



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

De Berkel B.V.

PUBLICATION DATE: JULY 2016

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2015 to 31-12-2015

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

De Berkel B.V.

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2015 to 31-12-2015

AFFILIATE INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Varsseveld, Netherlands
Member since:	29-06-2007
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where FWF is active:	China, India
Production in other countries:	Lithuania, Republic of Moldova, Poland, Ukraine
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	47%
Benchmarking score	59
Category	Suspended

Summary:

De Berkel meets most of FWFs management requirements. Their benchmark score is 59, which is an improvement compared to last year. However, their monitoring percentage is 47% of the total production volume, which means that they do not meet the 90% required of brands in 3+ years of membership. This is partly due to the security threat in Ukraine, making it impossible to audit there and partly because insufficient monitoring systems.

Additional audits have taken place in the beginning of 2016.

De Berkel sources mainly from Moldova and Ukraine where they have been in business for more than ten years and also own a number of factories. This means leverage in the factories is high. In 2015 De Berkel focused on improving the monitoring percentage and follow-up on the CAPs resulting from these audits. In addition the company worked on transparency, through clearer communication and by collecting signed questionnaires from all suppliers and external producers.

In 2016 the focus should be on creating systems to better monitor FWF related activities.

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: De Berkel has a limited number of suppliers. At each supplier they buy more than 10% of the production capacity. A few exceptions in 2015 were suppliers in India and China where only a small percentage of production was sourced.

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: De Berkel has worked with almost all suppliers for more than ten years. In 2014 they started a new factory in Moldova, where production was set up in 2015. Production volumes will increase there the coming years.

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

Recommendation: De Berkel should ensure suppliers sign and return the CoLP before the first orders are placed.

Comment: All supplier have signed and returned the CoLP. However, there is no system in place that ensures this happens before the first orders are placed.

1.4 Company conducts human rights due diligence at all new suppliers before placing orders.	No	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.	0	4	0
---	----	---	---	---	---	---

Requirement: A formal process should exist to evaluate the risks of labour violations in the production areas De Berkel 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.

Comment: Almost all suppliers that De Berkel uses have been selected by the mother company. They also search for possible new suppliers. During this search, working conditions are taken into account. However, this is not done in a systematic or transparent manner.

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 De Berkel consistently evaluates the entire supplier base and includes information into decision-making procedures.

Comment: At the moment CoLP compliance is evaluated on an adhoc basis, based on whenever the financial director visits or is in contact with a factory.

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: De Berkel guarantees a number of production minutes at each of its suppliers. This is based on the available capacity within the factories. Given the high leverage at its main suppliers, De Berkel is able to make an accurate planning taking the production capacity of the respective supplier into account. A total of 2,000 production minutes per week (equivalent of some 33 hours) per sewing worker is taken as a basis for planning, which supports reasonable working hours and ensures suppliers a steady supply of work.

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: Through their production planning approach De Berkel knows how much time the suppliers spend on working on their products. Also, De Berkel is able to vary in orders for customers and stock orders, reducing the risk of overtime. This system is not fool proof, and sometimes De Berkel has to request its suppliers to work overtime. This request has to be approved by the general director of De Berkel's mother company before it is forwarded to the factories. This way the general director monitors that there is no excessive overtime.

1.8 Affiliate's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.	Style-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.	4	4	0
--	--------------------	--	--	---	---	---

Comment: At De Berkel's own factories, workers receive a fixed salary during the first three months of employment. This fixed salary is based on the legal minimum wage. After three months, when the worker has achieved a higher degree of productivity, the worker receives a piece rate payment. De Berkel works with standard minutes. Calculations for pricing per minute are based on sampling done at De Berkel. The piece rates for workers in factories allow for payment of at least legal minimum wages to double minimum wage, which is supported by audit findings. There is no insight yet in whether this approaches living wage.

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

Comment: Through the pricing policy De Berkel ensures that in all factories workers get at least legal minimum wage.

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.	No efforts shown.	Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to affiliates' policies.	Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages.	0	8	0
---	-------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Requirement: De Berkel 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, 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. As De Berkel buys exclusively at - and owns some suppliers - it is more accountable for implementing adequate steps.

