



Brand Performance Check

Zeeman textielSupers BV

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. 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

Zeeman textielSupers BV

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

Member company information	
Headquarters:	Alphen aan den Rijn , Netherlands
Member since:	2019-10-01
Product types:	Garments, clothing, fashion apparel, Accessories, Home textiles, Footwear
Production in countries where Fair Wear is active:	Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Turkey
Production in other countries:	Pakistan, Philippines
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	97%
Benchmarking score	65
Category	Good

Summary:

In its first year of membership, Zeeman has met most of Fair Wear's performance requirements. A score of 65 points places the brand in the 'Good' category. Despite the pandemic, the brand monitored 97% of its suppliers through initiating audits or collecting external audit reports.

Corona Addendum:

The Covid pandemic hit Zeeman as it had to close shops in several countries due to lockdowns. However, when shops opened up and through online sales, the brand maintained a stable business. Therefore, the brand did not significantly change its product lines and the placement of orders.

As soon as the pandemic hit, Zeeman reached out to its suppliers and entered into a dialogue about the production process, order placement, and workers' working conditions. The brand made a public statement to confirm its commitment to its payment terms, placement of 100% of its planned annual orders as part of its long term contractual obligations and to future orders. In cases where there were postponements in production planning, the brand did not cancel orders in production or ones already produced. Although factory closures or delays of raw materials challenged the production process, Zeeman maintained and ensured that they placed 100% of the planned annual orders. At several suppliers, Zeeman reduced its production volume but these decisions were not COVID-19 related but were made for business reasons, such as due to delivery and quality issues.

Publicly available country risk information, its local network of agents, and a questionnaire informed the brand of the situation on a country and suppliers level. When the situation allowed, the brand initiated audits again to learn more about the impact of Covid-19 on suppliers. Suppliers raised the most critical issues, which were non-payment of wages and health and safety. Loss of jobs was often not presented as an issue. The brand prioritised the payment of wages to workers. For eight Indian suppliers and eight Bangladeshi suppliers, the brand made a plan to contribute to the unpaid wages due to factory closures based on its share of the production volume. It has planned to pay this contribution in 2021. In monitoring and remediating violations of workers' rights, the voices of workers are often not included. Fair Wear encourages Zeeman to collaborate with its suppliers to make these voices more heard.

We commend the brand for conducting a supplier survey that provided feedback on how Zeeman could improve its purchasing practices. Furthermore, Fair Wear recommends improving its risk assessment system, especially for new suppliers, to set up an evaluation system for suppliers and gain more insight into the link between prices and wages.

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.	86%	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: In 2020, Zeeman had garments produced at 152 production locations. About 50 factories produce 75% of its production volume, while the remaining 100 suppliers produce 25% of its production volume. At most of its production locations, Zeeman bought at least more than 10% of the suppliers' production capacity. As part of its strategy for financial sustainability of suppliers, Zeeman aims not to obtain more than 40% of the production capacity of a supplier.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to consolidate its supplier base where possible. It is advised to describe the process of consolidation in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff.

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.	63%	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.	0	4	0

Comment: In 2020, Zeeman took efforts to consolidate its supply chain. Purchasers, agents and CSR staff assessed relationships with suppliers in its tail-end. Relationships with several suppliers were stopped. According to Zeeman, further shortening the tail end is challenged by the fact that most suppliers produce unique products that cannot be produced by other suppliers. Next to that, the member also spreads orders to prevent becoming too dependent on a particular supplier or country.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to consolidate its supply base by limiting the number of production locations in its 'tail end'. To achieve this, Zeeman should determine whether production locations where they buy less than 2% of their FOB are of strategic relevance. Shortening the tail will reduce the social compliance risks the member is exposed to and will allow the member to improve working conditions in a more efficient and effective way. It is advised to describe the process of consolidation in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff.

