Brand Performance Check

Zeeman textielSupers BV

Publication date: December 2025

This report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2024 to 31-12-2024

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.

Scoring overview

Total score: 116
Possible score: 202
Benchmarking Score: 57
Performance Benchmarking Category: Good



Foundational system's criteria	Sourcing strategy	Identifying continuous human rights risks	Responsible purchasing practices	Quality and coherence of prevention and remediation system	Improvement and prevention	Communication, transparency and evaluation
100%	76%	53%	62%	53%	50%	55%

Summary:

Zeeman textielSupers BV (Zeeman) has met most of Fair Wear's performance requirements. With a total benchmarking score of 57, the member is placed in the Good category. In 2024, the member brand has improved its HRDD policy, trained all its internal staff about Fair Wear membership and disclosed 100% of its production locations in line with Fair Wear's transparency policy.

Zeeman's sourcing strategy focuses on stability and long-term relationships, 91% of its FOB comes from suppliers of over five years, though formal long-term contracts are still missing. Risk scoping covers all risk factores but lacks a gender lens and consistent inclusion of sector and model risks. The brand collects human rights data before onboarding suppliers and ensures early awareness of Fair Wear's Code and grievance mechanisms. Human rights risk assessment remains ad hoc, with partial integration of gender and freedom of association risks. Purchasing practices generally support reasonable working hours, but supplier evaluation based on human rights performance is not yet in place. Zeeman understands wage components but has not yet linked prices to actual wage levels. Zeeman sources from 10 factories in Bangladesh (17.4% of FOB). All are covered by the Ready Made Garment (RMG) Sustainability Council (RSC), and the company has signed the International Accord, in line with Fair Wear's enhanced policy.

Action plans exist for roughly one-third of production volume, including Bangladesh and Pakistan. Gender and freedom of association considerations are included inconsistently. Zeeman cooperates with other Fair Wear members and Accord signatories but needs to strengthen prevention programmes and timely remediation of wage non-compliance. The brand's living wage programme remains a key strength: Zeeman pays its share of the living wage estimate at ten factories (26% of FOB) and aims to reach 50% coverage by 2027. The member brand contributes to living wages through a structural bonus.

Zeeman communicates transparently about its Fair Wear membership and submitted its social report. Factory-level reporting and follow-up on previous requirements, especially wage-pricing linkage and freedom of association monitoring, are still pending. Zeeman maintains strong sourcing stability and notable progress on living wages. Main challenges remain in systematic risk assessment, integration of gender and freedom of association lenses, and consistent remediation of wage issues.

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.

Company Profile Zeeman textielSupers BV

Member company information

Member since: 1 Oct 2019
Product types: Apparel, Accessories, Home textiles and Footwear
Percentage of turnover of external brands resold 0%
Member of other MSI's/Organisations GOTS, BCI (Better Cotton Initiative), International Accord - Bangladesh, International Accord - Pakistan and EIS pilot bangladesh
Number of grievances received last financial year 26

Basic requirements

Definitive production location data has been submitted for the financial year under review? Yes
Projected production location data have been submitted for the current financial year? Yes
Membership fee has been paid? Yes

Production countries, including number of production locations and total production volume.

Production Country	Number of production locations	Percentage of production volume
China	66	48.24%
Bangladesh	10	17.39%
Pakistan	17	14.27%
Türkiye	8	9.85%
India	16	9.4%
Philippines	1	0.82%

Layer 1 Foundational system's criteria

Possible Points: 8
Earned Points: 8

1.1 Member company has a publicly shared Human Rights Due Diligence policy that has been adopted by top management.: Yes

Comment: Zeeman has a solid Human Rights Due Diligence policy in place.

1.2 All member company staff are made aware of Fair Wear's membership requirements, in particular the Fair Wear's HRDD policy and Fair Wear's Code of Labour Practices.: Yes

1.3 All staff who have direct contact with suppliers are trained to support the implementation of Fair Wear requirements, in particular the Fair Wear's HRDD policy and Fair Wear's Code of Labour Practices.: Yes

1.4 A specific staff person(s) is designated to follow up on problems identified by the monitoring system, including grievance handling. The staff person(s) must have the necessary competence, knowledge, experience, and resources.: Yes

1.5 Member company has a system in place to identify all production locations, including a policy for unauthorised subcontracting.: Yes

1.6 Member company discloses internally through Fair Wear's information management system, in line with Fair Wear's Transparency Policy.: Yes

Comment: Zeeman discloses 100% of production locations internally through Fair Wear's information management system.

1.7 Member company discloses externally on Fair Wear's transparency portal, in line with Fair Wear's Transparency Policy.: Yes

Comment: Zeeman discloses 100% of production locations internally through Fair Wear's information management system.

1.8 Member complies with the basic requirements of Fair Wear's communication policy.: Yes

Layer 2 Human rights due diligence, including sourcing strategy and responsible purchasing practices.

