



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Anna van Toor

PUBLICATION DATE: JULY 2018

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2017 to 31-12-2017

ABOUT THE BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

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

FWF's Brand Performance Check is a tool to evaluate and report on the activities of FWF's member companies. The Checks examine how member company management systems support FWF's Code of Labour Practices. They evaluate the parts of member company supply chains where clothing is assembled. This is the most labour intensive part of garment supply chains, and where brands can have the most influence over working conditions.

In most apparel supply chains, clothing brands do not own product locations, and most product locations work for many different brands. This means that in most cases FWF member companies have influence, but not direct control, over working conditions. As a result, the Brand Performance Checks focus primarily on verifying the efforts of member companies. Outcomes at the product location level are assessed via audits and complaint reports, however the complexity of the supply chains means that even the best efforts of FWF member companies cannot guarantee results.

Even if outcomes at the product location level cannot be guaranteed, the importance of good management practices by member companies cannot be understated. Even one concerned customer at a product location can have significant positive impacts on a range of issues like health and safety conditions or freedom of association. And if one customer at a product location can demonstrate that improvements are possible, other customers no longer have an excuse not to act. The development and sharing of these types of best practices has long been a core part of FWF's work.

The Brand Performance Check system is designed to accommodate the range of structures and strengths that different companies have, and reflects the different ways that brands can support better working conditions.

This report is based on interviews with member company employees who play important roles in the management of supply chains, and a variety of documentation sources, financial records, supplier data. The findings from the Brand Performance Check are summarized and published at www.fairwear.org. The online [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators.

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Anna van Toor

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2017 to 31-12-2017

MEMBER COMPANY INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Meerkerk, Netherlands
Member since:	01-02-2013
Product types:	Fashion
Production in countries where FWF is active:	China, India, Turkey
Production in other countries:	Hong Kong, Italy, Lithuania, Madagascar, Poland, Portugal, Serbia
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	94%
Benchmarking score	50
Category	Good

Summary:

Anna van Toor has met most of FWF's performance requirements. Its monitoring threshold of 94% is an improvement compared to last year (81%). The monitoring threshold consists of FWF audits, external audits and fulfilling monitoring requirements for all its production locations in low-risk countries. One point of attention remains to ensure audits also occur at all production locations where more than 2% of production takes place. The monitoring percentage, combined with a benchmark score of 50, means that FWF has awarded Anna van Toor the 'Good' rating.

In 2017, Anna van Toor developed an annual approach for the production department, which includes general human rights due diligence. The main aim of this approach is to share responsibility within the production department for human rights due diligence when selecting new suppliers, as well as CAP follow-up and checking on production location information throughout the relationship management. For 2018, FWF recommends to also share responsibility on root cause analyses of overtime and wages as the company is expected to show progress on these points for next performance check.

While Anna van Toor has decided not to extend its production in Turkey it is maintaining a stable relationship with one supplier (responsible for multiple production locations). Since the company is producing in Turkey, Fair Wear Foundation expects an active approach related to the risk related to Syrian refugees in the country.

FWF expect Anna van Toor to develop a systematic supplier evaluation related to compliance with the FWF Code of Labour Practices. A systematic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decision-making. The approach needs to ensure that the member consistently evaluates the entire supplier base and includes information into decision-making procedures.

PERFORMANCE CATEGORY OVERVIEW

Leader: This category is for member companies who are doing exceptionally well, and are operating at an advanced level. Leaders show best practices in complex areas such as living wages and freedom of association.

Good: It is FWF's belief that member companies who are making a serious effort to implement the Code of Labour Practices—the vast majority of FWF member companies—are 'doing good' and deserve to be recognized as such. They are also doing more than the average clothing company, and have allowed their internal processes to be examined and publicly reported on by an independent NGO. The majority of member companies will receive a 'Good' rating.

