



## **Brand Performance Check**

# **Bierbaum-Proenen GmbH & Co. KG**

**Publication date: June 2021**

This report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2020 to 31-12-2020

## 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](http://www.fairwear.org). The online [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators.

*This years' report covers the response of our members and the impact on their supply chain due to the Covid-19 pandemic which started in 2020. The outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic limited the brands' ability to visit and audit factories. To ensure the monitoring of working conditions throughout the pandemic, Fair Wear and its member brands made use of additional monitoring tools, such as complaints reports, surveys, and the consultation of local stakeholders. These sources may not provide as detailed insights as audit reports. To assess outcomes at production location level, we have included all available types of evidence to provide an accurate overview of the brands' management systems and their efforts to improve working conditions. Nevertheless, brands should resume verifying working conditions through audits when the situation allows for.*

# Brand Performance Check Overview

## Bierbaum-Proenen GmbH & Co. KG

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2020 to 31-12-2020

| Member company information   |  |
|--|--|
| Headquarters:  | Cologne , Germany  |
| Member since:  | 2010-07-01   |
| Product types:   | Workwear   |
| Production in countries where Fair Wear is active:                                     | Bangladesh, China, North Macedonia, Romania, Tunisia, Turkey, Viet Nam |
| Production in other countries:   | Armenia, Germany, Pakistan, Slovakia                                   |
| 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   | 81%  |
| Benchmarking score   | 79   |
| Category   | Leader   |

## Summary:

Bierbaum-Proenen GmbH & Co. KG (BP) has made progress and shown advanced results on performance indicators. A combination of Fair Wear audits and external audits result in a monitoring percentage of 81%. This result and a benchmarking score of 79 means BP maintains its 'Leader' status.

## Corona Addendum:

Bierbaum-Proenen GmbH & Co. KG (BP) is a workwear company with a diverse portfolio, ranging from industry to gastronomy and health care. For 2020, the company had two main goals: keeping financially stable with all suppliers in business and ensuring its employees stayed healthy. The entire company was on 40% furlough from April through June. The purchasing/sustainability department was on 40% furlough from April to May and continued with 20% furlough until the 1st of July. From July onwards, the company was back to full capacity.

In April and May 2020, the company experienced a big drop in sales because of lockdowns and the change in consumer behaviour. Later sales picked up again, where BP had to accommodate a shift in its portfolio. This required the company to adjust its orders and work with suppliers to ensure it could meet the increased demand. BP switched orders between factories and supported factories to produce different products than they were used to, to keep production going. The supply chain and purchasing team constantly assessed risks, adjusted orders, and kept track of stock levels in the warehouse to match demand and supply. Also, it accommodated an increased demand for face masks by buying from an external producer and starting up its own production.

Throughout 2020, the head of production and the head of purchasing kept close contact with all production locations, with most every week with some even daily. During these calls, BP would check on the general COVID-19 situation and government measures in the country or region, check on any factory's health problems and discuss general business and BP orders. Production sites that needed to go in lockdown or regional quarantines were the biggest issue throughout the year. BP was able to accommodate any changes to production without cancelling any orders. Throughout the year, BP continued its focus on worker involvement during its regular check-ins with production locations.

BP has its own production location in Tunisia, where it experienced problems keeping in touch with people during the lockdown. However, the company has used its experience of working with a workers' committee in Germany to improve its cooperation with workers and union representatives in Tunisia.

## 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. | 80%    | 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:** BP is responsible for at least 10% of production capacity at production locations responsible for 80% of FOB. BP want to ensure it is not the only customer at production locations and actively suggests suppliers to find other brands to produce there as well, in order to reduce the risks for the production location in case BP stops working at the production site.

Like previous years, approximately 65% of BP's sourcing volume is made on cut make trim (CMT) basis (Macedonia, Armenia, Tunisia, Vietnam), the other 35% is bought ready-made (China, Pakistan, Turkey, Bangladesh).

| 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. | 5%     | Fair Wear 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 Fair Wear. | 3     | 4   | 0   |

**Comment:** BP has a small and limited amount of suppliers where the company buys less than 2% of its 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. | 77%    | 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:** BP has long-lasting business relationships with most of its suppliers.



| 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     | 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. | 0     | 2   | 0   |

**Comment:** In 2020, BP started production at a location in Tunisia where they last had production in 2015. The company asked for an updated questionnaire and asked the factory to re-post the worker information sheet, but the factory did not respond.