Possible Points: 90
Earned Points: 58

Indicators on Sourcing strategy

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.1 Member company's sourcing strategy is focused on increasing influence to meaningfully and effectively improve working conditions.	Advanced	Fair Wear expects members to adjust their sourcing strategy to increase their influence over working conditions. Members should aim to keep the number of production locations at a level that allows for the effective implementation of responsible business practices.	Strategy document; consolidation plans, examples of implementation.	6	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has a sourcing strategy addressing influencing labour conditions. The member company has 118 active suppliers. 82% of the production volume comes from suppliers where the brand has at least 10% leverage. 18% of the production volume comes from suppliers where Zeeman buys less than 2% of its total FOB. Zeeman's sourcing strategy is focused on maintaining the size of the supply chain without increasing the number of factories used. It prioritises forging long-term commitments with factories, emphasising equal partnership. The member brand also focuses on collaboration with other brands to strengthen leverage and drive joint improvements at shared suppliers.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.2 Member company's sourcing strategy is focused on building long-term relationships.	Intermediate	Stable business relationships underpin the implementation of the Code of Labour Practices and give factories a reason to invest in improving working conditions.	Strategy documents; % of FOB from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for more than five years; Examples of contracts outlining a commitment to long-term relationship; Evidence of shared forecasting.	4	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has a sourcing strategy that focuses on maintaining long-term relationships. 91% of the member's total FOB volume comes from suppliers with whom Zeeman has a business relationship for at least five years. Zeeman maintains long-term partnerships with its suppliers, renewing commitments each season without formal documentation. The member does not commit to long-term contracts yet. However, for suppliers that are part of its living wage programme, it has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). An MoU provides a shared framework for long-term collaboration and mutual understanding, but it is not legally binding.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to commit to long-term contracts. Zeeman is advised to embed long-term contracts in its sourcing strategy.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.3 Member company conducts a risk scoping exercise as part of its sourcing strategy.	Basic	Human rights due diligence, according to the OECD guidelines, requires companies to undertake a scoping exercise to identify and mitigate potential human rights risks in supply chains of potential business partners.	HRDD policy; Sourcing strategy linked to results of scoping exercise; HRDD processes, including specific responsibilities of different departments; Use of country studies; Analysis of business and sourcing model risks; Use of licensees and/or design collaborations.	2	6	-2

Comment: Zeeman conducts risk scoping and includes the following risk factors: country, sector, business model, sourcing model, and product level, but they are not consistently included. The risk scoping, however, misses a gender lens, and the risks of sexual harassment and gender-based violence are not systematically included. The brand uses the Fair Wear Member Hub for most of its risk scoping, but for countries where Fair Wear is not active, it applies its own 'Country Risk Declaration Form'. Zeeman conducts risk scoping at the sourcing country level, covering all eight labour standards. Risk analysis is informed by tools such as the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Risk Checker and Fair Wear country studies. In addition, the brand's network of local intermediaries plays an important role in identifying high-risk issues. While risks are prioritised by the brand, it has not yet integrated liability and severity into its risk overview. In its risk scoping, the member company has assessed the impact and prevalence of the risks correctly for most countries.

Zeeman sources from Bangladesh, which accounts for a significant share of its total FOB. The member company is a signatory to the International Accord for Health and Safety in the Textile and Garment Industry and thereby addresses the high risks of occupational health and safety in this country and at its suppliers.

It has identified the absence of Freedom of Association in several sourcing countries such as China, Pakistan and Turkiye as a high risk. The risk scoping also highlights the risks of discrimination and sexual harassment at the workplace, particularly affecting women in India and Bangladesh. Furthermore, Zeeman has assessed the risk of forced labour in China, particularly linked to cotton production, and monitors the origin of its cotton and the availability of certified or sustainable alternatives.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to include all risk factors in its risk scoping.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.4 Member company engages in dialogue with factory management about Fair Wear membership requirements before finalising the first purchase order.	Advanced	Sourcing dialogues aim to increase transparency between the member and the potential supplier, which can benefit improvements efforts going forward.	Process outline to select new factories; Material used in sourcing dialogue; Documents for sharing commitment towards social compliance; Meeting reports; On-site visits; Reviews of suppliers' policies.	4	4	0

Comment: It is the standard process for Zeeman to inform new suppliers about its HRDD policy and Fair Wear membership by sending an information package, including the Fair Wear questionnaire, onboarding checklist, and relevant policy documents. This process has been followed for all three new suppliers added in 2024.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.5 Member company collects the necessary human rights information to inform sourcing decisions before finalising the first purchase order.	Intermediate	Human rights due diligence processes are necessary to identify and mitigate potential human rights risks in supply chains. Specific risks per factory need to be considered as part of the decision to start cooperation and/or place purchasing orders.	Questionnaire with CoLP, reviewing and collecting existing external information, evidence of investigating operational-level grievance system, union and independent worker committee presence, collective bargaining agreements, engaging in conversations with other customers and other stakeholders, including workers.	4	6	0

Comment: Zeeman collects human rights information of potential new suppliers by using existing audit reports, risk declaration forms, and information provided by buyers, agents, and stakeholders. The member company also requires suppliers to sign the Code of Labour Practices (CoLP), in which all elements are discussed, with forced labour and child labour being treated as zero tolerance issues. In addition, Zeeman checks whether suppliers have a functioning grievance mechanism in place and whether workers are free to form or join a trade union. Freedom of Association and social dialogue are specifically included in the risk declaration form. When onboarding new suppliers, the brand also verifies available country- or sector-specific resources, such as the remediation status on the RSC website for Bangladeshi suppliers. Worker representation is also checked, and suppliers are asked to provide evidence of activity, such as proof of meetings. Zeeman does not systematically exclude suppliers based on findings but considers the information collected as part of a broader assessment. The general approach is that suppliers can improve over time, and the member company provides guidance on how to move forward where needed. This is different from what was noted in the previous Brand Performance Check. This process was applied to the three suppliers that were added in the previous year.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.6 Member actively ensures awareness of the Fair Wear CoLP, the grievance mechanism, and social dialogue mechanisms within the first year of starting business.	Advanced	This indicator focuses on the preliminary mitigation of risks by actively raising awareness about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and complaints helpline. Discussing Fair Wear's CoLP with management and workers is a key step towards ensuring sustainable improvements in working conditions and developing social dialogue at the supplier level.	Evidence of social dialogue awareness raised through earlier training/onboarding programmes, onboarding materials, information sessions on the factory grievance system and complaints helpline, use of Fair Wear factory guide, awareness-raising videos, and the CoLP.	6	6	0

Comment: In 2024, Zeeman has added three new suppliers. Zeeman has shared information about Fair Wear's CoLP and the grievance mechanism within the first year of doing business. The Worker Information Sheet (WIS) has been posted at all its newly added suppliers. Zeeman ensures that factories receive information about the Code of Labour Practices (CoLP), complaints helpline, and social dialogue mechanisms in the form of an onboarding package both before they start doing business together and after the first order is completed. Zeeman organised onboarding sessions for workers and the management of new suppliers. The member organised these sessions to raise awareness about the Fair Wear CoLP and the grievance mechanism for two out of three new suppliers. The remaining supplier is in a country where Fair Wear is not active and the brand is looking to create an onboarding training with its audit and training partner in Pakistan.