Needs Improvement: Member companies are most likely to find themselves in this category when major unexpected problems have arisen, or if they are unable or unwilling to seriously work towards CoLP implementation. Member companies may be in this category for one year only after which they should either move up to Good, or will be moved to suspended.

Suspended: Member companies who either fail to meet one of the Basic Requirements, have had major internal changes which means membership must be put on hold for a maximum of one year, or have been in Needs Improvement for more than one year. Member companies may remain in this category for one year maximum, after which termination proceedings will come into force.

Categories are calculated based on a combination of benchmarking score and the percentage of own production under monitoring. The specific requirements for each category are outlined in the Brand Performance Check Guide.

1. PURCHASING PRACTICES

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity.	45%	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.	2	4	0

Comment: In 2017, Anna van Toor bought 45% of its production from production locations where it buys at least 10% of production capacity.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Anna van Toor to consolidate its supplier base where possible, and increase leverage at main supplier(s) to effectively request improvements of working conditions. 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.	11%	FWF provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts.	Production location information as provided to FWF.	2	4	0

Comment: In 2017, 11% of Anna van Toor's production volume came from production locations where it buys less than 2% of its total FOB.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Anna van Toor to consolidate its supply base by limiting the number of suppliers in its 'tail end'. To achieve this, Anna van Toor should determine whether suppliers where it buys less than 2% of its 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.

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.	45%	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.	2	4	0

Comment: In 2017, 45% of Anna van Toor's production volume came from production locations where a business relationship has existed for over five years.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.3 All new production locations are required to sign and return the questionnaire with the Code of Labour Practices before first bulk orders are placed.	Yes	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between production locations and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	2	2	0

Comment: In 2017, Anna van Toor started production at several new production locations. All questionnaires were signed before the first bulk orders were placed.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.4 Member company conducts human rights due diligence at all (new) production locations before placing orders.	Intermediate	Due diligence helps to identify, prevent and mitigate potential human rights problems at suppliers.	Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments.	2	4	0

Comment: When selecting new production facilities Anna van Toor mainly relies on its existing network of production locations, agents and employees. This means it mainly focuses on producing in countries where the company already knows the human rights and labour situation. In 2017, it developed an annual approach for the production department, which includes general human rights due diligence to ensure all buyers are aware of the main risks and actively discuss this with the suppliers.

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.	No	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.	0	2	0

Comment: Anna van Toor evaluates suppliers continuously, specifically on quality issues, and good quality leads to repeat order. Compliance with the Code of Labour Practice is not a systematic part of supplier evaluation.

Requirement: A systematic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decision-making. The approach needs to ensure that the member consistently evaluates the entire supplier base and includes information into decision-making procedures.

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

Comment: Anna van Toor has monthly orders at their suppliers, which means they spread the pressure they put on production. When they select a new supplier they ask them about their capacity and will not over-ask this capacity. This information is evaluated regularly to see whether it is correct and also discussed during visits.

In 2017, Anna van Toor started with a salesman sample collection, which means the company started with the production process much earlier and is able to inform suppliers much more in advance when production needs to take place and suppliers are able to plan ahead. Placing of orders is not based on known production capacity of production locations.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Insufficient 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.	0	6	0

Comment: In 2017, Anna van Toor planned to discuss root causes of excessive overtime with its production locations, but did not succeed.

Requirement: Anna van Toor should investigate to what extent its current buying practices has an effect on the working hours at supplier level. A root cause analysis of excessive overtime should be done to investigate which steps can be most effective to reduce overtime.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.8 Member company's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.	Country-level policy	The first step towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages - and towards implementation of living wages - is to know the labour costs of garments.	Formal systems to calculate labour costs on per-product or country/city level.	2	4	0

