



## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

---

Mountain Force AG

this report covers the evaluation period 01-05-2016 to 30-04-2017

## ABOUT THE BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Fair Wear Foundation believes that improving conditions for apparel product location workers requires change at many levels. Traditional efforts to improve conditions focus primarily on the product location. FWF, however, believes that the management decisions of clothing brands have an enormous influence for good or ill on product location conditions.

FWF's Brand Performance Check is a tool to evaluate and report on the activities of FWF's member companies. The Checks examine how member company management systems support FWF's Code of Labour Practices. They evaluate the parts of member company 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 product locations, and most product locations work for many different brands. This means that in most cases FWF member companies have influence, but not direct control, over working conditions. As a result, the Brand Performance Checks focus primarily on verifying the efforts of member companies. Outcomes at the product location level are assessed via audits and complaint reports, however the complexity of the supply chains means that even the best efforts of FWF member companies cannot guarantee results.

Even if outcomes at the product location level cannot be guaranteed, the importance of good management practices by member companies cannot be understated. Even one concerned customer at a product location 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 product location 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 member company 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](http://www.fairwear.org). The online [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators.

# BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Mountain Force AG

Evaluation Period: 01-05-2016 to 30-04-2017

MEMBER COMPANY INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Rotkreuz, Switzerland
Member since:	15-08-2011
Product types:	Sportswear
Production in countries where FWF is active:	China
Production in other countries:	Germany
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
SCORING OVERVIEW	
% of own production under monitoring	99%
Benchmarking score	71
Category	Good

## Summary:

In the past financial year, Mountain Force has met most of FWF's performance requirements. Mountain Force does extensive monitoring at its main supplier and as such has 99% of its supply chain under monitoring, meeting the requirements for FWF members in the third+ year of membership. With a benchmarking score of 71, Mountain Force has dropped slightly in its benchmarking score and is in the 'Good' category.

Mountain Force has a very stable supply base, with 99% of their production coming from one long-term supplier, with whom it has a close partnership. This supplier shows strong commitment to sustainability and fair working conditions, and is in frequent, open conversation with Mountain Force to discuss issues and improvements. Improvement and an increase in wages for workers was once again seen in the most recent audit. Mountain Force does its production planning in conjunction with the supplier, and is flexible in delivery dates when necessary.

Mountain Force, in collaboration with their main supplier, engages in meetings and conversations with stakeholders and experts in sustainability, to further see how improvements can be made. Recently they have met with a prominent Professor of Corporate Social Responsibility to discuss further research they would like to do in this area, and to talk about possible improvements for Mountain Force and its supplier.

Mountain Force has a small percentage of its production at a low-risk location, however it needs to ensure that it meets the FWF monitoring requirements for this supplier as well. It is important that Mountain Force has an understanding of the working conditions and production at all of its locations. FWF also encourages Mountain Force to collaborate with other FWF members sourcing at the same supplier(s), to work together on improvements.

## PERFORMANCE CATEGORY OVERVIEW

**Leader:** This category is for member companies 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 member companies who are making a serious effort to implement the Code of Labour Practices—the vast majority of FWF member companies—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 member companies will receive a 'Good' rating.

**Needs Improvement:** Member companies 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. Member companies 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:** Member companies 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. Member companies 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
1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity.	0%	Member companies with less than 10% of a production location's production capacity generally have limited influence on production location managers to make changes.	Supplier information provided by member company.	0	4	0

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.1b Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys less than 2% of its total FOB.	1%	FWF provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts.	Production location information as provided to FWF.	3	4	0

Comment: Mountain Force produced 99% of its garments at its main supplier in China. Only a small number of specific products (hats) are produced at another location based in Germany.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.2 Percentage of production volume from production locations where a business relationship has existed for at least five years.	99%	Stable business relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give production locations a reason to invest in improving working conditions.	Supplier information provided by member company.	4	4	0

Comment: Mountain Force has a long-term relationship with its main supplier in China, having a close partnership for the last ten years.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.3 All new production locations are required to sign and return the questionnaire with the Code of Labour Practices before first bulk orders are placed.	No new production locations added in past financial year	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between production locations and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	N/A	2	0

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.4 Member company conducts human rights due diligence at all new production locations before placing orders.	No new production locations added in past financial year	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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.5 Production location compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	Yes, and leads to production decisions	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.	2	2	0

Comment: Through annual visits, receiving updated corrective action plans, and via almost daily phone conversations, Mountain Force stays up to date on any key issues related to compliance of the Code of Labour Practices at its main supplier. The supplier, KTC, puts social responsibility high on their priority list and is fairly transparent with the status of its working conditions, publishing audit and social reports on its website. Mountain Force rewards its supplier's compliance and efforts by continuing their long term relationship and placing almost all of its production at this location.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.6 The member company's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	Strong, integrated systems in place.	Member company production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at production locations.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	4	4	0

**Comment:** Mountain Force produces one collection per year for the winter season, for which it has a long-term production plan in place. Due to the close relationship Mountain Force has with its main supplier, the deadlines for each phase of production are discussed with the supplier and agreed upon in advance. Throughout the production process Mountain Force stays in close communication with the supplier to discuss any potential delays, in order to be able to adjust deadlines appropriately. Mountain Force also allows flexibility with its delivery deadlines - for example this year their supplier did not receive the fabric on time, so instead of pressuring the supplier to still deliver at the set deadline, they agreed to receive the shipment a few weeks later.