Indicators on Identifying continuous human rights risks

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.7 Member company has a system to continuously assess human rights risks in its production locations.	Basic	Members are expected to regularly evaluate risk in a systematic manner. The system used to identify human rights risks determines the accuracy of the risks identified and, as such, the possibilities for mitigation and remediation.	Use of risk policies, country studies, audit reports, other sources used, how often information is updated.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has an ad hoc approach to identifying human rights risks in its production locations. It identifies risks by collecting information directly from factories and setting up systems at the production level. The brand applies a variety of monitoring instruments, including Fair Wear factory assessments, third-party audits, generic health and safety checks, buying-preparation meetings. In addition, Zeeman conducts online follow-up after Fair Wear factory assessments and gathers input from agents and quality controllers. The member company has recently started to use the Fair Wear Member Hub for factory-level risk assessments, but it has not yet been able to assess all of its factories.

Zeeman works with local offices together in Bangladesh, Pakistan, India, China and Turkiye. The local offices have the function of an agent, as the local staff takes over the responsibility of order placements, quality control, follow up on Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings, grievances and support the brand with frequent factory visits. These offices are an important contact point to all its factories in several countries, and the Zeeman CSR is in frequent contact with the local staff from those offices. Zeeman has a system to identify risks at suppliers based in Bangladesh by evaluating factory risk assessments, checking the results of the RSC factory assessments and the level of improvements and factory visits. The member is a signatory of the International Accord.

While the member brand has several monitoring tools in place, it has not sufficiently assessed the human rights risks in production locations in country, where Fair Wear has a heightened monitoring policy.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to approach the assessment of risk in its production locations systematically, identifying the appropriate tool and frequency depending on the outcome of the risk scoping and risk assessment.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.8 Member company's human rights due diligence process includes an assessment of freedom of association (FoA).	Intermediate	Freedom of association and collective bargaining are 'enabling rights.' When these rights are respected, they pave the way for garment workers and their employers to address and implement the other standards in Fair Wear's Code of Labour Practices - often without brand intervention.	Use of supplier questionnaire to inform decision-making, collected country information, and analyses.	4	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has started to map the risks to Freedom of Association (FoA) and collective bargaining (CB) in all its sourcing countries and can explain the main risks per country, including those that affect women workers. The risks identified include limited freedom of association in high-risk sourcing countries such as India, Türkiye, and Pakistan, where legal restrictions, weak enforcement, and anti-union practices are common. In some factories, there are no functional social dialogue mechanisms, and representation of workers is not guaranteed.

The member company assesses FoA and CB rights through its supplier management system on factory level, by collecting risk information in dedicated forms, and by reviewing audit outcomes. While it has started documenting risks at country level, implementation at the factory level is still in progress. The brand acknowledges that the involvement of women workers in social dialogue is limited and that a gender perspective is often missing. Zeeman identified that women face additional barriers in representation and leadership roles, which makes it more difficult for them to exercise their rights to FoA and CB.

Engagement with trade unions and worker representatives at supplier level is still under development, and the inclusion of gender-specific FoA risks in assessments and remediation efforts has not yet been fully implemented.

Recommendation: Zeeman is recommended to use Tool 2: Supplier Questionnaire from Fair Wear's FoA Guide to assess and understand the risk regarding violation of FoA at its suppliers.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.9 Member company includes a gender analysis throughout its human rights risk identification, to foster a better understanding of gendered implications.	Basic	Investing in gender equality creates a ripple effect of positive societal outcomes. Members must apply gender analyses to their supply chain to better address inequalities, violence, and harassment.	Evidence of use of the gender mapping tools and knowledge of country-specific fact sheets.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has started to include gender in its human rights risk identification in its risk scoping on country level and risk assessment on factory level. The member company could show it understands the basic gender risks for its sourcing countries, and for instance, identified discrimination in hiring and promotion practices, unequal pay, and limited opportunities for women to participate in social dialogue as important risks prevalent in Pakistan. According to its gender risk analysis, workers and job candidates face systemic discrimination, which can create long-term disadvantages such as missed career opportunities or lower pay. In addition, Zeeman has noted that women are frequently disadvantaged in hiring decisions, have fewer opportunities for promotions or bonuses, and often earn less than men. The member brand has yet to collect gender risks for each labour standard.

While wage discrimination is less common in some contexts, unequal access to opportunities and advancement remains widespread. This analysis was based on the brand's own experience, information from Fair Wear's Member Hub and external information sources, including the International Accord.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends the member to collect country-level gender risks for each Code of Labour Practices. Fair Wear recommends the member to start analysing the gender data collected at country and factory levels and connect them. Fair Wear's gender instruments, especially the new Gender-Responsive Human Rights Due Diligence (GRHRDD) guidelines, can be helpful.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.10 Member company considers a production location's human rights performance in its purchasing decisions.	Insufficient	Systematic evaluation is part of continuous human rights monitoring. A systematic approach to evaluating production location performance is necessary to integrate social compliance into normal business processes and to support good decision-making.	Supplier evaluation format, meeting notes on supplier evaluation shared with the factory, processes outlining purchasing decisions, link to responsible exit strategy.	0	4	0

Comment: Zeeman does not evaluate its suppliers' human rights performance. Based on last year's information, the supplier scorecard has not yet been updated to include human rights performance. The brand is still in the process of developing this. In the meantime, information on suppliers' human rights performance is actively shared with buyers, who then communicate it back to the suppliers. The brand systematically integrates supplier performance on human rights into its purchasing decisions, but has yet to formalise the process.

