



Brand Performance Check
Teamdress Holding GmbH

This report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2019 to 31-12-2019

About the Brand Performance Check

Fair Wear Foundation (Fair Wear) 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. Fair Wear, however, believes that the management decisions of clothing brands have an enormous influence for good or ill on product location conditions.

Fair Wear's Brand Performance Check is a tool to evaluate and report on the activities of Fair Wear's member companies. The Checks examine how member company management systems support Fair Wear'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 Fair Wear 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 Fair Wear 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 Fair Wear'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. The online [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators.

Brand Performance Check Overview

Teamdress Holding GmbH

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2019 to 31-12-2019

Member company information	
Headquarters:	Hamburg , Germany
Member since:	2019-04-09
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where Fair Wear is active:	
Production in other countries:	Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Moldova, 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
Scoring overview	
% of own production under monitoring	53%
Benchmarking score	61
Category	Good

Disclaimer

This performance check was conducted amidst the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020. Due to travel restrictions in 2020, the assessment methodology for this check was modified to adapt to an online version.

While the performance check does cover all indicators, Fair Wear was not able to cross-check information with the member company's other departments to the extent it would normally do. This may have led to shorter descriptions/comments in the report. We have taken additional measures to ensure the scores are still inclusive and representative of the performance/progress made: more documentation was requested from the member during the preparation phase and other staff members were interviewed to score a specific indicator, where necessary. Furthermore, due to our improved data management system, Fair Wear was able to better track and document progress, mitigating much of the disadvantage of a remote performance check.

This modified version was applied consistently to all members' performance checks evaluating the year 2019 in order to maintain fair and comparable data.

Fair Wear's performance checks review the progress that was made in the previous financial year. In this case, the 2019 financial year. Thus, this report does not cover the member's response to COVID-19, which will be monitored during the year and evaluated in the next performance check.

Summary:

Teamdress has met most of Fair Wear's performance requirements. With a monitoring percentage of 53, it meets the monitoring threshold for first year members. Teamdress received a benchmarking score of 61, according to the indicators in Fair Wear's Brand Performance Check Guide. Therefore, Teamdress is placed in the 'good' category.

Teamdress' daughter company De Berkel was a Fair Wear member for more than 10 years. De Berkel's sourcing activities go through mother company Teamdress, which is why it was decided to move membership to Teamdress from 2019. Teamdress is considered a first year member, yet due to De Berkel's previous membership, the requirements given in 2018 to De Berkel are assessed in this performance check.

In 2019, Teamdress created a risk assessment form to monitor human rights and to prioritise topics for discussion with factory management. Fair Wear recommends to define a process of assessing working conditions as part of a clear sourcing strategy.

Through frequent visits, Teamdress monitors working conditions at production locations and technical staff have been internally trained on monitoring working conditions by the CSR manager.

Teamdress has shown basic remediation efforts in following up on Corrective Action Plans, mostly focusing on OHS. Fair Wear expects Teamdress to examine and support remediation of other problems too.

There were no worker complaints in factories supplying Teamdress in 2019 and no training sessions were organised. Teamdress sources from countries where Fair Wear is not active, which makes it more challenging to take steps in raising awareness. Fair Wear encourages Teamdress to make use of ensure high quality systematic training of workers and management on these topics through service providers.

Thanks to working with standard minutes, Teamdress has good insight into the link between buying prices and wage levels. Teamdress is dedicated to working on living wages and could show a considerable increase in wage levels for the workers at its own production locations in Moldova. Fair Wear expects that Teamdress is able to take more steps with the joint membership of Teamdress and De Berkel.

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 Fair Wear's belief that member companies who are making a serious effort to implement the Code of Labour Practices—the vast majority of Fair Wear 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.	88%	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.	4	4	0

Comment: The total production volume where Teamdress buys at least 10% of the production capacity is 88%.

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.	0%	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.	4	4	0

Comment: The production volume bought by Teamdress at each of its production locations is above 2% of the total FOB.

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.	58%	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.	3	4	0

Comment: Teamdress started a business relationship with three of its production locations in the past five years. All other suppliers - the vast majority - have been working with Teamdress for more than five 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.	Yes	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.	2	2	0

Comment: All production locations signed the questionnaire with the CoLP, except one in Bosnia Herzegovina. However, Teamdress stopped working with this factory in 2019.

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.	Intermediate	Due diligence helps to identify, prevent and mitigate potential human rights problems at suppliers.	Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments.	2	4	0

Comment: Prior to entering a new sourcing country, Teamdress carries out a risk assessment, using external sources such as Human Rights Watch, ILO and OECD. The quality manager, who is responsible for CSR, keeps track of social developments within the sourcing countries and updates the risk assessment form when issues occur. This risk assessment form is used to monitor human rights and to prioritise topics for discussion during the frequent visits to the production locations.