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.	81%	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: Zeeman values long term relationships with its suppliers. With 94 suppliers representing 81% of Zeeman's production volume, Zeeman has relationships for more than 5 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: Zeeman has a system in place to ensure that production locations sign and return the questionnaire with the Fair Wear CoLP before first bulk orders are 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: Zeeman has a system in place to conduct human rights due diligence. Country risk analysis is conducted by collecting information through various sources, such as the CSR Risk Checker and Fair Wear Country studies. Furthermore, Zeeman's network of local agents play an important role in informing Zeeman of high risks. When it comes to specific risks at suppliers, Zeeman requires suppliers to be audited. Furthermore, the brand conducted a supplier survey that included questions about Zeeman's purchasing practices. The outcome of this survey led among others to the identification of risks caused by its purchasing practices, which Zeeman started to follow up internally.

Zeeman started relationships with 2 new suppliers. For new suppliers, Zeeman requires factories to send their most recent audit report, not older than 1 year. Where possible, the agent will visit the production location to discuss labour standards and subcontracting. The OHS checklist is not yet used in a standardized manner when visiting the supplier. Although country or sectoral specific risks are to some extent linked to new suppliers, Zeeman does not yet do this in a structured and systematic manner. The outcomes of the audit report are included in its decision-making process, where relationships cannot be started with factories with severe issues. Relationships with suppliers can only be started after approval of the purchasing and CSR department.

When the Covid-19 pandemic broke out, audits and visits were put on hold. Through its local network of agents, the Fair Wear Covid dossier and the CCC blog, Zeeman analysed and assessed risks per country. Besides a regular dialogue with its suppliers, the brand also sent a letter to all suppliers with a reconfirmation of its payment term and a questionnaire. The questionnaire contained questions related to OHS, payment of wages, dismissals and governmental support. Most suppliers reported that there were no dismissals. However, suppliers in India and Bangladesh reported that they made use of the legal possibility to pay below legal minimum wage for a specific period of time. Zeeman then started to address these issues with suppliers (see 1.9). Due to the closure of Chinese factories at the start of 2020, there was a high risk of non-payment of legal minimum wage at these factories. Chinese suppliers did not report issues in payment of the legal minimum wage in the supplier survey. However, Zeeman did not further assess and investigate this high risk. The brand resumed conducting audits when possible and conducted audits or collected audit reports at 45 suppliers between March and December 2020. Decisions on where to place audits were based on strategic relevance or expiry date of the audit report. A significant amount of these reports did not (fully) cover the impact of Covid-19 on the factory. Despite the brands' efforts to know more about the impact of Covid, the lack of information in the reports limited the brands' ability to get a deeper insight on this impact.

Requirement: Zeeman needs to assess the risks and impact of the closure of Chinese factories due to the Covid-19 pandemic on Chinese workers.

Recommendation: To improve its human rights due diligence system, Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to collect country, sector and product specific risks more systematically and link these risks to suppliers, especially new suppliers. Furthermore, Zeeman could make use of the Fair Wear OHS-sheet when visiting new suppliers. In assessing and mitigating risks due to Covid, Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to also include the likelihood and severity of risks of harm in prioritising where to conduct audits.

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: Zeeman regularly discusses outcomes of audit reports with factories, where progress is also tracked. However, the brand does not yet have an evaluation system in place with clear CSR indicators on the basis of which it can assess, rank and evaluate suppliers. The member should be commended for the fact that it had 171 suppliers (also beyond garment) fill out the supplier survey that included 56 questions concerning the purchasing practices of Zeeman and root causes of among others excessive overtime and non-payment of living wages. The conclusions and recommendations in this report provide ample basis for improving its purchasing practices and entering into a two-way dialogue and evaluation. One its own conclusions based on the survey was that an evaluation system should be implemented.

At the start of the Covid-pandemic, the brand made a public statement in which it emphasized that it would not alter its payment terms, guaranteed suppliers to purchase 100% of its planned annual orders as part of its long term contractual obligations and show commitment to future orders. Furthermore, Zeeman supported the ILO Call to Action and later on, also the Garment Industry Coalition statement on Covid. Zeeman entered into a dialogue with its agents and suppliers on the impact of Covid on the factory, workers and production planning. The brand also sent out a questionnaire on the basis of which it continued the dialogue on the effects on suppliers and workers. Zeeman did not cancel in-production or produced orders. However, as Zeeman also makes use of framework agreements that span multiple years, pre-planned orders were sometimes lowered or postponed. This was done in dialogue with suppliers. In the end, Zeeman purchased 100% of its planned annual orders over time from its suppliers unless there were regular changes in purchasing and placing orders due to business reasons.