Comment: A target price is given by the supplier to Anna van Toor based on samples produced. The company does not negotiate on price, but relates the quoted price to prices of similar styles in the past. The price is specified to production costs, without insight into the share that goes to workers. In 2015, Anna van Toor has asked several suppliers to provide more insight how prices are calculated, but suppliers were not willing to share this information. Therefore, Anna van Toor started collecting information on the minimum wage levels for all production countries making use of information from audit reports and BSCI reports of different factories to find information of wages paid. This forms the basis for relating the wage levels to their own pricing system.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.9 Member company actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages.	Yes	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage, FWF member companies are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, FWF audit reports or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	1	2	-2

Comment: In one audit minimum wages could not be verified due to incorrect records. Anna van Toor has addressed this with the production location and could show improved record keeping.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.10 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by member company.	No	Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on production locations and their ability to pay workers on time. Most garment workers have minimal savings, and even a brief delay in payments can cause serious problems.	Based on a complaint or audit report; review of production location and member company financial documents.	0	0	-1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.11 Degree to which member company assesses root causes of wages lower than living wages with suppliers and takes steps towards the implementation of living wages.	No efforts shown.	Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to member companies' policies.	Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages.	0	8	0

Comment: Anna van Toor has collected wage information from the different audit reports as a first step towards addressing living wages at production location. The company did not assess root causes of wages lower than living wages or taken steps towards implementation of living wages.

Requirement: Anna van Toor has to take adequate steps to move towards living wages as estimated by local stakeholders.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Anna van Toor to contact other customers sourcing in the same factories for a joined conversation about the relevance of living wage. Or select one or two factories that are open for this topic. With their input Anna van Toor can start working with the wage calculation templates provided by FWF

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.12 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the member company (bonus indicator).	None	Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an member company's score.	Supplier information provided by member company.	N/A	2	0

PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 44

Earned Points: 17

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	31%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled	63%	FWF low risk policy should be implemented. 0 = policy is not implemented correctly. N/A = no production in low risk countries.
Meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	No	FWF members must meet tail-end monitoring requirements. Implementation will be assessed during next Brand Performance check.
Total of own production under monitoring	94%	Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100% Measured as a percentage of turnover.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.1 Specific staff person is designated to follow up on problems identified by monitoring system	Yes	Followup is a serious part of FWF membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	2	2	-2

Comment: Anna van Toor has identified a specific person to follow-up on problems identified by the monitoring system, together with the production manager shared responsibility to address FWF monitoring requirements.

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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.3 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory and worker representation where applicable. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner.	Yes	2 part indicator: FWF audit reports were shared and discussed with suppliers within two months of audit receipt AND a reasonable time frame was specified for resolving findings.	Corrective Action Plans, emails; findings of followup audits; brand representative present during audit exit meeting, etc.	2	2	-1

Comment: Audit reports and Corrective Action Plans are shared with the factory and improvement timelines are established.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.4 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans and remediation of identified problems.	Basic	FWF considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that member companies can do towards improving working conditions.	CAP-related documentation including status of findings, documentation of remediation and follow up actions taken by member. Reports of quality assessments. Evidence of understanding relevant issues.	4	8	-2

Comment: Anna van Toor had several active Corrective Action Plans in 2017. Anna van Toor uses the CAP format to keep track on CAP resolution and highlights what issues they want to have solved first. Production locations are asked to provide follow up on CAPs primarily focusing on factory-level issues.

Recommendation: To facilitate remediation, Anna van Toor could consider:

- Hire a local consultant to assist factory in developing an action plan and to assist factory management in investigating root causes.
- Organise supplier seminars.
- Provide factory training.
- Share knowledge/material.
- Providing financial support to the supplier for implementing improvements

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.	65%	Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by member company staff or local representatives. They reinforce to production location managers that member companies are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices.	Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	3	4	0

Comment: In 2017, production locations responsible for 65% of production volume have been visited by employees of Anna van Toor or its agents. Both employees and agents shared photos and the Health and Safety checklist.