For risk assessment per factory, Teamdress uses a checklist with basic information such as production capacity and production processes, but also includes health and safety indicators. During factory visits this checklist is used to gather information and crosscheck. The supplier contract contains a clear requirement to commit to the Code of Labour Practices and is used as a basis to accept or block a potential supplier. The CSR manager reports to the CEO and has a veto right for social commitment of a potential factory, based on the company's code of conduct.

Recommendation: It is advised to describe the process of assessing working conditions at potential new suppliers in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff. This process should describe defined steps such as requesting audit reports and visiting the location and checking on health and safety with the FWF checklist. When a new supplier will be added in the future, this information needs to be stored together with the document that Teamdress created.

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	A systemic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decisionmaking.	Documentation of systemic approach: rating systems, checklists, databases, etc.	1	2	0

Comment: In 2019, Teamdress has focused on updating a social compliance form to monitor each production location. The CSR manager keeps track of status and has a clear overview of social compliance of each factory. The social compliance form is filled during each factory visit and overall performance is evaluated annually by the CSR manager. Visual inspection is done several times a year - as all locations are frequently visited. The social compliance is discussed with factory management during each visit, yet no clear performance incentives are given to suppliers.

Teamdress stopped working with one Bosnian supplier in 2019, with a 5% leverage. The phasing out of this supplier was not related to social compliance, neither was this taken into account when the phase out was started.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Teamdress to implement a responsible exit strategy and make sure all relevant staff is informed about this. Please see Fair Wear's guidelines on a responsible exit strategy.

Teamdress is encouraged to make more explicit how social compliance in the supplier rating system in which quality, relationship, price, and planning are assessed is weighted and how compliance with CoLP leads to production decisions.

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: Teamdress is in direct contact with suppliers about production planning. The member company has a good insight of capacity per production location. Given the high leverage at its suppliers, Teamdress is able to make an accurate production plan. All products are defined in sewing minutes and orders are placed based on the available production capacity at each factory. A total of 2,000 production minutes per week (the 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. A space of 20% of capacity is built into the plan, in case of rush orders. Teamdress is also able to control the flow of orders through its stock program, reducing the risk of overtime. Any request for overtime at its suppliers must be approved by the General Director of Teamdress before it is forwarded to the factories.

As Teamdress has fabric in stock, fabric delays will not happen. Suppliers also have fixed minimum orders guarantees with suppliers. When orders suddenly need to be increased because of customer demands, Teamdress tries to find a solution that doesn't affect working hours, such as splitting orders.

Production capacity of each facility is weekly updated by the production planning team in Hamburg, in close cooperation with the Polish supplier. In 2019, Teamdress has focused on ensuring stable order flows per week for each factory, which functions as a tool to support reasonable working hours.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Intermediate 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.	3	6	0

Comment: In several audits done in 2018 and 2019, excessive overtime was found or records could not be verified due to incomplete data.

A stable relationship with the suppliers is a good basis and Teamdress has been focusing on gaining trust to be open about the root causes of excessive overtime. The frequent factory visits done by the technicians enable Teamdress to respond to root causes such as broken machines in an effective way.

Recommendation: Teamdress Holding GmbH could develop instruments or policies to deal with possible delays to avoid excessive overtime. Those instruments could include being flexible with delivery dates, prioritizing orders, offer support/flexibility for material delivery, ordering in low season, keeping stock etc. The outcomes of the root cause analysis can be used for identifying strategies that minimise the impact of its sourcing practice on working hours at other factories.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.8 Member company can demonstrate the link between its buying prices and wage levels in production locations.	Advanced	Understanding the labour component of buying prices is an essential first step for member companies towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages – and towards the implementation of living wages.	Interviews with production staff, documents related to member's pricing policy and system, buying contracts.	4	4	0

Comment: Teamdress works with standard minutes and contracts with suppliers are based on minutes instead of pieces. Calculations for pricing per minute are based on sampling done at Teamdress' own location in Poland. At almost all of Teamdress' 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. The piece rates for workers in factories allow workers at 60% efficiency to earn at least legal minimum wages. The legal minimum wage is guaranteed for workers below 60% efficiency. Higher efficiency rates mean workers are earning up to double the minimum wage, which is supported by audit findings.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.9 Member company actively responds if production locations fail to pay legal minimum wages and/or fail to provide wage data to verify minimum wage is paid.	No problems reported/no audits	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage or minimum wage payments cannot be verified, FWF member companies are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law. Payment below minimum wage must be remediated urgently.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, FWF Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a FWF auditor, or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	N/A	0	-2

Comment: In 2018, during one of the audits in Moldova, it was found that not everyone received a minimum wage. Teamdress actively responded; pay slips are verified monthly to ensure proper payment. In 2019 no audits were conducted.

