

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Westveer Holding B.V.

PUBLICATION DATE: OCTOBER 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 <u>www.fairwear.org</u>. The online <u>Brand Performance</u> <u>Check Guide</u> provides more information about the indicators.



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Westveer Holding B.V.

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

| AFFILIATE INFORMATION | |
|--|---------------------|
| Headquarters: | Goes, Netherlands |
| Member since: | 01-07-2005 |
| Product types: | Workwear |
| Production in countries where FWF is active: | |
| Production in other countries: | Netherlands, Poland |
| 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? | No |
| SCORING OVERVIEW | |
| % of own production under monitoring | |
| Benchmarking score | 61 |
| Category | Needs Improvement |

Summary:

Westveer Holding BV, made up of two divisions (Bout BV and PWG), has shown insufficient progress in implementing FWFs management system requirements.

It does not meet its monitoring threshold for 2014, as its main factory located in a low-risk country has not met the monitoring requirements for low-risk countries. This is due to the fact that it has not posted the FWF Code of Labour Practices.

To get back into the Good category, Westveer is required to ensure and show that workers at its production facility have an opportunity to be made aware of their rights.

Furthermore, Westveer is recommended to include legal minimum wage calculations when negotiating prices with its suppliers and to analyse its own pricing policy in relation to the share that is paid to workers.

Westveer is recommended to increase the external production that it sources from FWF or other credible initiative members and ensure that these companies have completed the external production questionnaire.

Finally, FWF also recommends Westveer to hand in its annual Workplan and Social Report on a timely basis.

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 | 96% | 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: The main supplier for Westveer own production is in Poland. Leverage at this supplier is substantial given that the vast majority of the supplier's production is for Westveer Holding.

| 1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years | 96% 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: Westveer has worked with the supplier in Poland for over 20 years and works closely with the supplier on a daily basis.

| 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 | Signed CoLPs are on file. | N/A | 2 | 0 |
|--|---------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|---|---|
| | | improvements. | | | | |

Comment: No new suppliers were selected in 2014.

| 1.4 Company conducts human rights due No diligence at all new suppliers before placing orders. | ew Liers | 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: No new suppliers were selected in 2014.

| 1.5 Supplier compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner. | 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: According to Westveer, the supplier in Poland is working in compliance with all standards. Labour laws and effectively functioning institutions such as labour inspections and trade unions guarantee minimum basic rights.

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

Comment: Westveer's supplier in Poland is responsible for setting the production planning. Westveer works to reduce overtime by keeping an inventory of needed materials at the factory. However, it still sometimes occurs that the materials are delivered late. Sometimes there are also rush orders, which means that production priorities get shifted. Westveer does work to maintain flexibility to match with supplier planning.

| 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: Westveer indicates that overtime happens on occasion. It works to analyze root cause of overtime by knowing when the peak times are and trying to place orders effectively. It makes sure that it has other production options in case the orders cannot be completed (on time and without excessive overtime) by the factory. In 2014, overtime was not an issue.



At the end of 2014, Westveer helped the supplier in Poland purchase an automatic cutting machine. This machine should improve the efficiency of the supplier. Getting the maching online and running at full capacity will take place throughout 2015.

| 1.8 Affiliate's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.Country-level policyThe first step towards ensuring the paymen of minimum wages - and towards implementation of living wages - is to know the labour costs of garments. | calculate labour | 2 | 4 | 0 | |
|---|------------------|---|---|---|--|
|---|------------------|---|---|---|--|

Recommendation: Westveer is recommended to develop a pricing policy where it knows the labour cost of garments and which allows the payment of at least legal minimum wages in production countries.

Comment: Westveer agrees on a price per article produced. This process does not take local minimum wage into account but the payment of legal minimum wages is covered by effective local legislation. No change took place in 2014.

| 1.9 Affiliate actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages. | No data available | 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. | N/A | 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. | Supply chain approach | Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to affiliates' policies. | Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages. | 6 | 8 | 0 |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
|--|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|

Comment: Westveer indicates that the wages at the factory are covered by collective bargaining agreements.

| 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: 32

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

| BASIC MEASUREMENTS | RESULT | COMMENTS |
|---|--------|--|
| % of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries) | 0% | |
| % of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented | 100% | 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 | | 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 | 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 |
|---|-------------------|---|---|-----|---|----|
| 2.3 Percentage of production volume from suppliers that have been visited by the affiliate in the past financial year | 96% | 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: Westveer visits its Polish production facility on a regular basis.