Requirement: Zeeman needs to evaluate the human rights performance of its suppliers systematically.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Zeeman to develop a 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.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.11 Member company prevents and responds to unauthorised or unknown production and/or subcontracting.	Advanced	Subcontracting can decrease transparency in the supply chain and has been demonstrated to increase the risk of human rights violations. Therefore, when operating in higher-risk contexts where it is likely subcontracting occurs, the member company should increase due diligence measures to mitigate these risks.	Production location data provided to Fair Wear, financial records from the previous financial year, evidence of member systems and efforts to identify all production locations (e.g., interviews with factory managers, factory audit data, web shop and catalogue products, etc.), licensee contracts and agreements with design collaborators.	4	4	0

Comment: Zeeman has a policy that allows for announced subcontracting, described in its responsible purchasing practices policy. To assess its environmental impact, the brand has developed a roadmap to identify printing and embroidery subcontractors. Additionally, as part of the material template, Zeeman maintains an overview of all material production locations, covering its entire supply chain. Zeeman uses the outcomes of its human rights monitoring to respond to unauthorised subcontracting. There are no findings about unauthorised subcontracting in Fair Wear factory assessements. Transparency about production locations and capacity planning was a key topic in China. Despite efforts to collect information about all production locations, Zeeman sometimes discovers a production location only after production has started. The company assesses the risk of subcontracting by analysing its products and verifying with suppliers whether all necessary processes can be conducted in-house. Furthermore, Zeeman uses audit reports to identify instances of subcontracting and uses it local offices for additional monitoring.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.12 Member company extends its due diligence approach to homeworkers.	Advanced	Homeworkers should be viewed as an intrinsic part of the workforce, entitled to receive equal treatment and have equal access to the same labour rights, and therefore should be formalised to achieve good employment terms and conditions.	Supplier policies, evidence of supplier and/or intermediaries' terms of employment, wage-slips from homeworkers.	4	4	0

Comment: Zeeman has investigated the prevalence of homework in its sourcing countries and used this information to update its risk declaration form for India. The brand concluded that the risk of homeworkers would be most prevalent in India. Due to the nature of its products, Zeeman states that there is a very low risk of its suppliers using homeworkers. The brand also states that it is highly unlikely for goods to leave the factory, as its Quality Control team from its local offices frequently visits and monitors the factories. Monitoring the risk of homeworkers is an integral part of the brand's due diligence efforts.

Indicators on Responsible purchasing practices

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.13 Member company's written contracts with suppliers support the implementation of Fair Wear's Code of Labour Practices and human rights due diligence, emphasising fair payment terms.	Intermediate	Written, binding agreements between brands and suppliers, which support the Fair Wears CoLP and human rights due diligence, are crucial to ensuring fairness in implementing decent work across the supply chain.	Suppliers' codes of conduct, contracts, agreements, purchasing terms and conditions, or supplier manuals.	2	4	0

Comment: Zeeman uses agreements in the form of purchase orders, supplier manuals, sustainability manuals, purchasing conditions, and claim procedures that stipulate terms of payment, liability, and penalties instead of formal contracts with its suppliers. The payment terms are very reasonable, with payments made when goods are delivered to the port on Free Carrier (FCA) conditions. Penalties are charged only if Zeeman can prove that a delivery delay or damage is the supplier's fault. Additionally, Zeeman has a two-way code of conduct and purchase orders that include general terms and conditions, such as pricing terms and shared responsibilities for implementing the Code of Labour Practices (CoLP). Fair payment terms are outlined, with payment made within 14 days after shipment. Zeeman ensures clear purchase orders are provided on time without modifications.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends the member to enrol in the learning module 'Introduction to responsible contracting in the supply chain'.
Fair Wear strongly recommends Zeeman to include the shared responsibility of CoLP implementation in its contracts, including fair payment terms.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.14 Member company has formally integrated responsible business practices and possible impacts on human rights violations in its decision-making processes.	Advanced	Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), purchasing, and other staff that interact with suppliers must be able to share information to establish a coherent and effective strategy for improvements. This indicator examines how this policy and Fair Wear membership requirements are embedded within the member company.	Internal information systems, status Corrective Action Plans, sourcing score- cards, KPIs listed for different departments that support CSR efforts, reports from meetings from purchasing and/or CSR staff, and a systematic manner of storing information.	6	6	0

Comment: Zeeman shares relevant CSR information with other departments. For example, assistants in the buying team receive updates to ensure that suppliers are aware of requirements. There is an active interchange of information between CSR and other departments to enable coherent and responsible business practices. Travel schedules are shared with CSR, as well as the outcomes of factory visits, research on management systems, audit findings, and living wage topics. The member includes responsible business practices in job role competencies. For instance, CSR-related responsibilities are included in the job descriptions of staff in sourcing and buying teams. In addition, departments such as sourcing, purchasing, and design work with KPIs that support responsible sourcing and pricing strategies.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.15 Member company's purchasing practices support reasonable working hours.	Intermediate	Members' purchasing practices can significantly impact the levels of excessive overtime at factories.	Proof that planning systems have been shared with production locations, examples of production capacity knowledge that is integrated into planning, timely approval of samples, and proof that management oversight is in place to prevent late production changes.	4	6	0

Comment: Zeeman's purchasing practices support reasonable working hours through planning, forecasting, and responsible behaviour expectations outlined in its two-way code of conduct. This code specifies that buyers should engage in early order placement, limit sampling, and avoid modifying contract terms. Zeeman works with three product types: Never Out of Stock (NOS) items, basic items (multilot) that go directly to shops, and seasonal products.