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 and responds to root causes for wages that are lower than living wages in production locations.	Intermediate	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: Internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc	4	6	0

Comment: Teamdress visits its production locations at least once a year - and the owned factories are visited on a monthly basis. During the factory visits the costs of living, such as rent, electricity, staple food, etc are discussed with management and with workers to come to a better understanding of what a local living wage should be. According to Teamdress, setting a target wage is still too difficult, as the living wage benchmarks for the relevant sourcing countries are not set for rural areas. During two audits conducted in 2018 factory management stated that the prices paid by Teamdress were not enough to support living wages. Teamdress showed an increase in prices of 25% between 2018 and 2020.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Teamdress to involve worker representatives and local organisations in assessing root causes of wages lower than living wages. It is advised that the outcomes of the root cause analysis are discussed internally and with top management, to form a basis for an embedded strategy.

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).	27%	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.	1	2	0

Comment: Teamdress is owner of four production locations; one in Poland, two in Moldova and one factory in Ukraine. These factories cover 27% of Teamdress' total production volume.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.13 Member company determines and finances wage increases.	Intermediate	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach.	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: Teamdress increased the prices of all suppliers between 2018 and 2020 with an average of 25%. For the factories owned by Teamdress, the member brand has insight into what amount of the price increase is related to the wages of the workers. Yet, for the other production locations, Teamdress does not know the relation between increase of minute price and wages.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Teamdress to investigate whether the price increase has actually led to a wage increase. In determining what is needed and how wages should be increased, it is recommended to involve worker representation.

To support companies in analysing the wage gap, Fair Wear has developed a calculation model that estimates the effect on FOB and retail prices under different pricing models.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.14 Percentage of production volume where the member company pays its share of the target wage.	10%	FWF member companies are challenged to adopt approaches that absorb the extra costs of increasing wages.	Member company's own documentation, evidence of target wage implementation, such as wage reports, factory documentation, communication with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: For two factories in Moldova, both owned by Teamdress, a target wage was set. Evidence was provided that a wage increase of 25% is implemented.

Teamdress also increased the prices for its other factories, yet the member brand has not yet succeeded in verifying whether this price increase was used for a wage increase for the factory workers.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Teamdress to show that discussions and plans for wage increases have resulted in the payment of a target wage.

Purchasing Practices

Possible Points: 52

Earned Points: 36

2. Monitoring and Remediation

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
% of production volume where approved member own audit(s) took place.	0%	
% of production volume where approved external audits took place.	13%	
% of production volume where Fair Wear audits took place.	25%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	15%	To be counted towards the monitoring threshold, FWF low-risk policy should be implemented. See indicator 2.9. (N/A = no production in low risk countries.)
% of production volume where an audit took place.	38%	
Member meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	First or second year member and tail-end monitoring requirements do not apply	1st or 2nd year member and tail-end monitoring requirements do not apply.
Total monitoring threshold:	53%	Measured as percentage of production volume (Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100%)

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: Teamdress could show that CAPs are shared with factory and timelines were established in a timely manner for the CAPs active during 2019.

Recommendation: Before an audit takes place, Teamdress is recommended to check with the supplier whether worker representatives are active. In this way, they can be involved from the start of an audit and be invited for the audit opening and exit meeting. Including workers when following up on audit reports gives them the opportunity to be informed of issues in the factory and have a voice in the prioritization of issues.

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.	Basic	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.	4	8	-2

Comment: One external audit was conducted in December 2019 and the report was only received in 2020, so follow up will be assessed in the next performance check.

CAPs of the audits conducted in 2018 have been used to follow up. However, Teamdress has had a very basic role; Teamdress has been emailing the factory for evidence on remediation, but no proactive support through analysis of root causes of the more complex issues and no discussion with the factory about remediation. Several improvements are made, but merely the basic matters, such as OHS issues.

Requirement: Resolving and remediating non-compliances is one of the most important criteria member companies can do towards improving working conditions. Fair Wear expects Teamdress to examine and support remediation of any problem that they encounter. Coordinated efforts between different departments are required to ensure sustained responses to 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.	97%	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: Out of the twelve production locations, eleven have been visited by Teamdress staff in 2019. The supplier in Bosnia Herzegovina was not visited, as cooperation with this supplier was ended in 2019. In case sourcing and production staff visits the locations, reporting back to the CSR manager is done verbally.