Following a recent audit, Mountain Force's main supplier said, "Having a quite early period of development and thus relatively long allowances to tackle potential issues during production for Mountain Force, we consider this arrangement and the practice of and with Mountain Force exemplary to reduce overtime and seasonal peak production."

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Advanced efforts	Some production delays are outside of the control of member companies; however there are a number of steps that can be taken to address production delays without resorting to excessive overtime.	Evidence of how member responds to excessive overtime and strategies that help reduce the risk of excessive overtime, such as: root cause analysis, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	6	6	0

**Comment:** Mountain Force still continues to receive its sales forecasts as early as possible and has incentives for early placement of orders. It also continued to define core and non-core styles and place orders for these styles at different times, thereby easing the pressure on the factory.

In 2016, Mountain Force also started working with a new external design team, who is also responsible for the product development. The main designer visits the supplier regularly (at least four times per year) and is in close contact with them during the design and development phase. This design team has extensive experience working with suppliers in China, designing and developing technical products, giving them a strong understanding of how the design phase can affect or contribute to excessive overtime if not managed properly. This shift has reduced the challenges in communication between the former in-house design team and allows for quicker resolution to any challenges that arise.

Mountain Force has discussed with the supplier what the causes of overtime may be (when it occurs), and the supplier cites late orders from other buyers and delays with fabric as the leading causes. There has been no evidence that the practices of Mountain Force contribute to this.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.8 Member company'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

**Comment:** Mountain Force is aware of the minimum wage requirements in China, and stays up to date via audit reports and conversations with its main supplier on the wage levels at the factory. The supplier sets prices for production based on the quantity, technical requirements and fabric costs, and Mountain Force generally accepts the quoted prices, unless they vary significantly from previous years. Although Mountain Force has a close relationship with its supplier, they hold relatively little FOB leverage (approximately 5%) so feel there is limited room for negotiations.

Their supplier currently does not have an open costing system, so Mountain Force has limited insight into the specific labour costs at a style level.

**Recommendation:** As an advanced step for Mountain Force, increased transparency in costing and productivity gives insight in the labour costs per product. This forms the basis for ensuring enough is paid to cover at least minimum wage and for making steps towards living wages. FWF encourages Mountain Force to discuss more transparency regarding the breakdown of costs with its supplier to better understand the labour costs for its products.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.9 Member company actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages.	No minimum wage problems reported	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage, FWF member companies 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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.10 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by member company.	No	Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on production locations 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 production location and member company financial documents.	0	0	-1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.11 Degree to which member company 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 member companies' policies.	Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages.	6	8	0

**Comment:** Mountain Force's main supplier has made a commitment in its social reports to pay living wages to its workers. The last FWF audit done at this supplier in 2016 does show that some of the workers do receive a wage equivalent to the Asia Floor Wage benchmark for living wages, when benefits are included. Importantly the supplier can show increases in wages from the previous audit done the year before, although less workers are now reaching the Asia Floor Wage rate due to a significant increase in the Asia Floor Wage standard during the last year.

Mountain Force continues to discuss wages with its supplier, but feels that the supplier is already quite committed to this, and therefore does not focus on this specifically, but continues to stay informed of the situation.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.12 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the member company (bonus indicator).	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 member company's score.	Supplier information provided by member company.	N/A	2	0

## PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 38

**Earned Points: 29**

## 2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	99%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled	0%	FWF low risk policy should be implemented. 0 = policy is not implemented correctly. N/A = no production in low risk countries.
Meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	Yes	
Total of own production under monitoring	99%	Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100% 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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.2 Quality of own auditing system meets FWF standards.	Member makes use of FWF audits and/or external audits only	In case FWF teams cannot be used, the member companies' own auditing system must ensure sufficient quality in order for FWF to approve the auditing system.	Information on audit methodology.	N/A	0	-1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.3 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory and worker representation where applicable. 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: Following the most recent audit of its main supplier in 2016, Mountain Force discussed the audit findings with them and established timelines for remediation.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.4 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans and remediation of identified problems.	Intermediate	FWF considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that member companies can do towards improving working conditions.	CAP-related documentation including status of findings, documentation of remediation and follow up actions taken by member. Reports of quality assessments. Evidence of understanding relevant issues.	6	8	-2

Comment: Following the latest audit of their main supplier in late 2016, Mountain Force has discussed the Corrective Action Plan with the supplier and received updated information and advice on how Mountain Force can support remediation from them. The supplier has, for example, improved the health conditions at the canteen and updating their own Code of Labour Practices and posting for employees to see.