In addition, BP wanted to respond to the growing demand in face mask and looked for possibilities to produce these. They selected a production location in Germany for one order. Although the company did its due diligence it did not receive a completed questionnaire before the first bulk orders were placed.

| 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. | Advanced | 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. | 4     | 4   | 0   |

**Comment:** BP has clear processes in place to check all suppliers against the Code of Labour Practices. Both regarding new suppliers and existing suppliers. The process outlines that potential new suppliers are visited by either the CEO, the head of purchasing or the head of production before trial orders are placed. Social standards are an important issue in these first meetings. The travel report made by them also includes suppliers' willingness to work on the Fair Wear CoLP.

Before BP places the first orders at new suppliers the selected supplier must hand in supplier information. As part of its quality management system, there is a quality management process to follow up on this internally for both new and existing production locations. For new suppliers, BP requires them to provide an audit before a formal business relationship can start. This could be a Fair Wear or other audit report such as BSCI, SEDEX, SA8000. This is to ensure that new suppliers are prepared for auditing and know about the processes. This evaluation is integrated into the decision making of whether to start production at a new supplier and to have a benchmark of the working conditions from the beginning.

BP also conducts country risk assessments for its suppliers based on several benchmarks, such as Human Development Index (HDI), regular updates from Fair Wear and based on information from their production locations. In management meetings, BP's management discusses in which country and with which suppliers it wants to start a cooperation.

In 2020, the company received a lot of orders for face masks, which are not part of the standard portfolio. While the company started production in its location in Germany and with one supplier in Turkey, it also looked for alternative production locations. The company selected a German manufacturer, which did not have enough regular orders because of shop closures and was able to produce face masks at high volumes quickly. BP considered it a win-win situation. With this production location BP did not follow the standard due diligence process, such as visits and collection of existing audits, but did make sure to select a partner with similar sustainability standards. The company did realise that not following the standard procedure creates more problems than it solves, specifically related to adjusting systems, and would not deviate from the process in a similar situation in the future.

Throughout 2020, the head of production and the head of purchasing kept close contact with all production locations, with most on a weekly basis with some even daily. During these calls BP would check on the general COVID-19 situation and government measures in the country or region, check on any health problems in the factory and discuss general business and BP orders. BPs sustainability manager would feed information about country risks and specific guidance, as provided by Fair Wear and other initiatives, to her colleagues to discuss during these regular calls. All information was captured in a shared overview of all suppliers. BP also sent out the regular questionnaire to suppliers collecting information on wages and working hours and conducted an audit at its Vietnamese production location.

| 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:** BP evaluates suppliers' social compliance systematically and this is shared with suppliers regularly and forms the basis of the ongoing discussion. Information on social compliance is included in the general supplier evaluation system which includes indicators on products, the supplying company, the services, and the price. All of these indicators guide production decisions. If suppliers score low extra attention is given to see how they can improve. If suppliers fail to improve over a certain period of time (depending on the actual score) BP's exit strategy comes into force. If suppliers score high they are included in the development of new products and are thereby recognised as valuable partners for future orders.

In 2020, BP kept track of development for each individual supplier to be able to respond when necessary. During these calls the company discussed Occupational Health & Safety (OHS) measures at supplier, lockdown of production site, orders, wages and other COVID-19 related topics as financial situation of supplier and governmental support. BP did not cancel orders, although it did reduce the forecast on future orders. The company experienced a shift in its portfolio. To keep to order forecasts with all production locations they actively supported locations to change product styles from one product group to another.

| 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:** For every supplier, BP arranges fixed lead times depending on the location of the supplier and if they do CMT or FOB production. For its biggest suppliers, BP's production planning is based on labour minute calculation. For the smaller suppliers, the production demand is based on an agreed (and monitored) weekly number of pieces. If a supplier does not meet the agreed output, the weekly agreed pieces can be reduced.