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

Comment: In December 2019, one external audit was conducted at a supplier in Ukraine. Teamdress collected the report, yet the quality of the report still needs to be assessed. The report was only received in 2020, so follow up will be assessed in the next performance check.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Teamdress to use the Audit Quality Assessment Tool and immediately discuss with the supplier what information is missing and how to collect that information.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies.	Average score depending on the number of applicable policies and results	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.	3	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
Compliance with FWF guidance on risks related to Turkish garment factories employing Syrian refugees	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Other risks specific to the member's supply chain are addressed by its monitoring system	Intermediate			3	6	-2

Comment: Teamdress has informed itself on risks in Ukraine, Moldova, and Macedonia by consulting various sources, such as Human Rights Index, audit reports and country reports. A clear overview was made to evaluate the information gathered. The outcome of discussions during meetings with embassies in their production countries is also included in the evaluation. An example is the high risk of discrimination regarding homophobia in Ukraine. Such risks are shared with employees being in regular contact with the supplier.

The CSR manager keeps the information up to date by reviewing it quarterly. Whenever necessary, it is discussed with Teamdress management and decisions are made. The overview of specific risks is used in conversations with suppliers, but no other actions have been taken to prevent these risks from happening.

In 2019 no new countries were added to Teamdress' supply base.

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

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 CAPs active, no shared production locations or refusal of other company to cooperate	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.	N/A	2	-1

Comment: Teamdress does not share any production locations with other Fair Wear members.

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.	50-100% AND member undertakes additional activities to monitor suppliers	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws. FWF has defined minimum monitoring requirements for production locations in low-risk countries.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	3	3	0

Comment: There are two suppliers in low risk countries. Both have signed and returned the CoLP and the questionnaire, posted the Worker Information Sheet. The production locations are visited regularly.

In 2018 and 2019, Teamdress increased wages in its own Polish production location. The supplier in Poland is visited twice a month and Teamdress has a very close cooperation with them.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits at tail-end production locations (when the minimum required monitoring threshold is met).	No	FWF encourages its members to 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	2	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.11 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from external brands resold by the member company.	No	FWF believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of FWF or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	0	2	0

Comment: Out of the 20 external brands resold by Teamdress in 2019, two were not provided with the questionnaire. The other 18 did receive the questionnaire, nine have returned the questionnaire with the required information.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.12 External brands resold by member companies that are members of another credible initiative (% of external sales volume).	2%	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.	1	3	0

Comment: One of the external brands resold by Teamdress is member of Fair Wear Foundation, representing 2% of the total external sales volume.

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: 30

Earned Points: 19

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

Comment: The Quality and CSR manager is responsible for addressing worker complaints.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.2 Member company has informed factory management and workers about the FWF CoLP and complaints hotline.	Yes	Informing both management and workers about the FWF Code of Labour Practices and complaints hotline is a first step in alerting workers to their rights. The Worker Information Sheet is a tool to do this and should be visibly posted at all production locations.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from production location visits, etc.	2	2	-2

Comment: During the annual factory visits by Teamdress staff it is checked whether posters are placed on a visible spot in the factory. Pictures are made and filed, shown during the Brand Performance Check.

For the factories owned by Teamdress the process is less formal, as staff is very frequently present in the facilities and is able to monitor closely. The staff members are in close contact with the CSR manager, monitoring the status.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.3 Degree to which member company has actively raised awareness of the FWF CoLP and complaints hotline.	0%	After informing workers and management of the FWF CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural worker-management dialogue.	Training reports, FWF's data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	0	6	0

Comment: Most of Teamdress' production takes place in countries without access to the FWF worker helpline. Only the Macedonian supplier is located in a country where FWF is active. None of the production locations have been enrolled in training to raise awareness about the FWF CoLP.

Requirement: Fair Wear requires members to actively raise awareness about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and Fair Wear complaint hotline. Teamdress should ensure good quality systematic training of workers and management on these topics. Fair Wear does not offer trainings in Teamdress' sourcing countries, and therefore the member should implement training with other service providers. Fair Wear's guidance on training quality standards is available on the Member Hub.

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: 9

Earned Points: 3

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	0

Comment: Teamdress has made all staff aware of Fair Wear membership. At the start of membership in 2019, the CSR manager created an information sheet which was shared with all employees.

Recommendation: It is advised to develop a standard procedure for all new employees to get familiar with Fair Wear membership. Fair Wear has material available that can be used to inform (sales) staff.