The brand made an assessment of its tail end suppliers to see how to shorten its tail end and select suppliers with whom it could end relationships. As an outcome of the supplier survey, Zeeman adopted an internal policy on responsible exits of suppliers in December 2020.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Zeeman to develop an evaluation/grading system for suppliers where compliance with labour standards is a criterion for future order placement. Part of the system can be to create an incentive for rewarding suppliers for realised improvements in working conditions. Such a system can show whether and what information is missing per supplier and can include outcomes of audits, trainings and/or complaints.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.6 The member company's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	General or ad-hoc system.	Member company production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at production locations.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	2	4	0

Comment: In its buying-practices policy, Zeeman has described what type of responsible behaviour is expected from buyers when placing production, such as early order placement, limited sampling or not modifying contract terms.

Zeeman works with three types of products: Never out of stock-items (NOS) which are stored, basic items that directly go to the shops (multilot) and seasonal products. Forecasts for the NOS- and multilot-items are discussed nine months in advance and orders are placed six months in advance. Seasonal products are not forecasted but orders are placed six months in advance. Zeeman includes amounts in its contracts (5%-10%) that are 'open to buy', where orders can also be placed within a shorter timeframe than 6 months. Feedback from suppliers in the survey showed that lead times could be up to 2-3 months.

During the Covid-pandemic, changes to the production planning were made. Zeeman discussed new lead times and deliveries with its suppliers in case of raw materials that were not available, factory closure, or postponement from Zeeman to ensure production and delivery. Suppliers that had finished products could send them to Zeeman, which stored the products in its stock while Zeemans' shops were closed. In case of delays, Zeeman accepted to change the delivery dates. In some instances, products were sent by air freight.

Zeeman does not yet have insight in the production planning process of its factories, such as (available) production capacity, knowledge about labour minutes or peak seasons.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to further analyse the impact of 'open to buy'-orders and other lead times shorter than 6 months on the production capacity of its suppliers as these practices could be considered a risk to contribute to excessive overtime. It is advised to establish a system for sharing and updating forecasts for all its products. Furthermore, we recommend Zeeman to learn more about the standard minute per style and how the production of its products impacts the total production capacity of the factory.

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: Zeeman learned through the audit reports that excessive overtime is an issue for many of its suppliers. The brand is generally aware of the root causes but has not identified root causes per supplier. The brand identified peak seasons, bad planning from the factory and too high orders compared to available staff as potential root causes. The supplier survey also gave insight into how Zeemans' purchasing practices could pose a risk to causing excessive overtime. During the Covid-pandemic, Zeeman acknowledges that its production planning was done with more peaks and lows than usual.

In following up on audit reports, Zeeman discussed excessive overtime with its suppliers. Furthermore, the member has shared guidelines on its purchasing practices with its buyers to prevent contributing to excessive overtime. However, during the Covid-19 pandemic, Zeeman did not take extra efforts to assess to what extent its peak production was a risk of contributing to excessive overtime.

Recommendation: Fair Wear strongly recommends Zeeman to further analyse the impact of its own production planning on suppliers and take pro-active measures to prevent the risk of causing excessive overtime. Furthermore, Zeeman should discuss with each factory on the causes of excessive overtime and provide support to manage overtime, starting with their main suppliers and suppliers with the highest risks. If necessary, Zeeman could hire local experts to analyse root causes of excessive overtime in cooperation with the supplier. Fair Wear could recommend qualified persons upon request. Fair Wear recommends cooperating with other customers at the factory to increase leverage, when trying to mitigate excessive overtime hours.