Factories tell BP how many lines and minutes/pieces are available for BP orders. Generally, the fixed lead times include a time reserve of one week to be flexible in case of unexpected problems. BP also includes holiday plans for its production sites when sending the forecasting plan. BP additionally re-confirms the status of production every two weeks with its suppliers, to ensure the booked capacity is in fact used for the production of BP goods and delays are encountered at an early stage.

BP has a very broad and extensive range of 'never-out-of-stock' products (NOS). For all production locations, BP has regular quantities of repeating articles per month. The goal is to provide suppliers with the same styles. When there is sudden extra demand in certain styles, suppliers are called to check for additional capacity (and different delivery dates are agreed upon). In cases where production capacity is an issue, NOS production is replaced by urgent additional styles, and existing stock is used for standard goods while the additional style is produced.

The company keeps a large stock supply and aims for equal production planning throughout the year which is regularly checked with its suppliers in order to produce without excessive overtime. Furthermore, BP has material in stock at its biggest suppliers. This stock gives the company and its suppliers more flexibility in case of urgent orders, reducing pressure on delivery times and therefore risk of overtime. Moreover, several of BP's suppliers can produce the same styles.

In 2020, the head of supply chain, head of purchasing and head of planning were in regular contact to make sure the process was updated based on regional lockdowns or factory closure. BP asked the supplier in advance about their situation and what the effect would be on production capacity. Also, to be in line with all necessary medical guidelines and distancing in production several production locations indicated lower available capacity, which was accepted and incorporated in future capacity planning. BP accepted late deliveries and tried to reschedule production where possible also using its available stock.

| 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:** Although several audits indicate excessive overtime, none are specifically linked to BP's purchasing practices. With one Chinese location, BP has extensively discussed possible root causes, which resulted in a change in order schedule from four times a year to every other month to facilitate better planning on both sides. Also they have evaluated the supply of materials to make sure the two processes are better aligned to decrease production pressure. To continue monitoring of overtime, BP has included questions about capacity and overtime in its standard annual questionnaire which is shared with suppliers.

| 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:** Price negotiations for CMT are done based on standard minutes developed in house at BP's own production unit. Cost of material and accessories are known as well as CMT price, BP has a good impression of costs for management and workers as it can compare price and working minutes with other comparable suppliers including their own factory. Local wage levels are taken into account through this system when calculating an acceptable price. Further BP considers inflation in price agreements with the suppliers each year.

For suppliers which are paid FOB (35% of all), BP asks for the CMT price so it has an idea of how much workmanship needs to go in each product and bases its price on this and then calculate by price per minute. BP relates the price among others to the size of the production volume and related productivity and working minutes needed.

BP has started an analysis comparing minimum wages and local living wages before and after social audits in the past years. Doing this, the company can measure wage increases in the long-run. BP also compares minimum wages against calculated minute wages and whether paying the minute wages would lead to a higher wage than the minimum wage. In the past financial year, the company combined the analysis of the current wages in the factory with its own minute calculation to identify the gap between what is paid and what could be paid to the workers.

On a case-by-case decision, BP also can agree to a price increases with its suppliers. In some cases, BP has contract agreements of regularly price increases with its suppliers. In addition, BP has a calculation of almost each article about the amount of production minutes per piece. This calculation is checked also via sewing sample tests in its own production location in Cologne.

In 2020, the company has started price negotiations with several production locations for orders in 2021 and has agreed on increasing the price to also accommodate wage increase.

| 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. | Yes    | If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage or minimum wage payments cannot be verified, Fair Wear 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, Fair Wear Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a Fair Wear auditor, or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved. | 0     | 0   | -2  |

**Comment:** BP received a complaint regarding wage payments, indicating the factory had not applied for government funding. This was investigated and remediated by BP.

| 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  |

**Comment:** There were no late payments by BP in 2020.

| 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. | Advanced | 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 | 6     | 6   | 0   |

**Comment:** In 2019, BP started to raise awareness with the factory management on the topic of living wages (through the annual wage survey and in-person conversations). The idea was that a well-informed management would be better able to calculate prices to support a living wage. BP actively invited factories to participate in supplier seminars on costing. This was a first step in uncovering and addressing root causes. In addition, the company started to more actively address the topic of including workers/worker representatives; they gathered information about the situation of worker representatives at production locations through the annual survey as well.