Forecasts for NOS and multilot items are discussed nine months in advance, with orders placed six months ahead. For multilot products, sizes are connected across two or more designs, and replenishment is based on shop sales data. A demand planner monitors replenishment across a wide product range, including lingerie, t-shirts, and towels, with replenishment covering more than 50 articles. Order volumes may fluctuate depending on sales, but administrative processes and supplier agreements are structured to avoid late or last-minute changes. Some factories also prepare stock in advance, with production slots agreed upon based on lead times and product type. While last-minute adjustments are sometimes possible, suppliers are always involved in these decisions to ensure feasibility.

Seasonal products are not forecasted but are also ordered six months in advance. Capacity planning includes a 5–10% 'open to buy' margin, allowing for some orders to be placed within a shorter timeframe of two to three months. Lead times are set well in advance, typically five months before the ex-factory date, with two trips per season to discuss quantity, price, and lead time. Adjustments are made to ensure timely delivery, such as shifting swimwear production to avoid delays around Chinese New Year. Forecasting is a collaborative process, with buyers discussing plans during a December meeting to block production capacity as needed.

Zeeman does not enforce strict production deadlines; instead, it monitors delivery deviations from production plans, although this data has not yet been used to evaluate overall production capacity. The member company has yet to evaluate the process retroactively with its suppliers.

Recommendation: The member is encouraged to evaluate with the supplier the production process after each season and, where needed, adapt its future planning.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.16 Member company can demonstrate the link between its buying prices and wage levels at production locations.	Basic	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, cost sheets including labour minutes.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has basic insight into the labour component of its prices. In addition, Zeeman has collected wage information from different countries and production sites. The member brand organised training for buyers to strengthen their understanding of the relationship between prices and wages. However, the member company does not yet directly link its prices, and specifically the labour cost, to the wages paid in production locations. It has investigated cost breakdowns directly with production locations and by using Fair Wear tools, such as the Fair Price App.

Recommendation: Zeeman needs to demonstrate an understanding of the link between buying prices and wage levels to ensure its pricing allows for the payment of the legal minimum wage.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.17 All sourcing intermediaries play an active role in upholding HRDD and Fair Wear's Code of Labour Practices and ensure transparency about where production takes place.	Intermediate	Intermediaries have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is members' responsibility to ensure production relation intermediaries actively support the implementation of the CoLP.	Correspondence with intermediaries, trainings for intermediaries, communication on Fair Wear audit findings, etc.	2	4	0

Comment: Zeeman has informed its sourcing intermediaries of Fair Wear requirements and could show they informed production locations. Next to that, the intermediaries actively support HRDD and the implementation of the CoLP by following up on corrective action plans and training follow-up. Zeeman has informed its sourcing intermediaries of Fair Wear requirements and could show they informed production locations.

Layer 3 Prevention, mitigation and remediation

Possible Points: 90
Earned Points: 46

Indicators on the quality and coherence of a members' prevention and remediation system

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.1 Member company integrates outcomes of human rights risk identification (layer 2) into risk prioritisation and creates subsequent action plans.	Intermediate	Based on the risk assessment outcomes, a factory risk profile can be determined with accompanying intervention strategies, including improvement and prevention programmes.	Overview of supplier base with accompanying risk profile and follow-up programmes.	4	6	0

Comment: Based on the risk identification described in chapter two, Zeeman has linked factory risks to appropriate follow-up actions for about one-thirds of its production volume. Follow-up is determined through risk assessments and root cause analysis, using a colour-coding system to prioritise different action points. For each factory, Zeeman evaluates whether additional information needs to be collected and identifies specific actions based on audit outcomes. The member also applies a hierarchy to determine the most appropriate follow-up plans across its production locations.

Additionally, Zeeman keeps track of training needs and sessions organised as part of its general approach. Zeeman sources from 12 production locations in Bangladesh and 19 in Pakistan and has signed the International Accord for both countries. In Bangladesh, action plans are linked to the outcomes of the RSC system, including inspections, remediation programmes, safety committees, safety training, and grievance mechanisms. Given that health and safety risks were assessed as less severe for Zeeman's suppliers in Bangladesh, the member brand has prioritised other issues. The member's action plans therefore include topics such as overtime, social insurance, and forced labour, which were addressed during a supplier conference.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to ensure more factories have an action plan that matches their risk profile.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.2 Member company's action plans include a gender lens.	Basic	The prevention and improvement programmes should ensure equitable outcomes. Thus, a gender lens should be incorporated in all programmes regardless of whether or not the programme is specifically about gender.	Proof of incorporation of the gender lens in follow up programmes, including stakeholder input.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has applied a gender lens in some of its improvement and prevention steps, but not yet across all of its actions. The member company has included gender considerations directly at the factory level, linking impact projects to its leverage in specific sourcing contexts. However, Zeeman has not yet extended a gender lens to all of its improvement and prevention actions. This means that while gender considerations are present in certain action plans, they are not yet systematically embedded across the brand's full due diligence process.