**Recommendation:** FWF recommends Mountain Force to continue taking an active role in following up on the latest CAP, especially regarding issues around worker representation and management listening to workers' complaints. In some areas where the factory management does not see room for improvement, Mountain Force can encourage them to continue seeking solutions.

FWF also encourages Mountain Force to get in contact with other FWF members sourcing at this location and work together on remediation of the CAPs.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.5 Percentage of production volume from production locations that have been visited by the member company in the previous financial year.	99%	Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by member company staff or local representatives. They reinforce to production location managers that member companies are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices.	Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	4	4	0

**Comment:** The Managing Director of Mountain Force aims to visit its main supplier annually, and the designer visits the supplier at least four times per year. No visits have been made to Mountain Force's supplier in Germany.

**Recommendation:** Annual visits should be made for production sites (including subcontractors and production locations in low-risk countries). Regular visits provide the opportunities to discuss problems and corrective actions in the time period between formal audits.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.6 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	No existing reports/all audits by FWF or FWF member company	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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies.	None of the specific risk policies apply	Aside from regular monitoring and remediation requirements under FWF membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. FWF requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by FWF.	Policy documents, inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories, reports of meetings with suppliers, reports of additional activities and/or attendance lists as mentioned in policy documents.	N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF Myanmar policy	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF guidance on abrasive blasting	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.8 Member company cooperates with other FWF member companies in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers.	No cooperation	Cooperation between customers increases leverage and chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the chances 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:** Mountain Force is currently not in communication with other FWF members who are sourcing from the same supplier. Mountain Force believes that as a small company they do not have much influence over larger companies to collaborate, however are open to collaboration if those companies were to approach them.

**Recommendation:** Cooperation among FWF members is required. In addition, it is advised to identify other clients and their commitment to improving working conditions. Involving more costumers of the factory increases leverage, the chances of successful outcomes and long term improvements. Given the long-term and close partnership that Mountain Force has with its main supplier, FWF believes that it could support other members in how best to work with the supplier and better coordinate communication with the supplier.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.9 Percentage of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	0-49%	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	0	2	0

**Comment:** Mountain Force produces a small percentage of its FOB from one supplier in Germany. Mountain Force has not visited this supplier, nor could demonstrate whether the CoLP was posted or a questionnaire had been signed.

**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:

- o Be visited regularly by Mountain Force representatives;
- o Be informed of FWF membership and return the completed CoLP questionnaire before production orders are placed;
- o Be aware of specific risks identified by FWF;
- o Have the FWF Worker Information Sheet posted in local languages.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Not applicable	FWF encourages all of its members to audit/monitor 100% of its production locations and rewards those members who conduct full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Production location information as provided to FWF and recent Audit Reports.	N/A	3	0
2.11 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from external brands resold by the member company.	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	2	0
2.12 External brands resold by member companies that are members of another credible initiative (% of external sales volume).	No external brands resold	FWF believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods.	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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.13 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from licensees.	No licensees	FWF believes it is important for member companies to know if the licensee is committed to the implementation of the same labour standards and has a monitoring system in place.	Questionnaires are on file. Contracts with licensees.	N/A	1	0

---

## MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 20

Earned Points: 13

---

### 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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.2 System is in place 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 production location visits, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Mountain Force checks whether the Worker Information Sheet is posted via visits, regular audits and by asking for photos.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited production locations where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	100%	The FWF complaints procedure is a crucial element of verification. If production location 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. Production location participation in the Workplace Education Programme also count towards this indicator.	Percentage of audited production locations where at least 50% of interviewed workers indicate awareness of the FWF complaints mechanism + percentage of production locations in WEP programme.	4	4	0

**Comment:** At Mountain Force's main supplier in China, a session on FWF is included in training for the workers upon hire. Additionally worker cards are distributed to the workers with the FWF worker helpline, and the helpline is posted clearly for all workers to see.

The latest audit report did find that based on interviews workers could not confirm that they were aware of the FWF code of labour practices, but follow up with the auditors directly confirmed that the workers were aware of the helpline and have access to the worker cards.

