online system that shows all the things that are related to FWF and social compliance.

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

Comment: On-garment communication was removed up until the time that Van Puijenbroek becomes a Leader in terms of FWF membership.

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 Van Puijenbroek to publish one or more of the following reports on its website: brand performance check, audit reports, supplier information.

Comment: Van Puijenbroek currently does not engage in advanced reporting activities.

6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on affiliate's website	Complete report submitted to FWF	The Social Report is an important tool for affiliates to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders.	Report adheres to FWF guidelines for Social Report content.	1	2	-2
---	----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----

Comment: Social Report was submitted to FWF but not found on its website.

TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 4

Earned Points: 2

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: The person responsible for FWF membership is part of the management team.

7.2 Changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by affiliate	100%	In each Brand Performance Check report, FWF may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of FWF membership and its process approach.	Affiliate should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	4	4	-2
--	------	---	--	---	---	----

Recommendation: FWF encourages Van Puijenbroek to continue its discussions with its external suppliers to sign up to FWF or improve working conditions in another way.

Comment: Van Puijenbroek had two required changes in the previous Brand Performance Check report. Both requirements were followed up on:

- removing on-garment communication;
- working towards getting external suppliers to sign up to FWF or another way of improving working conditions.

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 6

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	33	40
Monitoring and Remediation	22	31
Complaints Handling	4	7
Training and Capacity Building	3	7
Information Management	7	7
Transparency	2	4
Evaluation	6	6
Totals:	77	102

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

75

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

30-04-2015

Conducted by:

Kees Gootjes, Hendrine Stelwagen

Interviews with:

Rob Kwaspen, Director

Edith Kwaspen-Janssen, Online & Media Marketeer

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.