Recommendation: Zeeman is recommended to extend its gender lens to the implementation of all its improvement actions.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.3 Member company's action plans include steps to encourage freedom of association and effective social dialogue.	Basic	Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining are enabling rights. Therefore, ensuring they are prioritised in improvement and prevention programmes can help support improvements in all other areas.	Available prevention and improvement programmes, including stakeholder input.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman included some steps to encourage freedom of association (FoA) and effective social dialogue (SD) in its action plans. These steps include applying the FoA lens directly at factory level, linking impact projects to its leverage, and raising awareness through initiatives such as worker engagement activities. In specific cases, suppliers have been asked to strengthen worker representation structures and to ensure that workers are able to exercise their rights to organise and participate in dialogue without fear of retaliation. The member company has not yet implemented these measures in a comprehensive and detailed way across all suppliers.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to include steps encouraging FoA and effective social dialogue in all action plans.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.4 Member company actively supports a factory-level grievance mechanism.	Basic	Fair Wear's complaints helpline is a safety net in case local grievance mechanisms do not provide access to remedy. Members are expected to actively support and monitor the effectiveness of operational-level grievance mechanisms as part of regular contact with their suppliers.	Communication with suppliers, responses to grievances, minutes of internal worker committees, evidence of democratically elected worker representation, evidence of handled grievance, review of factory policies, and proof of effective social dialogue.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman monitors suppliers' internal grievance mechanisms from the beginning and throughout their business relationship. Despite gathering information from production locations and recognising that these mechanisms do not always function effectively, Zeeman does not actively support or monitor their effectiveness. Instead, the company focuses on sharing information about the Fair Wear complaints helpline. Occasionally, assessments or monitoring visits reveal issues, such as suggestion boxes being placed in locations that do not ensure privacy. When such issues are identified, Zeeman intervenes to correct them. However, the member has yet to include the promotion and improvement of factory-level grievance mechanisms in all its follow-up plans.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to always involve suppliers and worker representatives in the assessment of the factory-level grievance mechanism and to share and discuss the outcome of the assessment with the above stakeholders, who should be encouraged to lead a discussion on how the mechanisms can be improved.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.5 Member company collaborates with other Fair Wear members or customers of the production location.	Advanced	Cooperation between Fair Wear members increases leverage and the chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the chances of a factory needing to conduct multiple improvement programmes about the same issue with multiple customers.	Communication between different companies.	6	6	0

Comment: Zeeman cooperates with other Fair Wear members at its shared suppliers, responding to CAPs and grievances. The member company can demonstrate it works on joint prevention, mitigation and remediation with the RSC and signatories of the International Accord. Next to that, the member also cooperates in taking more preventive measures , such as describe preventive measures briefly, such as organising training, and joint living wage work with other. At suppliers that are not shared with other members, Zeeman works together with other customers.

Indicators on implementation: improvement and prevention

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.6 Degree of verified actions.	40%	Fair Wear expects members to show progress towards the implementation of improvement programmes. Members are expected to be actively involved in the examination and remediation of any factory-specific problem.	Progress reports on improvement programmes.	4	6	-2

Comment: During the performance check Zeeman could demonstrate it has followed up 36% of actions out of all outstanding actions. These actions are linked to CAPs of full assessments conducted in the previous financial year.

Recommendation: Fair Wear strongly recommends ensuring that the size of the supply chain and the available resources of Zeeman to actively follow up on CAP issues are coinciding. Possible solutions could be to decrease the number of suppliers or increase the resources needed to be able to work on improvement actions.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.7 Degree of progress towards implementation of prevention programme.	Basic progress	Fair Wear expects members to show progress towards the implementation of prevention programmes. With this indicator, Fair Wear assesses the degree of progress based on the percentage of actions addressed within the set timeframe.	Update on prevention programmes.	2	6	-2

Comment: Zeeman has not yet identified root causes of the CAP findings. However, the brand did work on preventive actions based on the risk assessment.

Requirement: Please note that following Fair Wear's policy for repeated non-compliance, members that receive an insufficient score on this indicator for the second year will be placed in the 'needs improvement' category. Zeeman should identify root causes of CAP issues and discuss these with its suppliers. The member needs to start developing preventive actions to address these root causes.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to identify root causes of CAP issues together with its suppliers.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.8 Member company validates risk profile and maintains regular dialogue with factories where no action plan is needed.	No factories in the respective risk profile	When no improvement or prevention programme is needed, Fair Wear expect its member companies to actively monitor the risk profile and continue to mitigate risks and prevent human rights abuses.	Use of Fair Wear workers awareness digital tool to promote access to remedy. Evidence of data collected, worker interviews, monitoring documentation tracking status quo.	N/A	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has no suppliers where improvement or prevention steps are not needed.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.9 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Insufficient	Member companies should identify excessive overtime caused by the internal processes and take preventive measures. In addition, members should assess ways to reduce the risk of external delays.	This indicator rewards self-identification of efforts to prevent excessive overtime. Therefore, member companies may present a wide range of evidence of production delays and how the risk of excessive overtime was addressed, such as: reports, correspondence with factories, collaboration with other customers of the factory, use of Fair Wear tools, etc.	0	6	0

Comment: In the previous financial year, Zeeman received 19 Fair Wear full assessments. Six out of 19 mentioned excessive overtime. Zeeman analysed the root causes of these findings. According to the member company, production delays and supplier-level management practices are significant causes for excessive overtime. When such findings are identified, corrective action plans are shared with the suppliers through the agents, who are asked to follow up. The approach therefore depends strongly on the involvement of agents. Where excessive overtime was not directly linked to Zeeman's production planning, the brand has encouraged suppliers to improve internal planning and management systems to reduce pressure on workers. However, follow-up remains basic, as the member relies on agents to ensure that corrective measures are implemented and monitored effectively.

Requirement: Zeeman should investigate to what extent its current buying practices affect the working hours at the supplier level. A root cause analysis of excessive overtime should be done to investigate the most effective steps to reduce overtime. The Fair Working Hours Guide can be used as a resource.

Recommendation: Fair Wear strongly recommends Zeeman to address suppliers' reluctance to be transparent about working hours.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.10 Member company adequately responds if production locations fail to pay legal wage requirements and/or fail to provide wage data to verify that legal wage requirements are paid.	Insufficient	Fair Wear members are expected to actively verify that all workers receive legal minimum wage. If a supplier does not meet the legal wage requirements or is unable to show they do, Fair Wear member companies are expected to hold the management at the production location accountable for respecting local labour law.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, Fair Wear Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a Fair Wear auditor, or other documents that show the legal wage issue is reported/resolved.	-2	4	-2

Comment: In the previous year, 16 out of 19 audits included findings regarding non-payment of legal minimum wage and legally required wage elements. Zeeman did not respond to these findings in a timely manner.