AIR 10/25

| 2.4 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected. | No existing reports/all audits by FWF or FWF affiliate | 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. | N/A | 3 | 0 | |
|--|--|---|--|-----|---|---|--|
|--|--|---|--|-----|---|---|--|

Recommendation: Westveer is recommended to inquire whether its Polish supplier has more recent labour inspection reports that can be shared.

Comment: Westveer does have a state labour inpection report on file from 2011.

| 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 | 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. | N/A | 2 | -1 |
|---|---|--|---|-----|---|----|
| 2.6 High risk issues specific to the affiliate's supply chain are identified and addressed by the monitoring system. | No high-risk issues | Different countries and products have different risks associated with them; monitoring systems should be adapated 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. | N/A | 6 | 0 |

Comment: In its own production supply chain, there are no high risk issues as production only takes place in the low-risk country of Poland.

| 2.6a High risk issues specific to Bangladesh are identified and adressed 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 adressed 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 | 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 annually by affiliate representatives;

• Be informed of FWF membership and return the completed CoLP questionnaire before production orders are placed;

• Have the FWF Worker Information Sheet posted in local languages.

Comment: Westveer's main production location is located in a low-risk country. This supplier, however, has not posted the FWF Code of Labour Practices on its premises.

| 2.9 External brands resold by the affiliate who have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire. (% of external sales volume) | 29% | 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. | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|---|-----|--|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
|---|-----|--|--------------------------------|---|---|---|

Recommendation: FWF recommends Westveer to get more of its external producers to complete and return the external brand questionnaire.

Comment: Most external brands have been sent the external brand questionnaire, but only 29% of the sales volume has been signed by external producers and is on file (a reduction of 20% from last year).

| 2.10 External brands resold by affiliates that are members of another credible initiative. (% of external sales volume) | 3% 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 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | products made by FWF or FLA members. | | | |

Comment: Westveer buys about 3% of its external brand purchases from FWF members.

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 14 Earned Points: 6

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 | No | The Worker Information Sheet is a key first | Photos by company | 0 | 2 | 0 |

| | | i notoo og oompang | 0 | ~ | U | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Information Sheet is posted in factories | step in alerting workers to their rights. | staff, audit reports, | | | | |
| | | checklists from | | | | |
| | | factory visits, etc. | | | | |
| | | | | | | _ |

Comment: For its supplier located in Poland, it is aware that the Worker Information Sheet is currently not posted there.

| 3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline. | No audits done or no FWF helpline available | 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. | N/A | 4 | -2 |
|--|--|---|---|-----|---|----|
| 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: 3



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 |

Recommendation: FWF recommends Westveer to actively inform its staff about FWF membership and what that all entails.

Comment: Westveer's intranet contains information on FWF membership.

| 4.2 Ongoing training in support of FWF requirements is provided to staff in direct contact with suppliers. | No | 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. | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|----|
| 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 |

Comment: Westveer's agent is aware of FWF membership.

| and managers is a key step towards Workplace Education sustainable improvements. Programme. | 0 1 1 1 | No production in WEP areas | related to labour standards is acommon issue in factories. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards | relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education | N/A | 6 | 0 |
|---|----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-----|---|---|
|---|----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-----|---|---|

| 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: 5



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: As mentioned earlier, Westveer currently only has production at one production location in Poland along with some very minor production volume taking place in the Netherlands.

| 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 |
|---|-----|---|--|---|---|----|
|---|-----|---|--|---|---|----|

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible 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, | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Recommendation: FWF recommends Westveer 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: Westveer currently does not engage in advanced reporting.

| 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: The Social Report 2014 has been submitted but not (yet) published.

Supplier List.

TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 4



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 the general director.

| 7.2 Changes from previous Brand Performance 0% Check implemented by affiliate | 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. | -2 |
|--|---|--|----|
|--|---|--|----|

Comment: Westveer did not implement the requirement related to the posting of the Code of Labour Practices in its supplier located in a low-risk country.

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 0

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

N/A

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK - WESTVEER HOLDING B.V. - 01-01-2014 TO 31-12-2014

SCORING OVERVIEW

| CATEGORY | EARNED | POSSIBLE |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Purchasing Practices | 25 | 32 |
| Monitoring and Remediation | 6 | 14 |
| Complaints Handling | 1 | 3 |
| Training and Capacity Building | 2 | 5 |
| Information Management | 7 | 7 |
| Transparency | 2 | 4 |
| Evaluation | 0 | 6 |
| Totals: | 43 | 71 |

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

61

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Needs Improvement



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

10-09-2015

Conducted by:

Kees Gootjes

Interviews with:

Marcel Westveer, General 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.

