



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

ROOTS for Safety B.V.

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

ROOTS for Safety B.V.

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

AFFILIATE INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Hoogvliet, Netherlands
Member since:	01-07-2013
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where FWF is active:	China
Production in other countries:	Italy, Romania
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	95%
Benchmarking score	59
Category	Good

Summary:

Roots for safety B.V. (hereafter: Roots for Safety) met most of FWF's requirement on implementation of the Code of Labour Practices. With a monitoring percentage of 95%, it met FWF's required monitoring threshold of 90% for members in their third year of membership.

Roots for Safety's sourcing practices supports preventing and reducing excessive overtime at the suppliers. The company has developed an automated production forecasting system. The system contributes to preventing excessive overtime at the suppliers.

Nearly 90% of Roots for Safety's production value is made in China. Roots for Safety has a local office in China, which conducts monitoring visits and discusses followups on audit reports. Roots for Safety has sufficiently followed up on Corrective Action Plans.

In 2016, Roots for Safety should increase its efforts to identify, register and audit all production locations in China and Romania. Roots for safety should require all its suppliers to post FWF's workers information sheets. In addition, Roots for Safety could invite more suppliers to join the Workplace Education Programme.

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	24%	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.	1	4	0

Comment: Roots for safety has high leverage (10-30%) in at least two producers in China, according to audit findings.

1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years	18%	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.	1	4	0
--	-----	--	---	---	---	---

Comment: Roots for safety has been working with a FWF member factory in China for over 6 years.

1.3 All new suppliers are required to sign and return the Code of Labour Practices before first orders are placed.	No new suppliers	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between factories and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	N/A	2	0
--	------------------	---	---------------------------	-----	---	---

1.4 Company conducts human rights due diligence at all new suppliers before placing orders.	No new suppliers	Due diligence helps to identify, prevent and mitigate potential human rights problems at new suppliers.	Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments.	N/A	4	0
---	------------------	---	---	-----	---	---

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 Roots for safety consistently evaluates the entire supplier base and includes information into decision-making procedures.

Recommendation: Roots for safety could design a process to evaluate its suppliers based on various aspects of their performance, such as quality, lead time, social compliance, price, communication, etc. The result of the evaluation could help Roots for safety to systematically assess their suppliers. In addition, Roots for safety could reward the suppliers based on the rating.

Comment: There is currently no systematic evaluation of suppliers' compliance with Code of Labour Practices.

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: Roots for safety has invested a considerable amount of time and resources in building an automated production forecast system. The system has been in place for the second year. The accuracy of information provided by the system enables the planning department, production department as well as suppliers to plan productions.

The sales department registers the sales volumes of each item to the system. The system is able to provide information and compare that information with historical data - the pattern of sales in the past. The purchasing department can have accurate data on the needs for production. It can also detect potential urgent demands. For example, if there is an unusual big sale, the purchasing department will be informed immediately by the system. The purchasing department can immediately discuss with the sales department to decide how production in the manufactures can be planned to avoid rush production orders. The purchasing department updates production managers in China and other suppliers regarding timelines for production weekly.

The automated forecast system enhances internal communication between the sales and purchasing department of Roots for safety. It contributes to better planning in the manufacturers, which consequently reduces the risk of overtime perform by workers.

Unlike fashion companies, Roots for safety does not make urgent orders. There is no peak or low season. There is a constant flow of orders all year long. The standard lead time of 3-4 months applies to all suppliers.

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

Recommendation: Roots for safety could conduct a root cause analysis at brand level as well as factory level. At brand level, Roots for safety could check if delay in materials or accessories links to excessive overtime at the factories. At factory level Roots for safety could help factories to map the time when frequent excessive overtime happens. Roots for safety could also provide factory trainings to make proper production planning, increase productivity and efficiency.

Comment: Excessive overtime was found at three factories audited by FWF in China. Roots for safety had analysed the situation based on the discussion with suppliers. According to Roots for safety, overtime work of the factories is not caused by its sourcing practice. In both audits, the factories said that Roots for safety have allowed enough lead time for production.

At brand level Roots for safety tried to prevent and reduce overtime through further development of the production forecast system. At factory level, Roots for safety provides flexibility in lead time especially regarding the 'never out of stock' products.

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

Requirement: Roots for Safety needs to develop a pricing policy where the member knows the labour cost of all products and which allows the payment of at least legal minimum wages in production countries.

Comment: It is important for Roots for safety to control the quality of fabrics and other materials because Roots for safety produces technical garments. Roots for safety works with Cut Made & Trim (CMT) factories. Roots for safety knows the costs of fabrics, accessories, labels, etc. Roots for safety is aware of minimum wage level in China. Labour minute costing is not used by the brand. The factory is paid a lumpsum for its CMT work, which include labour costs. According to Roots for safety, the payment of Roots for safety is higher than average brands which produce similar garments in China.

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

Recommendation: Roots for safety should make more effort to support suppliers to improve towards payment of living wages. The member company could consider to join FWF's living wage challenge as the first step.

Comment: As part of the follow up on audits, Roots for safety discussed with audited suppliers regarding the current wage level and the ambition of the brand towards living wage benchmarks.

Roots for safety has co-funded an investment in new machinery with the intention of allowing workers to work more efficiently. The brand has not yet taken extra steps directly contribute to wage increase.

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

PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 35

Earned Points: 16

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	89%	
% of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented	6%	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	95%	Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 90% Measured as a percentage of turnover.

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

Recommendation: Roots for safety could request support from FWF on a training to follow up on corrective action plans. After the training, the local representative of Roots for safety would be able to conduct follow up visits to factories.