Requirement: Please note that following Fair Wear's policy for repeated non-compliance, members that receive an insufficient score on this indicator for the second year will be placed in the 'needs improvement' category.

If a supplier fails to comply with legal wage regulations, members are expected to respond in time, identify root causes with factory management, and resolve that local labour laws are respected. Evidence of remediation must be collected.

Recommendation: Fair Wear strongly recommends Zeeman to ensure problems of payments below legal minimum wages are not just prevented going forward but also remediated retroactively.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.11 Degree to which member company assesses and responds to root causes of wages lower than living wages in production locations.	Basic	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.	Member companies may present a wide range of evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: internal policy and strategy documents, reports, wage data/wage ladders, gap analysis, correspondence with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman understands which suppliers pay wages below living wage estimates as a consequence of the member's policies and actions but has yet to identify other root causes. Zeeman followed up on this and reviewed internally how the member's practices could be altered and ensured this was done according to its living wage roadmap, which is set around a structural bonus system.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Zeeman to discuss with suppliers about different strategies to work towards higher wages and develop a systemic and time-bound approach. 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.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.12 Member company determines and finances wage increases.	Advanced	Member companies should have strategies in place to contribute to and finance wage increases in their production locations.	Analysis of wage gap, strategy on paper, demonstrated roll out process.	6	6	0

Comment: Zeeman is committed to continuing to raise wages at its production locations. Understanding that this requires long-term commitments, Zeeman has formalised its efforts through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). As a target wage, Zeeman decided to use living wage estimates provided by the Global Living Wage Coalition in all production countries. In 2023, Zeeman began contributing to the living wage benchmark for five key production facilities, financing this contribution from its overall margin. For its share of production, Zeeman compensates the difference between the minimum wage and a living wage, with the extra amount being paid directly to the workers. In 2024, preparations began for five new programmes, aiming to extend the living wage initiative to a total of 10 factories by early 2024. This will represent approximately 25% of Zeeman's clothing and textile purchasing value. The company has allocated a budget for the implementation of its Living Wage roadmap at least until 2027, aiming to ensure that 50% of its total FOB is directed towards a living wage. Zeeman's commitment to living wages is also included in its two-way Code of Conduct.

Recommendation: Fair Wear advises companies to avoid the concept of a one-time charitable contribution. We strongly recommend members to integrate the financing of wage increases it into their own systems, herewith committing to a long-term process that leads to sustainable implementation of living wages.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.13 Percentage of production volume where the member company pays its share of the living wage estimate.	26%	Fair Wear requires its member companies to act to ensure a living wage is paid in their production locations to each worker.	Member company's own documentation such as reports, factory documentation, evidence of Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) payment, communication with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman pays its share of the living wage estimate surcharge to ten factories. This is initially checked by its local teams and verified by on-site assessments. These locations account for 26% of the total textile FOB.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.14 Member addresses grievances received through Fair Wear's helpline in accordance with the Fair Wear's Access to Remedy Policy.	Intermediate	Members are expected to actively support the operational-level grievance mechanisms as part of regular contact with their suppliers. The complaints procedure provides a framework for member brands, emphasising the responsibility towards workers within their supply chain.	Overview of supporting activities, overview of grievances received and addressed, etc.	2	4	-2

Comment: Zeeman received 10 complaints in the past financial year about living wages, legally binding employment relationships, and safe and healthy working conditions at its suppliers in Bangladesh, as well as freely chosen employment, living wages, and excessive overtime at its suppliers in Pakistan and China. Zeeman has addressed the complaints in line with Fair Wear's complaint procedure. The member has yet to involve worker representatives in the remediation of complaints. Zeeman has yet to include preventive actions following the grievances.

Recommendation: Zeeman could involve worker representatives in the remediation of complaints.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.15 Degree to which member company implements training to address the risks identified.	Advanced	Training programmes can play an important role in improving working conditions, especially for more complex issues, such as freedom of association or gender-based violence, where factory-level transformation is needed.	Links between the risk profile and training programme, documentation from discussions with management and workers on training needs, etc.	6	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has some CAP findings where training is a recommended follow-up action. The member has enrolled some of its suppliers with findings where training was suggested regarding lack of awareness about CoLP, social dialogue, worker representation, and gender-based violence in the following training modules: Workplace Education Programme (WEP) basic, Violence and Harassment Prevention Programme, and the onboarding module.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.16 Degree to which member company follows up after a training programme.	Basic	Training is a crucial tool to support transformative processes but complementary activities such as remediation and changes at the brand level are needed to achieve lasting impact	Evidence of engagement with factory management regarding training outcomes, documentation on follow-up activities, and proof of integration into further monitoring and risk profiling efforts.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman followed up on the implemented training by collecting feedback from suppliers on the sessions, including those addressing harassment and violence, and by discussing these topics during pre-buying meetings. In one case, the brand also stopped sourcing from a supplier and informed Fair Wear accordingly. At this stage, Zeeman has not yet used training results as input for its human rights risk monitoring.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Zeeman to use the training results as input for Zeeman's human rights due diligence.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.17 The member company's human rights due diligence system includes a responsible exit strategy.	Advanced	Withdrawing from a non-compliant supplier should only be the last resort when no more impact can be gained from other strategies. Fair Wear members must follow the steps as laid out in the responsible exit strategy.	Exit strategy policy, examples of supplier communications.	4	4	0

Comment: Zeeman's human rights due diligence system includes a responsible exit strategy. In the past financial year, the member stopped with 12 suppliers. The suppliers that were exited were part of the consolidation strategy. The member followed the steps in the responsible exit strategy. Zeeman has discussed the responsible exit strategy with all its suppliers.