**Recommendation:** In order to further raise awareness, Mountain Force can stimulate its suppliers to participate in WEP trainings, to raise awareness about the existence and the functioning of FWF's worker hotline. Alternatively, Mountain Force could look into the possibility of having the FWF hotline information added to the mobile app that the supplier has developed for workers, to further spread the information.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.4 All complaints received from production location 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. Member company involvement is often essential to resolving issues.	Documentation that member company has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process.	N/A	6	-2

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers	No complaints or cooperation not possible / necessary	Because most production locations supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the FWF member company 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	0

## 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 at member company are made aware of FWF membership.	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: Mountain Force's Managing Director regularly informs staff about any updates on FWF requirements and/or issues at their suppliers. Recently the Managing Director held a training for all staff, and included sessions on overall sustainability and FWF membership.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.2 All staff in direct contact with suppliers are informed of FWF requirements.	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	-1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.3 All sourcing contractors/agents are informed about FWF's Code of Labour Practices.	Yes + actively support COLP	Agents have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is the responsibility of member company to ensure agents actively support the implementation of the CoLP.	Correspondence with agents, trainings for agents, FWF audit findings.	2	2	0

Comment: As Mountain Force is a relatively small company, they outsource some of their functions, such as design and PR. These contractors are informed about FWF and the Code of Labour Practices and actively support it. For example, the PR contractor actively includes information about FWF in external communications and the designer actively works to ensure the product development process supports reasonable working conditions at the supplier.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.4 Production location participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume)	0%	Lack of knowledge and skills on best practices related to labour standards is a common issue in production locations. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards sustainable improvements.	Documentation of relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education Programme.	0	6	0

**Comment:** Mountain Force's main supplier has not participated in a Workplace Education Programme, despite Mountain Force's encouragement. Currently the supplier is investing in an internal app for workers called 'Micro-benefits', which helps to inform workers on their rights and benefits available to them. Because of their focus on this digital training for staff, they have chosen not to participate in the Workplace Education Programme.

**Recommendation:** Mountain Force can stimulate its suppliers to participate in WEP trainings, to raise awareness about the existence and the functioning of FWF's worker hotline. In addition to sending the worker information sheet, Mountain Force can use the worker information cards available for download on FWF's website. A WEP training, in conjunction with the app developed by the supplier, could work well together to reinforce the knowledge and understanding of labour rights.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.5 Production location 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, member companies may arrange trainings on their own or work with other training-partners. Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator.	Curricula, other documentation of training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	4	0

---

## TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 11

Earned Points: 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 member companies to first know all of their production locations.	Supplier information provided by member company. Financial records of previous financial year. Documented efforts by member company to update supplier information from its monitoring activities.	6	6	-2

Comment: Mountain Force has two suppliers and knows the locations and information for each. There is one subcontractor used by their main supplier, however Mountain Force regularly checks to confirm their production is not done at this location.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
5.2 CSR and other relevant staff actively share information with each other about working conditions at production locations.	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: 7

---

## 6. TRANSPARENCY

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
6.1 Degree of member company compliance with FWF Communications Policy.	Minimum communications requirements are met AND no significant problems found	FWF's communications policy exists to ensure transparency for consumers and stakeholders, and to ensure that member communications about FWF are accurate. Members will be held accountable for their own communications as well as the communications behaviour of 3rd-party retailers, resellers and customers.	FWF membership is communicated on member's website; other communications in line with FWF communications policy.	2	2	-3

Comment: Mountain Force complies with FWF's Communication Policy. As a 'Leader' in 2015, Mountain Force takes advantage of the option to have on-garment communication of their FWF membership, and regularly communicates its membership externally to its customers.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities	Production locations are disclosed to the public	Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of FWF's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	2	2	0

Comment: Mountain Force publishes the name and location of its main supplier on its website and shares information about their partnership.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mountain Force to publish one or more of the following reports on its website: brand performance check, audit reports. Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of the affiliate and FWF's work.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on member company's website	Complete and accurate report published on member's website	The social report is an important tool for members to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders. Member companies should not make any claims in their social report that do not correspond with FWF's communication policy.	Social report that is in line with FWF's communication policy.	2	2	-1

## TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 6

## 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:** Mountain Force considers its FWF membership of significant importance to show its commitment to fair working conditions to its customers. The Managing Director evaluates this regularly.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
7.2 Level of action/progress made on required changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by member company.	0%	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.	Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	-2	4	-2

**Comment:** Mountain Force had one requirement in last year's Brand Performance Check, to ensure the monitoring requirements for low-risk production locations was met. This requirement was not adequately followed up on this year.

**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.

---

## EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 0

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

Mountain Force encourages FWF to work with other initiatives to develop and standardise an audit methodology, to help reduce duplicate audits and conflicting recommendations.

## SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	29	38
Monitoring and Remediation	13	20
Complaints Handling	7	7
Training and Capacity Building	5	11
Information Management	7	7
Transparency	6	6
Evaluation	0	6
Totals:	67	95

### BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

71

### PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

20-10-2017

Conducted by:

Tina Rogers

Interviews with:

Werner Matzner, Managing Director