In addition, Roots for safety could also request FWF's local staff to conduct monitoring visits on behalf of the brand. During the monitoring visit, the status of the corrective action plans are checked.

Comment: Roots for safety has documented discussions with two suppliers regarding the followups on corrective action plans. According to the report from suppliers, improvements have been made on most issues in the corrective action plans. The production direction China visits the facilities regularly and has confirmed a number of improvements, mainly on health and safety. The improvements are not yet verified by a FWF audit team.

2.3 Percentage of production volume from suppliers that have been visited by the affiliate in the past financial year	90%	Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by affiliate staff or local representatives. They reinforce to factory managers that affiliates are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices.	Affiliates should document all factory visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	4	4	0
---	-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: All factories and subcontractors in China are visited by production director of Roots for safety. The Italian supplier for shoes which accounted for 10% of the total FOB is also visited in 2015. The upper soles of the shoes are made in Romania. The location is not visited by Roots for safety. The exact value of the production is not known by Roots for safety.

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

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: Audit reports and CAP findings are shared timely with suppliers.

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

Requirement: Roots for safety should invite its suppliers to join FWF's Workplace Education Programme in China.

Recommendation: Roots for safety should discuss with the supplier in Italy to know more about the total FOB of production in Romania. The factory in Romania should also be audited.

Comment: Roots for safety believes that there are high risk issues in China, especially when brands source from low -price factories located in remote provinces. By not producing in those factories, Roots for safety mitigated the risks to a certain degree.

In addition, Roots for safety considered health and safety a risk in their suppliers in China. During factory visits, staff of Roots for safety have noticed that workers are not using proper personal protective equipment. Staff of Roots for safety has talked to individual workers on using proper safety equipments.

Roots for safety has not organised any training to workers or management on social compliance.

Roots for safety confirms that there is no migrant workers in the factory in Italy. Roots for safety has not visited the factory in Romania.

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.	-1	2	-1

Comment: The management of Roots for safety has decided not to cooperate with its competitors, including a member company of FWF.

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

Requirement: Roots for safety should take picture of the post of workers information sheet during the visits in the factory in Italy.

Comment: Roots for safety works with one factory located in Italy. It has requested the factory to fill in the questionnaire and sign the Code of Labour practices. The factory has not been audited.

2.9 External brands resold by the affiliate who have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire. (% of external sales volume)	No external brands resold	FWF believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of FWF or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	N/A	3	0
--	---------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----	---	---

2.10 External brands resold by affiliates that are members of another credible initiative. (% of external sales volume)	No external brands resold	FWF believes affiliates who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to stock external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously.	External production data in FWF's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by FWF or FLA members.	N/A	3	0
---	---------------------------	---	---	-----	---	---

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 26

Earned Points: 16

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: Roots for safety should make sure that workers information sheet is posted in all production locations.

Comment: The audit in a factory in China found that it has not posted the workers information sheet. Roots for safety has not collected photos from suppliers to prove that the information sheet is posted at an easily accessible place for workers.

3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	24%	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.	1	4	-2
--	-----	--	--	---	---	----

Recommendation: Roots for safety should stimulate all its suppliers to participate in the workplace education programme to raise awareness about FWF's helpline for workers.

Comment: Workers at the FWF member factory are aware of FWF's helpline. At another factory in China, workers have participated in the Workplace Education Programme.

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: 2

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
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: Account manager and CSR staff participated in the FWF affiliates seminar.

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)	27%	Lack of knowledge and skills on best practices related to labour standards is a common issue in factories. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards sustainable improvements.	Documentation of relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education Programme.	4	6	0

Recommendation: Roots for safety could invite also subcontractors to join the Workplace Education Programme in China.

Comment: Two suppliers of Roots for Safety have participated in the Workplace Education Programme.

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: 9

Earned Points: 7

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

Requirement: Roots for safety should organise an audit at the new production location in China. Roots for safety should inform FWF the addresses of all production sites.

Recommendation: Roots for safety should establish a system to identify and register all production locations.

Comment: Roots for safety is in the process of identifying all production locations. A possible new production location is discovered during an audit in November 2015. According to the audit report, all production is actually made at a different location which is owned by the main supplier. Due to logistic reasons, Roots for safety did not audit the new location in 2015. It has made commitment for the audit in 2016.

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

Earned Points: 4

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	Yes	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.	1	1	0
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: Roots for safety publishes the brand performance check report on its website.

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

TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 4

Earned 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 CEO of Roots for safety discusses FWF's membership with the CSR team at least once a year.

7.2 Changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by affiliate	50%	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
--	-----	---	--	---	---	----

Requirement: It is required to work towards remediation of previous requirements from the last Brand Performance Check. Further engagement needs to be taken with regard to the following requirements mentioned in the last Brand Performance Check.

Comment: Roots for safety has demonstrated efforts to meet the requirements of the last brand performance check.

1. Roots for safety is in the process to identify all production locations. Roots for safety has audited most production locations and met FWF's monitoring threshold.
 2. Roots for safety has discussed with suppliers timely on the corrective action plans and documented the results.
 3. Roots for safety has fulfilled the requirements on monitoring its only supplier in low risk country - Italy.
 4. Roots for safety is yet to establish a system to 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.
-

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 6

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

NA

SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	16	35
Monitoring and Remediation	16	26
Complaints Handling	2	7
Training and Capacity Building	7	9
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	4	4
Evaluation	6	6
Totals:	55	94

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

59

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

18-05-2016

Conducted by:

Juliette Li

Interviews with:

Marco Kremers, Account manager

Ivanka van Teeffelen, CSR manager

Jean-Pierre Tabruyn, Production director China

Paul van der Stap, Purchasing manager

Audit Summary:

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