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.	Insufficient	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.	0	4	0

Comment: Zeeman negotiates its prices through crude bargaining and does not yet have insight into the link between buying prices and wages at almost all its suppliers. For its NOS-items, the brand also makes use of tenders. The supplier survey identified that there was a risk of suppliers accepting prices below the cost price (and root causes thereof) and a risk of price pressure of Zeeman.

Zeeman has started a process to obtain more insight into the link between prices and wages. In 2019, a number of Bangladeshi suppliers participated in a Fair Wear training on open costing. The calculations that were done during this training were also used in a Fair Wear training for Zeeman's buyers. In all of its sourcing countries, the brand is aware of the legal minimum wage and also checks payment of legal minimum wage through audit reports. In 'the Buying Practices policy for buyers' (2020), it is stipulated that Zeeman buyers should request cost price calculations from suppliers.

During the Covid-19 pandemic, Zeeman did not discuss and incorporate extra costs that suppliers had to make due to Covid in its prices.

Requirement: Zeeman needs to demonstrate an understanding of the link between buying prices and wage levels, to ensure their pricing allows for the payment of the legal minimum wage. Furthermore, the member should engage in a dialogue with their suppliers about the additional costs due to COVID-19, the effect on wages, etc. and take steps to incorporate these additional costs into their prices.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to expand its knowledge of cost break downs of all product groups. A next step would be to calculate the labour minute costs of its products to be able to calculate the exact costs of labour and link this to their own buying prices. Fair Wear's labour minute value and product costing calculator also enables suppliers to include any COVID-19 related costs. Priority would be to make sure this level of transparency can be achieved with their suppliers. Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to make open cost calculations a standard procedure for their buyers and suppliers, for example in tenders.

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: As a response to the Covid-pandemic, Zeeman sent out a questionnaire to its suppliers containing questions related to payment of wages and loss of jobs. 16 Suppliers from Bangladesh and India responded by stating that they made use of the legal possibility to only pay 65% and 50% of the (legal minimum) wages. Pakistani suppliers also had the legal possibility to cut wages, but these suppliers informed Zeeman that they had paid their workers in full. These suppliers provided additional documentation such as pay slips. Although Chinese suppliers were closed for 2-4 weeks in February 2020, they did not report any wage issues to Zeeman, although two Fair Wear audit reports later on confirmed that workers were not paid during this time period. Furthermore, these audit reports also showed inconsistent records or non-payment of statutory holidays and overtime premiums. Zeeman followed up on these reports.

Zeeman followed up with these Bangladeshi and Indian suppliers, calculated and started to prepare to finance the wage gap, set off against Zeeman's share of the total production volume. (see 1.11)

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to check through audits whether Chinese and Pakistani supplier paid workers at least the legal minimum wage during factory closures. Zeeman could specifically ask the auditors to verify the time period that these factories were closed. Furthermore, Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to follow up on findings related to overtime premiums and statutory holidays as they are part of legal minimum wage law.

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: During the Covid-19 pandemic, Zeeman actively communicated through a statement on its website that it would not change its payment terms. Zeeman pays suppliers 14 days after shipment. Audit reports and an invoice check showed there were no late payments. Zeeman paid in full for its completed or in production orders. Zeeman did not renegotiate prices or request discounts during the pandemic.

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: The supplier survey included questions to identify potential root causes of non-payment of living wages. The survey identified several root causes, such as low margins and accepting orders below production costs. Suppliers accepted this to secure future orders, to prevent financial losses or due to mistakes in cost price calculations. The survey also comes with clear recommendations on how Zeeman can address these root causes and improve its own purchasing practices.

In Bangladesh, Zeeman had already ensured the participation of 13 factories in the Fair Wear seminar on open costing (2019) which was followed up in 2020 where suppliers provided more insight into their costs. As a response to the supplier survey, purchasers of Zeeman were also trained on the link between prices and wages. Zeeman set up internal guidelines on responsible purchasing practices.

With one factory in Pakistan, Zeeman collaborated with Fair Wear member Schijvens to increase wages towards a living wage. Calculations were made to ensure that its prices would be able to cover the target wage.