Comment: At the moment De Berkel does not know the living wage level in the regions where they are active and has not discussed this topic with the factories.

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.	25%	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.	1	2	0

Comment: De Berkel is partly owner of two factories they source from in Ukraine and Moldova.

PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 42

Earned Points: 27

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	33%	
% of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented	14%	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	47%	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: De Berkel has appointed the financial director to be responsible for follow-up on problems identified by the monitoring system, as he is in direct contact with suppliers.

2.2 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans	Intermediate	FWF considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that affiliates can do towards improving working conditions.	Documentation of remediation and followup actions taken by affiliate.	4	8	-2
---	--------------	---	---	---	---	----

Comment: In 2015 two audits were executed by FWF audit teams. The CAP and audit reports are shared with the factory and during visits or via email progress is monitored. The latest email showed intermediate progress in solving the problems identified during the audits.

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

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: One of the factories has an SA8000 certificate, which was shared with De Berkel.

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

Comment: The CAP and audit report are shared with the factory and during visits or via email progress is monitored. In addition, the director of one of De Berkel's own factories in Moldova is responsible for follow-up.

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: De Berkel's monitoring system should identify and address high risk issues that are specific to De Berkel's sourcing practices. FWF provides policies and country-specific requirements to members. Priorities in remediation efforts are guided by these policies.

Comment: De Berkel sources mainly in Moldova and Ukraine and has done so for more than ten years. De Berkel is aware of the high risk issues in these specific countries, but does not have a system in place to actively monitor and address these issues.

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

Comment: De Berkel does not share any suppliers with other FWF members.

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

Comment: Suppliers in low risk countries, Lithuania and Poland, have signed and returned the CoLP and the questionnaire and the locations are visited annually.

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

Comment: All external producers have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire.

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: One of the external producers of De Berkel is FWF member, this accounts for 0.44 % of external sales volume.

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 33

Earned Points: 18

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	Yes	The Worker Information Sheet is a key first step in alerting workers to their rights.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from factory visits, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: De Berkel checks whether the Worker Information Sheet is posted during factory visits.

3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	75%	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.	4	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: 7

Earned Points: 7

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: FWF membership has been explained during staff meetings and is regularly on the agenda of management team meetings.

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: Information about FWF and its requirements are shared with the local director of De Berkel's factory in Moldova and the mother company of De Berkel. The first is responsible for CAP follow-up and the latter for selecting new suppliers.

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

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 trainings related to labour standards have been offered to the factories.

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	Intermediate	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.	3	6	-2

Comment: During the brand performance check there was no evidence of missing information regarding production locations. However, De Berkel is dependent on information provided by the mother company.

5.2 A system exists to allow purchasing, CSR and other relevant staff to share information with each other about working conditions at suppliers	No	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
--	----	--	---	----	---	----

Requirement: De Berkel needs to set up a system that allows staff members to share information regarding working conditions at suppliers and CAP follow-up. This also ensures continuity within the company.

Comment: At the moment there is no system in place to share information between staff members.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 2

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
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

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	No	An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	0	2	0

Requirement: De Berkel should conduct an annual evaluation involving top management of the mother company that ensures FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company. Evaluation should include input from relevant external stakeholders and feedback from suppliers.

Comment: Evaluation happens on an ad-hoc basis. A more systematic approach is planned for 2016.

7.2 Changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by affiliate	63%	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
--	-----	---	--	---	---	----

Comment: Compared to last years' brand performance check, De Berkel improved on indicators related to transparency on its suppliers.

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 4

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	27	42
Monitoring and Remediation	18	33
Complaints Handling	7	7
Training and Capacity Building	3	7
Information Management	2	7
Transparency	2	4
Evaluation	4	6
Totals:	63	106

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

59

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Suspended

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

04-05-2016

Conducted by:

Anne van Lakerveld, Hendrine Stelwagen

Interviews with:

Ronald Klunder (TPM & quality manager)

Wilfried Rasing (Financial 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.