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: In 2017, Anna van Toor has collected external audit reports, assessed the quality, created a corrective action plan based on the quality assessment and followed up on the findings.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies.	Average score depending on the number of applicable policies and results	Aside from regular monitoring and remediation requirements under FWF membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. FWF requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by FWF.	Policy documents, inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories, reports of meetings with suppliers, reports of additional activities and/or attendance lists as mentioned in policy documents.	-2	6	0
Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF Myanmar policy	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF guidance on abrasive blasting	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF guidance on risks related to Turkish garment factories employing Syrian refugees	Insufficient			-2	6	-2
Other risks specific to the member's supply chain are addressed by its monitoring system	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2

Comment: Anna van Toor only produces denim in Portugal, where sandblasting is legally forbidden. In addition, Anna van Toor is looking into other techniques for denim.

Anna van Toor produces in Turkey. They are aware of the country specific risks and have discussed this with their main production location and agent. However, the production locations have not participated in specific trainings and the company has not visited or developed a specific policy or procedure to address these issues. In 2017, there were no Syrian refugees employed at Anna van Toor's production location but they agreed with the factory to be updated regularly when this changes.

Requirement: FWF expects Anna van Toor to take a more active approach to its production locations in Turkey, please refer to FWF's guidance on Risk related to Turkish garment factories employing Syrian refugees for more information about expected steps.

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: Anna van Toor shares several production locations with other FWF member companies. In 2017, Anna van Toor actively cooperated with other FWF member companies in resolving corrective actions.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.9 Percentage of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	50-100%	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	1	2	0

Comment: In 2017, Anna van Toor fulfilled monitoring requirements for all its 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 above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Not applicable	FWF encourages all of its members to audit/monitor 100% of its production locations and rewards those members who conduct full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Production location information as provided to FWF and recent Audit Reports.	N/A	3	0

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

Comment: Anna van Toor contacted all its external brands via email to explain its approach to sustainability and asked for additional information on the topic from the external brands in return. A large part of the external brands have responded.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.12 External brands resold by member companies that are members of another credible initiative (% of external sales volume).	0%	FWF believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods.	External production data in FWF's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by FWF or FLA members.	0	3	0

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

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 34

Earned Points: 17

Additional comments on Monitoring and Remediation:

FWF requires Anna van Toor to ensure it audits all production locations that are responsible for over 2% of production and production locations where Anna van Toor is responsible for over 10% of the location's production capacity.

3. COMPLAINTS HANDLING

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
Number of worker complaints received since last check	0	At this point, FWF considers a high number of complaints as a positive indicator, as it shows that workers are aware of and making use of the complaints system.
Number of worker complaints in process of being resolved	0	
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check	0	

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.1 A specific employee has been designated to address worker complaints	Yes	Followup is a serious part of FWF membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	1	1	-1

Comment: Anna van Toor has designated a specific employee to address worker complaints. This is the same person to follow-up on problems identified by the monitoring system. She works in close cooperation with the production manager.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.2 System is in place to check that the Worker Information Sheet is posted in factories.	Yes	The Worker Information Sheet is a key first step in alerting workers to their rights.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from production location visits, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Anna van Toor requires all production locations to return a picture of the posted Worker Information Sheet. In addition, everyone visiting on behalf of Anna van Toor is asked to take a picture of the Worker Information Sheet.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited production locations where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	33%	The FWF complaints procedure is a crucial element of verification. If production location based complaint systems do not exist or do not work, the FWF worker helpline allows workers to ask questions about their rights and file complaints. Production location participation in the Workplace Education Programme also count towards this indicator.	Percentage of audited production locations where at least 50% of interviewed workers indicate awareness of the FWF complaints mechanism + percentage of production locations in WEP programme.	2	4	0

Comment: Anna van Toor had audits in 4 production locations. In one of these locations, responsible for 33 % of production in FWF-audited production locations, at least half of workers were aware of the FWF worker helpline.