In 2020, BP continued the conversation with several suppliers and continued its efforts to increase wages at its own production location in Tunisia. In this production location it focused on analysing efficiency to determine possible improvements. These were discussed with worker and union representatives to create shared responsibility.

| 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). | 13%    | 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:** One production site in Tunisia is owned by BP. Furthermore, a small amount of production and samples are produced in Cologne, Germany at the headquarter.

| 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:** By extrapolating the minute price and comparing this to the average wage levels in a factory BP was able to identify the link between prices and wages. As a first target going forward, the company would like to ensure that the factory's average wage and BP's extrapolated minute price are at the same level (which ever is higher). This will happen either through better costing to other customers or through increasing the company's own minute price.

| 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. | 13%    | Fair Wear 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:** At its own factory in Tunisia, responsible for 13% of total FOB (excluding production in low-risk countries), the company pays almost according to the living wage estimate recommended by local stakeholders of Fair Wear. The factory is located outside of Tunis, in an area where living standards are a little lower than in the city. In addition, it provides full coverage of social insurance, correct payments of working hours and overtime (if needed) and extra benefits (compared to other factories around), such as 100% social insurance, providing free doctor consults at the factory, longer-term contracts with employment protection.

---

## **Purchasing Practices**

**Possible Points: 52**

**Earned Points: 42**

---



## 2. Monitoring and Remediation

| Basic measurements   | Result  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|
| % of production volume where an audit took place.  | 79%   |  |
| % of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled. | 2%  | 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.) |
| Member meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.                    | No (implementation will be assessed next performance check)   | FWF members must meet tail-end monitoring requirements. Implementation will be assessed during next Brand Performance check.                               |
| Requirement(s) for next performance check  | Fair Wear requires BP to ensure it audits (or fulfils low-risk monitoring requirements at) all production locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That produce more than 2% of the member's volume</li> <li>• Where the member has more than 10% leverage</li> <li>• Where a high risk policy applies</li> <li>• Where a complaint is submitted.</li> </ul> Only when the above has been accounted for, 'tail-end monitoring requirements apply'. |  |
| Total monitoring threshold:  | 81%   | 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 Fair Wear membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis. | Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is. | 2     | 2   | -2  |

**Comment:** BP has a team of three people who are responsible for the monitoring system. The members of the team belong to the CSR and buying department.

| 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 Fair Wear teams cannot be used, the member companies' own auditing system must ensure sufficient quality in order for Fair Wear 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: Fair Wear audit reports were shared and discussed with suppliers within two months of audit receipt AND a reasonable time frame was specified for resolving findings. | Corrective Action Plans, emails; findings of followup audits; brand representative present during audit exit meeting, etc. | 2     | 2   | -1  |

**Comment:** The corrective action plans resulting from conducted audits are systematically agreed upon, followed up and reported on by designated persons including the travelling staff of BP.

When sending the audit report and corrective action plan, BP always highlights to factory management that everything should be discussed and followed upon together with worker representation. Experience in involving worker representation showed to BP that in some factories involvement of worker representation works well and in others, it does not. If not, BP is aware that this does not only count for the follow-up of findings but influences the general follow-up process.

| 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 | Fair Wear 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:** BP was able to show active follow-up on CAPs and findings actually being resolved. BP's Sustainability Manager participated online in the exit meeting of one of the audits in Vietnam and was able to start remediation even before the report was shared.

In 2020, the member continued to put specific emphasis on worker representatives and find out about the composition and effectiveness of worker committees. With its own production location in Tunisia it had several interactions with worker representatives.