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

Comment: At the start of membership in april 2019, purchasing and production planning staff was informed individually by the CSR manager, to ensure that FWF requirements were well understood. Furthermore, Fair Wear membership is part of the daily business, as the CSR manager is in close contact with the purchasing and production planning.

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.	Member does not use agents/contractors	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.	N/A	2	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.4 Factory participation in training programmes that support transformative processes related to human rights.	0%	Complex human rights issues such as freedom of association or gender-based violence require more in-depth trainings that support factory-level transformative processes. FWF has developed several modules, however, other (member-led) programmes may also count.	Training reports, FWF's data on factories enrolled in training programmes. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	0	6	0

Comment: No suppliers have been enrolled in training that supports transformative processes.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Teamdress to implement training programmes that support factory-level transformation such as establishing functional internal grievance mechanisms, improving worker-management dialogue and communication skills or addressing gender-based violence. Training assessed under this indicator should go beyond raising awareness and focus on behavioural change and long-term structures to improve working conditions. To this end, Teamdress can implement advanced training through service providers or brand staff. Fair Wear guidance on good quality training is available on the Member Hub.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.5 Degree to which member company follows up after a training programme.	No training programmes have been conducted or member produces solely in low-risk countries	After factory-level training programmes, complementary activities such as remediation and changes on brand level will achieve a lasting impact.	Documentation of discussions with factory management and worker representatives, minutes of regular worker-management dialogue meetings or anti-harassment committees.	N/A	2	0

Training and Capacity Building

Possible Points: 9

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 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.	3	6	-2

Comment: Efforts were shown to identify all production locations. The CSR manager is in close contact with the planning department and uses an Enterprise Resource Planning system to closely monitor capacity level of each production location. During the frequent visits capacity is checked to monitor the risk of subcontracting. Teamdress has created a document that requires basic information from suppliers such as production capacity and production processes, which is also used as a check whether Teamdress' orders are actually able to be produced at the location of the supplier.

Recommendation: Members are advised to develop a systematic approach to complete the production location list. Part of the approach can be:

1. Automatically include information from the questionnaire, audit reports and complaints
2. Business relationships with agents include transparency of production locations.
3. Periodical checks during production season to verify the information shared.

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

Comment: Audit reports and CAPs are available for all staff involved through the member brand's database. Important CSR information is shared prior to visiting a factory through the monthly meetings with production team and CSR manager. Critical audit findings are shared with top management whenever relevant.

Recommendation: It is advised to make relevant staff aware of the available tools Fair Wear offers, such as the Health and Safety guides, monitoring CAP documents, access to Fair Wear's online information system. Purchasing staff are recommended to share reports from factory visits that include a status update of implementing the CoLP.

Information Management

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 4

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: Information on Fair Wear membership is shared on the website of Teamdress, as well as their daughter company De Berkel. No significant problems were found and minimum communications requirements are met.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
6.2 Member company 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.	Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	0	2	0

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 submitted to FWF	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.	1	2	-1

Comment: Teamdress submitted its social report 2019 to Fair Wear.

Transparency

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 3

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: An annual management review is done in October by the CEO, shareholders and CSR manager. The CSR manager is in charge of the agenda and the results of the Brand Performance Check are discussed to set priorities and goals for the next year.

Recommendation: Fair Wear advises Teamdress to organise a meeting with management and sourcing staff right after receiving the Brand Performance Check report. In this way management can discuss the outcomes of this performance check and still have time to formulate and execute plans for the following year.

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.	45%	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: Teamdress' daughter company De Berkel was a member of Fair Wear since 2007. Due to the limitations of De Berkel (all sourcing runs through the supply base of Teamdress), it was agreed to move Fair Wear membership to Teamdress in 2019. Given the membership years of De Berkel it was decided to take into account and assess the most recent requirements given to De Berkel.

Total requirements given in the previous Brand Performance Check of De Berkel is eight. Teamdress has shown a level of progress made in 45% of those requirements, most of them related to monitoring and due diligence processes.

Evaluation

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 4

Recommendations to Fair Wear

Teamdress finds Fairforce a very helpful and efficient device, everything in one place.

The production countries Teamdress is active in are not a focus for Fair Wear. Especially for trainings it is very challenging to organise it. Teamdress recommends Fair Wear to provide better guidance, tools and comparable initiatives for those areas.

Scoring Overview

Category	Earned	Possible
Purchasing Practices	36	52
Monitoring and Remediation	19	30
Complaints Handling	3	9
Training and Capacity Building	3	9
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	3	6
Evaluation	4	6
Totals:	72	119

Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

61

Performance Benchmarking Category

Good

Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

20-05-2020

Conducted by:

Hendrine Stelwagen

Interviews with:

Annegret Dyck - quality manager