With 16 Bangladeshi and Indian suppliers, Zeeman calculated the impact on the wages of workers during factory closure due to Covid-19. Based on these calculations, Zeeman set up a plan to contribute to the payment of these unpaid wages by paying for its share of its production volume.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Zeeman to discuss with suppliers about different strategies to work towards higher wages. It is advised to start with suppliers where the member is responsible for a large percentage of production and has a long term business relationship. Furthermore, Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to take a similar approach to its Chinese factories as they did for its Indian and Bangladeshi suppliers for the period that factories were closed.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.12 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the member company (bonus indicator).	None	Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an member company's score.	Supplier information provided by member company.	N/A	2	0

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: In 2018, Zeeman had created a road map towards living wages which contains steps over a time period of 4 years and ends in 2021. This road map includes steps on mapping wages, gaining insight into the cost price of items and the launch of pilots. Zeeman has gathered information on minimum wages, actual wages and living wages at suppliers that represent 32% of its production volume. The analysis was done over 6 countries and 14 regions. Zeeman is preparing to update its living wage road map based on the lessons learned so far.

Furthermore, the brand joined Fair Wear member Schijvens to increase wages at one of its Pakistani suppliers. In establishing a living wage benchmark, employees were involved by indicating their cost of living and their estimates of a living wage. Several stakeholders were involved in the process. The results of the questionnaires were processed by The Sustainable Trade Initiative (IDH) and a benchmark was determined. True Price and Fair Wear Foundation also reviewed the methodology. The costs to pay for the target wage were incorporated in the prices of Zeeman and Schijvens. The raising of the wages was done at the start of 2020. The price and wage increase was maintained throughout the pandemic.

Recommendation: In determining what is needed and how wages should be increased, it is recommended to involve worker representation.

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.	7%	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 Pakistani supplier, Zeeman pays its share of the target wage, which was established through worker and stakeholder consultation.

Recommendation: Zeeman is encouraged to roll out their approach to other suppliers.

Purchasing Practices

Possible Points: 52

Earned Points: 30

2. Monitoring and Remediation

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
% of production volume where an audit took place.	97%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	0%	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.	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.
Requirement(s) for next performance check		
Total monitoring threshold:	97%	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: Zeeman has a CSR manager a CSR coordinator and CSR assistant who follow up on problems identified by the monitoring system.

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: Zeeman shares the audit reports and CAPs with factory management and ensures that improvement timelines are established in a timely manner. However, Zeeman does not yet actively share audit reports with worker representatives in the factories.

Recommendation: Before an audit takes place, Zeeman 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.	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: Zeeman actively follows up on audit reports. The brand prioritises the remediation of critical issues and issues at its biggest suppliers. The member keeps track of the progress factories make in one master file. When Zeeman buyers visit factories, they also discuss the CAP. Agents are actively involved in following up on audit reports and can support Zeeman in verifying whether issues were remediated through on-site visits and documents check. Workers and worker representatives are not yet actively included in the remediation of a CAP.

At the time of the Covid-pandemic, issues identified through the questionnaire were followed up, but not tracked in the same system as the CAPs, leading to two parallel systems. Covid-related issues that were identified in the audits that took place during the pandemic were also followed up, such as non-payment of wages which became part of its regular system of following up on audits.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to remediate issues by including worker representation. Furthermore, Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to improve its system to keep track of CAPs, also to facilitate sharing information with other staff within Zeeman. Issues identified through audits and the Covid-questionnaire should best be merged into one CAP to improve follow up.

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

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: Zeeman collects external audit reports. For example, Zeeman collected 30 audit reports of TUV Sud. These reports were assessed on quality and Zeeman followed up on corrective actions.