Recommendation: Anna van Toor can stimulate its suppliers to participate in WEP trainings, to raise awareness about the existence and the functioning of FWF's worker hotline. In addition to sending the worker information sheet, member companies can use the worker information cards available for download on FWF's website.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.4 All complaints received from production location workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure	No complaints received	Providing access to remedy when problems arise is a key element of responsible supply chain management. Member company involvement is often essential to resolving issues.	Documentation that member company has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process.	N/A	6	-2

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers	No complaints or cooperation not possible / necessary	Because most production locations supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the FWF member company can be critical in resolving a complaint at a supplier.	Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc.	N/A	2	0

COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 5

4. TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.1 All staff at member company are made aware of FWF membership.	Yes	Preventing and remediating problems often requires the involvement of many different departments; making all staff aware of FWF membership requirements helps to support cross-departmental collaboration when needed.	Emails, trainings, presentation, newsletters, etc.	1	1	-1

Comment: Anna van Toor publishes a monthly newsletter for all staff. In addition, the company organises training for sales people to share what Anna van Toor does with Fair Wear Foundation and a presentation about how a factory visits work.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.2 All staff in direct contact with suppliers are informed of FWF requirements.	Yes	Sourcing, purchasing and CSR staff at a minimum should possess the knowledge necessary to implement FWF requirements and advocate for change within their organisations.	FWF Seminars or equivalent trainings provided; presentations, curricula, etc.	2	2	-1

Comment: FWF requirements are shared regularly with the production department. With the newly developed approach, everyone takes responsibility for their own supplier.

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

Comment: Agents are actively involved in supporting CoLP implementation.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.4 Production location participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume)	4%	Lack of knowledge and skills on best practices related to labour standards is a common issue in production locations. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards sustainable improvements.	Documentation of relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education Programme.	1	6	0

Comment: One production location has participated in a WEP in 2015, which is still counted for this performance check.

Requirement: Manufacturers and their workers should be systematically informed about FWF and the implementation of the Code of Labour Practices. All factory management and workers should be informed and aware about the relevant labour standards and grievance mechanisms.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.5 Production location participation in trainings (where WEP is not offered; by production volume)	All production is in WEP areas.	In areas where the Workplace Education Programme is not yet offered, member companies may arrange trainings on their own or work with other training-partners. Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator.	Curricula, other documentation of training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	4	0

TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 11

Earned Points: 6

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: In 2017, Anna van Toor started an annual approach to ensure all information is correct, focusing specifically on production location addresses.

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: In 2017, Anna van Toor developed new steps to ensure all production managers are informed about working conditions at production locations and integrate it in their daily activities.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 4

6. TRANSPARENCY

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

Comment: Anna van Toor communicates about FWF on its website and in its seasonal brochures.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities	Published Performance Checks, Audits, and other efforts lead to increased transparency	Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of FWF's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	1	2	0

Comment: Anna van Toor has published its performance check report on the website.

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

Comment: Anna van Toor published its social report on its website.

TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 5

7. EVALUATION

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
7.1 Systemic annual evaluation of FWF membership is conducted with involvement of top management	Yes	An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: FWF membership is systematically evaluated with involvement of top management.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
7.2 Level of action/progress made on required changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by member company.	10%	In each Brand Performance Check report, FWF may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of FWF membership and its process approach.	Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	2	4	-2

Comment: In 2017, Anna van Toor improved its CAP follow-up albeit still only focusing on factory-level issues. It did not address supplier evaluation and root causes of excessive overtime or wages below living wage. Also, the company still has to ensure it audits all production locations where FOB is over 2%.

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 4

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

Audit planning have been difficult, we would like to some more information when an audit is confirmed.

SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	17	44
Monitoring and Remediation	17	34
Complaints Handling	5	7
Training and Capacity Building	6	11
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	5	6
Evaluation	4	6
Totals:	58	115

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

50

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

10-07-2018

Conducted by:

Anne van Lakerveld

Interviews with:

Chantelle van Toor (Production and Design Manager)

Karin Hooimeijer (Product Manager)

Lisette van Toor (Communication)

Iris Moss (Buying assistant)