Requirement: Zeeman must have human rights due diligence system that includes a responsible exit strategy.

Recommendation: Zeeman could discuss the responsible exit strategy with its suppliers, for instance as part of its supplier evaluation.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.18 Member company's measures, business practices and/or improvement programmes go beyond the indicators or scope.	Basic	Fair Wear would like to reward and encourage members who go beyond the Fair Wear policy or scope requirements. For example, innovative projects that result in advanced remediation strategies, pilot participation, and/or going beyond tier 2.	Overview of Human Right risk monitoring, remediation and prevention activities and processes.	2	6	0

Comment: Zeeman undertakes activities related to human rights that go beyond Fair Wear's scope, namely by collecting information that includes social aspects and uses it for its human rights monitoring.

Layer 4 External communication, outreach, learning, and evaluation

Possible Points: 22
Earned Points: 12

Indicators related to communication

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.1 Member company actively communicates about Fair Wear membership.	Advanced	Fair Wear membership includes the need for a brand to show its efforts, progress, and results. Fair Wear members have the tools and targeted content to showcase accountability and inform customers, consumers, and retailers. The more brands communicate about their sustainability work, the greater the overall impact of the work of the Fair Wear member community.	Member website, sales brochures, and other communication materials.	4	4	0

Comment: Zeeman communicates accurately about Fair Wear membership on its website. The member also uses other channels to inform customers and stakeholders about Fair Wear membership. By mentioning membership on its website, Zeeman actively spreads the Fair Wear message.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.2 Member company sells external brands with a Human Rights Due Diligence system (if applicable).	No reselling of external brands	Some member companies resell other brands, which Fair Wear refers to as 'external production'. These members are expected to investigate the Human Rights Due Diligence system of these other brands, including production locations and the availability of monitoring information.	External production data in Fair Wear's information management system, collected information about other brands' human rights due diligence systems, and evidence of external brands being part of other multi-stakeholder initiatives that verify their responsible business conduct.	N/A	4	0

Comment: Zeeman did not sell external brands in 2024.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.3 Human rights due diligence reporting is submitted to Fair Wear and is published on the member company's website.	Advanced	The social report is an important tool for member companies to share their efforts with stakeholders transparently. The social report explicitly refers to the workplan and the yearly progress related to the brands goals identified in the workplan.	Social report.	4	4	0

Comment: Zeeman has submitted its social report, which Fair Wear reviewed.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.4 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities.	Insufficient	Good reporting by members helps ensure the transparency of Fair Wear's work and helps share best practices within the industry. This indicator reviews transparency efforts reported beyond (or included in) the social report.	Brand Performance Check, audit reports, information about innovative projects, specific factory compliance data, disclosed production locations (list tier 2 and beyond), disclosure of production locations, alignment with the Transparency Pledge.	0	4	0

Comment: Zeeman does not report on factory-level data and remediation results.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.5 Member company has a system to track implementation and validate results.	Intermediate	Progress must be checked against goals. Members are expected to have a system in place to track implementation and validate the progress made.	Documentation of top management involvement in systematic annual evaluation includes meeting minutes, verbal reporting, PowerPoint presentations, etc. Evidence of worker/supplier feedback.	4	6	0

Comment: Zeeman has a system for tracking progress and evaluating the effectiveness of measures taken to prevent and remedy human rights violations. This system uses supplier scorecards to monitor progress and measure the success of implemented actions. The results from these scorecards are incorporated into the company's KPIs, which form the basis for the management team's appraisal system.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.6 Level of action/progress made on requirements from previous Brand Performance Check.	Basic	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 should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	0	4	-2

Comment: The previous performance check included the following requirements: Zeeman was requested to enhance its monitoring of freedom of association (FoA) risks by implementing supplier-level monitoring, to report on factory-level data and remediation progress to strengthen transparency, and to demonstrate a clearer understanding of the relationship between buying prices and wage levels to ensure that pricing supports the payment of legal minimum wages. Zeeman has not yet fully followed up on these requirements.

5 Appreciation chapter

5.1 Member company publicly responded to problems/allegations raised by consumers, the media, or NGOs.: Not applicable

5.2 Member company actively participated in lobby and advocacy efforts to facilitate an enabling environment in production clusters.: Yes

Comments: Zeeman actively participated in lobby and advocacy efforts to promote an enabling environment in its production clusters. In 2024, the member company organised two supplier events in China (April) and India (October) to present its 2024-2027 vision and strategy on responsible business conduct and CSR, and to engage suppliers on practical topics such as sourcing sustainable materials and implementing improvement programmes. Zeeman also issued a public statement supporting the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) and contributed to the official consultation on the WIVO/CSDDD. Furthermore, the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade visited Zeeman's office to discuss its CSR approach.

5.3 Member company actively contributed to industry outreach, visibility, and learning in its main selling markets.: Yes

Comments: Zeeman actively contributed to industry outreach, visibility, and learning in its main selling markets. The member company spoke at multiple industry events to promote responsible business practices and engaged with key stakeholders such as the Dutch government, the Social and Economic Council (SER), the Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO), and the OECD.

Recommendations to Fair Wear

Zeeman recommends that Fair Wear expand the Member Hub's scope to include non-textile product. Zeeman also suggests increasing the platform's upload capacity and improving its interface performance to ensure faster response times and smoother navigation. In addition, Zeeman recommends streamlining the presentation of action points to avoid overload and provide a clearer overview for users. Finally, Zeeman suggests that Fair Wear improve the responsiveness of the complaints team to ensure more timely follow-up and resolution.

Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check: 03-09-2025
Conducted by: Jason Mandels