Regarding follow-up on monitoring results related to COVID-19, the company actively responded to factory issues, such as low order volumes or lockdowns or limited capacity. Through the regular contact with all production locations BP was able to get a better understanding of the situation at their suppliers and also more insights in general business developments.

| 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. | not applicable | Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, brands could often not visit their suppliers from March - December 2020. For consistency purposes, we therefore decided to score all our member brands N/A on visiting suppliers over the year 2020. | Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor. | N/A   | 4   | 0   |

**Comment:** As travel was restricted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this indicator is not applicable in 2020 for all Fair Wear members.

| Performance indicators                                       | Result   | Relevance of Indicator  | Documentation  | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.6 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected. | Yes, quality assessed and corrective actions implemented | 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. | 3     | 3   | 0   |

**Comment:** BP checks all suppliers for other social audit reports on an annual basis. The reports are collected, the Fair Wear Audit Quality Assessment Tool done and CAPs integrated into the existing routine to follow up improvement possibilities at the production sites. Reports from other organisations are actively used to follow up uncovered points and to cross-check implementation status from what is reported by the supplier via email, phone and visits at the production site when possible.

| 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 Fair Wear membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. Fair Wear requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by Fair Wear. | 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. | 4     | 6   | -2  |
| Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh   | Intermediate   |   |   | 3     | 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 | Advanced   |   |   | 6     | 6   | -2  |
| Other risks specific to the member's supply chain are addressed by its monitoring system             | Intermediate   |   |   | 3     | 6   | -2  |

**Comment:** BP has two active production locations in Bangladesh, where it produces every other year. In 2020, it placed orders at one production locations in Bangladesh. BP is not a member of the Bangladesh Accord, but its production locations are a member of the Accord and have been audited. BP indicated that it has no plans to become a member of the Accord as its FOB sourced from this production location (0.3%) do not weigh up against the costs of membership. Other important aspects of the Enhanced Monitoring for Bangladesh (such as risk analysis, anti-harassment policies, and fire and health and safety monitoring) have been taken care of by the company.

Regarding the guidance of Syrian refugees in Turkey, BP had several meetings with this supplier to increase awareness of the issues regarding the Syrian refugees. At the end of 2020, the factory indicated it had four Syrian refugees employed through an agency with the support of the Association of Solidarity with Refugees and Migrants. BP requested more information and ensured that these people had working permits and were treated properly. The suppliers has participated in the WEP factory dialogue for Turkey.

For production in other countries, BP is aware of country and factory-specific risks. All risks are captured in a general overview and used for regular interactions with production locations. Based on complaints received over the past years BP focuses specifically on good worker-management dialogue and worker involvement. Specifically for China, where the main risks are related to excessive overtime and lack of freedom of association, BP has started cooperating with its main Chinese supplier to develop an agreement with worker representatives that working hours should not exceed 60 hours per week.

In 2020, BP made sure to keep updated on the main COVID-19 related risks regarding health and safety, factory closure and order development. However, the company did not specifically address payment of wages during closures, which may have resulted in lower wages. However, the standard questionnaire BP sends out to gather information on wages did not reflect that reality.

| 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. | Active 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. | 2     | 2   | -1  |

**Comment:** BP actively cooperates with Fair Wear members and brands not affiliated to Fair Wear.

| 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. | 42%    | Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws. Fair Wear has defined minimum monitoring requirements for production locations in low-risk countries. | Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of Fair Wear membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires. | 1     | 2   | 0   |

**Member undertakes additional activities to monitor suppliers.:** No (0)

**Comment:** BP did one order of face masks at a new location in Germany. This location did not sign the Code of Labour Practices, nor was the Worker Information Sheet posted.

| 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     | Fair Wear 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 Fair Wear 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     | Fair Wear believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of Fair Wear or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods. | Questionnaires are on file. | 0     | 2   | 0   |

**Comment:** In 2020, BP received several orders for face masks, which it was not able to produce themselves. For part of the orders the company relied on an external producer. Due to the rush of the orders, BP did not send the questionnaire or collected additional information. However, they did verify that the external producer had the same attitude towards sustainability and requested audit report of the production locations.

| 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). | 0%     | Fair Wear 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 Fair Wear's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by Fair Wear or FLA members. | 0     | 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 | Fair Wear 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: 31**

**Earned Points: 20**

### 3. Complaints Handling

| Basic measurements  | Result | Comments   |
|---|--------|--|
| Number of worker complaints received since last check.    | 3      | 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.    | 3      |  |

| 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 Fair Wear 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:** BP has a team of three persons who are designated to address workers 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 Fair Wear 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:** Staff from BP checks that the worker information sheet is posted in the factories when they visit the production location and via emails and pictures. During visits, a special checklist BP developed is used, filled in by technicians, based on the Fair Wear Occupational Health and Safety checklist added with additional issues, such as posting of Fair Wear CoLP in the production location, availability of or access to primary healthcare etc. Pictures of the posted worker information sheet are collected. In 2020, BP's technician was able to visit production locations in Tunisia, Turkey, North Macedonia, Slovakia and Armenia.