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.	3	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	Intermediate			3	6	-2
Other risks specific to the member's supply chain are addressed by its monitoring system	Intermediate			3	6	-2

Comment: Bangladesh:

Zeeman signed the Bangladesh Accord and the Transition Accord. The brand could show that most of its factories had implemented safety measures and over 90% of the issues were remediated. Zeeman actively collaborates with other brands including other Fair Wear members. Gender-Based Violence remains a risk at its Bangladeshi suppliers. At one supplier, one worker complained to Fair Wear's complaints hotline about harassment (see 3.4). Zeeman is currently enrolling factories in the Fair Wear WEP Violence and Harassment Programme.

Turkey:

Zeeman has a policy in place that allows for contracting Syrian refugees in Turkish factories. They need to be employed in line with legal standards. The brand discussed this policy with its suppliers. Factories participated in a Fair Wear seminar on Syrian refugees in 2019. They have been audited by TUV and BSCI, while one factory was audited by Fair Wear. The audit reports did not identify the employment of Syrian refugees. Zeeman checks for subcontracting through its local agents and through other measures, such as through a comparison of product design and in-house services of factories. The audit reports of TUV and BSCI often do not check and contain information on subcontractors. No subcontractors have been identified.

COVID-19:

As soon as the situation allowed, the brand started to conduct audits. In combination with information collected through the supplier questionnaire, the brand followed up on issues related to wages. The questionnaire identified several factories that had a loss of jobs. In case of non-payment of severance pay, the brand followed up. Through a steady order flow, the brand aimed to ensure a minimal loss of jobs. The brand did not check whether workers were included in Covid-related measures that were taken by factory management. The brand had included questions related to Occupational Health and Safety in its supplier questionnaire, which it also followed up. Local agents were also involved in following up. However, the brand did not use the Fair Wear OHS sheet or did not actively keep track of governmental measures and whether factories were following governmental regulations. By conducting audits and collecting audit reports, the brand gained a better understanding of the impact of Covid on 45 factories, although these reports do not always include findings on the impact of the pandemic, especially at the start of the pandemic. Zeeman actively shared a video from one of its Burmese suppliers with other factories which showed how the factory had taken OHS measures.

Other:

Zeeman has a policy in place for abrasive blasting. From 2011-2013, Zeeman actively engaged its suppliers to check for sandblasting. Suppliers switched to other forms such as brushing or hand sanding. The brand reported on sandblasting in several sustainability reports, 2018 being the most recent one. Therefore, this risk is no longer considered a high risk that needed active remediation in 2020 and therefore this part of the indicator is rated N/A.

The brand also started to address other high risks that need remediation such as excessive overtime in China and Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in Pakistan. In Pakistan, the brand organized two seminars to inform factory management about the risk of GBV. In India, the brand participates in a project of Goodweave /ETI to prevent, identify and remediate child labour in spinning mills.

Recommendation: The member is encouraged to support its suppliers with implementing the OHS COVID-19 measures. Furthermore, Fair Wear recommends to ensure enrolment of all its Bangladeshi suppliers in the WEP VHP programme. Also, Fair Wear recommends to actively check non-Fair Wear audit reports on the risk of subcontracting in Turkey and take additional measures if subcontracting cannot be ruled out based on the report.

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: Zeeman shares suppliers with several Fair Wear members. Zeeman showed to be open for active collaboration with other Fair Wear members to address and resolve risks and issues at suppliers.

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.	No production in low-risk countries	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.	N/A	2	0

Member undertakes additional activities to monitor suppliers.: Yes (1)

Comment: The brand does not source from production locations in low-risk countries.

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

Comment: Zeeman is in its first year of membership and therefore, this indicator does not apply.

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: Zeeman sells external brands through intermediaries. Although Zeeman has gathered information on the sourcing practices and production countries of these brands, the member has not yet send the questionnaire to these brands.

Recommendation: Fair Wear members are encouraged to send the Fair Wear questionnaire for external production to the brand(s) it resells.

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).	59%	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.	2	3	0

Comment: Zeeman sources products from 9 external brands of which 4 are a member of Fair Wear or FLA. These 4 brands represent 59% of its external sales volume.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Zeeman to progress towards an external supplier base that is covered by either Fair Wear or other credible initiatives.