| 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. | 14%    | After informing workers and management of the Fair Wear CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural worker-management dialogue. | Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes. | 4     | 6   | 0   |

**Comment:** BP organised training a WEP Basic training at three production locations and a training on prevention of violence and harassment in one production location in Bangladesh. Together these locations are responsible for 14% of FOB.

**Recommendation:** Fair Wear recommends BP to continue to actively raise awareness about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and Fair Wear complaint helpline among a larger portion of its suppliers. It is recommended to discuss with the production location what the best way is to organise this, whether it is through Fair Wear's WEP Basic module or another organisation. Non-Fair Wear training must follow the standards outlined in Fair Wear's guidance and checklist 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. | Yes + Preventive steps taken | 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. | 6     | 6   | -2  |

**Comment:** Over the past years, BP received one complaint related to worker-management communication, one complaint regarding overtime and one complaint on a factory not paying during lockdown.

The company has responded to these complaints in line with the Fair Wear Complaints procedure and has organised training in these production locations focused on improving worker-management dialogue. In addition, BP is now more aware of this issue and discusses worker-management communication as part of regular discussions with production locations.

| 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 Fair Wear 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: 15**

**Earned Points: 13**

## 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 Fair Wear membership requirements helps to support cross-departmental collaboration when needed. | Emails, trainings, presentation, newsletters, etc. | 1     | 1   | 0   |

**Comment:** All BP staff is made aware of Fair Wear membership requirements. Several times a year, BP provides a Fair Wear training for travelling staff, all new BP employees (requirement for job training) and interested colleagues. In addition, BP informs its staff about Fair Wear topics such as their new sustainability report, the Brand Performance Check report and its result.

| 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 Fair Wear requirements and advocate for change within their organisations. | Fair Wear Seminars or equivalent trainings provided; presentations, curricula, etc. | 2     | 2   | -1  |

**Comment:** Staff is trained in general. Staff travelling to production sites is briefed in detail before visiting the production site. Usually, the CSR team briefs travelling staff about supplier specific problems and asks for proof such as documents, notes, pictures and even video shots.

BP has developed a checklist for travelling staff like technicians. Staff is informed and regularly trained how to use the checklist. The travelling staff shares the collected documents and pictures with the CSR team. The CSR team evaluates the situation at the production site.

| 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, Fair Wear audit findings. | 2     | 2   | 0   |

**Comment:** With two production locations BP works with an agent/intermediary. All their factories signed the Fair Wear CoLP requirements. In addition to informing the agent, the production sites are visited regularly by staff of BP.

| 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. | 27%    | Complex human rights issues such as freedom of association or gender-based violence require more in-depth trainings that support factory-level transformative processes. Fair Wear has developed several modules, however, other (member-led) programmes may also count. | Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in training programmes. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes. | 4     | 6   | 0   |

**Comment:** BP organised trainings at three different production locations focused on improving worker management dialogue and one training on Prevention on Violence and Harassment in Bangladesh.

| Performance indicators  | Result           | Relevance of Indicator  | Documentation  | Score | Max | Min |
|---|------------------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 4.5 Degree to which member company follows up after a training programme. | Active follow-up | 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. | 2     | 2   | 0   |

**Comment:** After the training, BP has discussed the report with the factories and has monitored progress.

---

## **Training and Capacity Building**

**Possible Points: 13**

**Earned Points: 11**

---

## 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:** BP has a designated person who keeps the supplier register updated. BP uses its supplier register and Fair Wear Database to identify suppliers and update supplier information. Production locations are frequently visited during production to check on quality and whether production actually takes place in the agreed production location. In 2020, BP asked much more questions to production locations to verify production took place at the identified location. Especially when there were production delays, BP would be monitoring production closely and was lenient about leadtimes to avoid the use of subcontractors. In addition, BPs technician visited production locations in Tunisia, Turkey, North Macedonia, Slovakia and Armenia.

| 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:** BP has developed a system where information regarding code compliance is integrated in the overall assessment of the supplier. At this point, staff is informed about compliance and outstanding issues prior to factory visits. Staff can also access documents regarding social compliance of the individual suppliers on the server. Responsible staff from departments related to suppliers and products meet almost weekly. Fair Wear and social compliance in general is part of the agenda.