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: 29

Earned Points: 21

3. Complaints Handling

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
Number of worker complaints received since last check.	2	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.	2	
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check.	2	

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: The CSR manager and the CSR coordinator are responsible for following up on complaints arising from the Fair Wear complaints system.

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: Zeeman ensures that the Fair Wear CoLP is posted at its suppliers. Agents are asked to check whether the worker information sheet is posted when they visit the factory. Furthermore, all factories are required to send in photographic evidence of posted worker information sheets.

However, in two Fair Wear audits, it was reported that the worker information sheet was not posted. This was immediately corrected by Zeeman. In some cases, photographic evidence did not show whether the sheet was posted in an area that is safe and easily accessible to workers.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to ensure that photographic evidence sufficiently shows that the worker information sheet is posted in an area that is safe and easily accessible to workers.

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.	15%	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: Awareness on worker rights was raised at five suppliers. At two Bangladeshi suppliers training on violence and harassment was held, which also informed workers about their rights. Zeeman organized a WEP Basic at one Chinese factory, while two other members had already trained workers at a Pakistani and Bangladeshi supplier on workers rights.

Zeeman did not actively share the worker videos that were made available during the Covid-19 pandemic. Besides the mentioned training, Zeeman did not take extra efforts to inform workers about their rights during the pandemic.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to actively raise awareness about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and Fair Wear complaint helpline among a larger portion of its suppliers. Zeeman should ensure good quality systematic training of workers and management on these topics. To this end, Zeeman can either use Fair Wear's WEP Basic module, or implement training related to the Fair Wear CoLP and complaint helpline through third-party training providers or brand staff. 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	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.	3	6	-2

Comment: In 2020, Zeeman received two complaints. In the first complaint, the worker was fired after she had complained to management about being verbally and physically harassed after she had made an error. Management denied the allegations, also after they investigated the complaint. A meeting between the factory, Fair Wear, Zeeman and the complainant was held to come to a solution. Unfortunately, no satisfactory outcome was found and the worker remained dismissed. The worker received 3 months gross salary and 3 months basic wage. The brand helped her to find a new job at a different supplier of Zeeman. Furthermore, the brand agreed with the factory to participate in the Fair Wear WEP Violence and Harassment Programme in 2021. Zeeman is evaluating the relationship with this factory.

In another complaint, a worker informed Zeeman that the worker representatives in the factory were not chosen freely. After a few months, the factory changed management. The complainant informed Fair Wear that the new management showed willingness towards social dialogue and that the representatives took the issues of workers at heart.

In both complaints, Zeeman cooperated in line with the Fair Wear Complaints Policy. No further preventive steps were taken.

Recommendation: It is recommended to uncover the root causes of complaints and prevent them from recurring. When appropriate, the investigation includes incidents at other factories.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers.	Active cooperation	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.	2	2	0

Comment: Zeeman actively collaborated with another Fair Wear member to resolve a complaint in one of its shared factories.

Complaints Handling

Possible Points: 17

Earned Points: 12

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: Zeeman made its staff aware of Fair Wear membership through communication on its intranet, sustainability report and an internal poster. Staff in its stores have been made aware of Fair Wear membership, but the brand recognises that the brand needs to take further steps to increase their knowledge on what membership entails.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to actively communicate about Fair Wear membership in its stores and to train its store staff on how to respond to questions from consumers.

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: The CSR-department holds regular meetings with the Purchasing Director. Before visits to suppliers, purchasing staff are informed of the latest status of the CAPs. Fair Wear trained the purchasing staff on the relationship between wages and prices in Zeemans' first year of membership.

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: Spread over five countries, Zeeman makes use of seven agents. Besides having informed these agents of Fair Wear membership, these agents are also actively involved in risk assessment, collecting audit reports, discussing labour standards with suppliers and verification of improvements that are made by suppliers.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to further strengthen the role of agents in following up on issues identified by the monitoring system and to actively train its agents on monitoring and remediating gender-related problems.