---

## 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 | Fair Wear's communications policy exists to ensure transparency for consumers and stakeholders, and to ensure that member communications about Fair Wear are accurate. Members will be held accountable for their own communications as well as the communications behaviour of 3rd-party retailers, resellers and customers. | Fair Wear membership is communicated on member's website; other communications in line with Fair Wear communications policy. | 2     | 2   | -3  |

**Comment:** BP's website and catalogues are the most important communication channels for BP to communicate about Fair Wear membership. Furthermore, the company has informed the public, customers and end users through press releases, flyers and social media channels. Communication regarding Fair Wear is important to BP, and the company experiences a growing interest from customers. For interested customers, BP has a special information sheet explaining key aspects of Fair Wear, also to make sure third-party sellers stick to the communication guidelines.

| Performance indicators                                       | Result  | Relevance of Indicator  | Documentation  | Score | Max | Min |
|--|---|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities. | Published Brand Performance Checks, audit reports, and/or other efforts lead to increased transparency. | Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of Fair Wear'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. | 1     | 2   | 0   |

**Comment:** The Brand Performance Check Report is published on BP's website and the social report includes audit results. The social report and website also mention the company's own production location by name.

**Requirement:** Fair Wear requires BP to disclose production locations to other member brands in Fair Force and on the Fair Wear website.



| 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 AND 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 Fair Wear's communication policy. | Social report that is in line with Fair Wear's communication policy. | 2     | 2   | -1  |

**Comment:** BP published its social report in German and English on its website.

---

## Transparency

**Possible Points: 6**

**Earned Points: 5**

---

## 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 Fair Wear policies are integrated into the structure of the company. | Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc. | 2     | 2   | 0   |

**Comment:** The Manager for Sustainability is responsible for evaluation of the effectiveness of the workplan and available resources. An evaluation meeting on Fair Wear membership takes place every year with top management.

| 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. | No requirements were included in previous Check | In each Brand Performance Check report, Fair Wear may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of Fair Wear membership and its process approach. | Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check. | N/A   | 4   | -2  |

## Evaluation

**Possible Points: 2**

**Earned Points: 2**

## Recommendations to Fair Wear

BP recommends Fair Wear to work on:

- More detailed information/more measurable information about Living Wages/Country possible? (China/Region, Vietnam, Bangladesh, Armenia)
- Wage analysis in CAP differs very often between audit teams and audit of different years, which makes it hard to compare wage analysis at factories.
- Fair Wear wage ladder tool: kindly request to add more information like month of implementation, wage archive, information about annual statutory wage increase by %.
- More support by Fair Wear on how to evaluate wages correctly (f.e. challenges by different wage categories etc., how to request wage data at suppliers which leads to reliable information and can be given by suppliers without enormous lots of research work on their side).
- More alignment between initiatives to reduce the administrative burden.

## Scoring Overview

| Category                       | Earned | Possible |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Purchasing Practices           | 42     | 52       |
| Monitoring and Remediation     | 20     | 31       |
| Complaints Handling            | 13     | 15       |
| Training and Capacity Building | 11     | 13       |
| Information Management         | 7      | 7        |
| Transparency                   | 5      | 6        |
| Evaluation                     | 2      | 2        |
| Totals:                        | 100    | 126      |

### Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

79

### Performance Benchmarking Category

Leader

## Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

10-06-2021

Conducted by:

Anne van Lakerveld

Interviews with:

Harald Goost (CEO)

Fabian Kusch (Head of Purchasing, Sustainability, Quality Assurance Material),

Dominik Schröder (Head of Supply Chain)

Ute Müller (Head of Production)

Annet Baldus (Purchasing/Sustainability)

Pia Brenner (Financial Accountant)

Annika Düren (Planning)

Ben Schneweis (Apprentice)