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.	6%	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.	1	6	0

Comment: At three suppliers of Zeeman, another Fair Wear member had already initiated training on harassment and violence.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends 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 and structural change to improve working conditions. To this end, Zeeman can make use of Fair Wear's WEP Communication or Violence and Harassment Prevention modules or implement advanced training through external training providers or brand staff. 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
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

Comment: As the member did not organize training, this indicator is rated n/a.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends to brand to reach out to the members that had already trained suppliers on how to collectively follow up on the training.

Training and Capacity Building

Possible Points: 11

Earned Points: 6

Additional comments on Training and Capacity Building :

As part of its ETI-membership, Zeeman participates in their Tamil Nadu multi-stakeholder (TNMS) programme. Female workers from 16 spinning mills in India are trained on their labour rights. As this concerns spinning mills which falls outside the scope of Fair Wear membership, these trainings are not included in indicator 4.4, but Fair Wear would like to commend Zeeman for its work deeper in the supply chain.

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: Zeeman has a policy in place that allows for announced subcontracting which is also described in its responsible purchasing practices policy. To assess its environmental impact, the brand has developed a road map to identify printing and embroidery subcontractors. Zeeman assesses the risk of subcontracting by analysing its products and checking with suppliers whether all needed processes can take place in-house. Furthermore, the brand uses audit reports to identify subcontracting. However, the brand recognizes that the external audit reports often do not sufficiently provide information on subcontracting. Local agents and QC-staff support Zeeman in identifying subcontractors through in-line inspections.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Zeeman to continue identifying subcontractors. Fair Wear recommends to expand its risk assessment by including a comparison of required production capacity to available production capacity of a supplier when its orders are produced. Furthermore, Zeeman could include checking for subcontracting more actively for external audit reports.

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: The management team, CSR-staff, agents and purchasers actively share information about risks and issues at suppliers with each other. However, purchasing staff does not have direct access to CAPs, but are informed of the latest status of a CAP before an on-site visit.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to ensure that agents and purchasers have direct and easy access to all documents related to labour standards for suppliers that they are responsible for.

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	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: Zeeman actively communicates about its efforts to improve working conditions for garment workers. The brand also made public statements during the Corona-crisis and about the situation of Uyghur workers in China. Zeeman communicates about Fair Wear in line with the Fair Wear Communications policy.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities.	Supplier list is disclosed to the public.	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.	2	2	0

Comment: This is Zeeman's first Brand Performance Check report. The brand disclosed all of its suppliers (100%) on our website. The brand signed the Transparency pledge in 2019 and registered its suppliers in the Open Apparel Registry.

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: Zeeman sent its social report to Fair Wear and published it online.

Transparency

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 6

7. Evaluation

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
7.1 Systemic annual evaluation of FWF membership is conducted with involvement of top management.	Yes	An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that Fair Wear policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Top management of Zeeman, including the CEO are highly involved in all matters related to Fair Wear membership. The management team meets every six weeks to discuss CSR-related progress, issues and opportunities.

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

Comment: As this is Zeeman's first Performance Check, this indicator is not applicable.

Evaluation

Possible Points: 2

Earned Points: 2

Recommendations to Fair Wear

Zeeman recommends Fair Wear to:

- become active in Pakistan
- reassess costs for membership and additional costs to lower the costs.
- improve communication between Fair Wear local staff and agents on the one hand, and CSR and Fair Wear HQ staff on the other.
- To bring large garment brands on-board to increase leverage at factories to create change.

Scoring Overview

Category	Earned	Possible
Purchasing Practices	30	52
Monitoring and Remediation	21	29
Complaints Handling	12	17
Training and Capacity Building	6	11
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	6	6
Evaluation	2	2
Totals:	81	124

Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

65

Performance Benchmarking Category

Good

Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

08-04-2021

Conducted by:

Wilco van Bokhorst

Interviews with:

Arnoud van Vliet- CSR & Quality Manager

Kelly Kristelijn - CSR & Quality Officer

Bo Duijvestijn - CSR & Quality Assistant

Hans van Krieken, Financial manager

Caroline van Turennot, Marketing & E-commerce Director

Erica Roolvink, Purchasing Director