

# BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

# Alchemist Fashion B.V.

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2016 to 31-12-2016

#### 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 <a href="https://www.fairwear.org">www.fairwear.org</a>. The online Brand Performance Check Guide provides more information about the indicators.

## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Alchemist Fashion B.V.

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2016 to 31-12-2016

| MEMBER COMPANY INFORMATION   |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Headquarters:  | Amsterdam, Netherlands                |
| Member since:  | 01-04-2013                            |
| Product types:   | Fashion, Bags & Accessories           |
| Production in countries where FWF is active:   | India, Macedonia, Republic of, Turkey |
| Production in other countries:   | Netherlands, Portugal                 |
| 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   | 86%                                   |
| Benchmarking score   | 66                                    |
| Category   | Good                                  |

#### Summary:

Alchemist has shown progress and met most of FWFs' performance requirements. Alchemist has monitored 86% of its purchasing volume, of which 18% was being monitored by following up on existing external audit reports. Alchemist is therefore awarded the category 'Good'.

Since the last Brand Performance Check, Alchemist has increased efforts to increase monitoring of its low-risk production sites by making regular visits and collecting all available audits. In 2016, Alchemist completed a living wage analysis together with two other FWF member brands, Filippa K and Anna van Toor, at its supplier in Portugal. Efforts made by the gain more insight into the relationship between their pricing and wages in the factory, which is an important step towards living wages. Unfortunately, monitoring and remediation are still a challenge for Alchemist because of the company's low leverage. This slows down the pace at which suppliers are willing to respond to improvements required to implement the FWF Code of Labour Practices. Nonetheless, despite slow progress, Alchemist has made efforts to negotiate and see through implementation. The commitment to transparency has been a major driving force for decision making by Alchemist, as can be seen with the brand's Turkish supplier, with whom they discontinued production due to the unwillingness to share any information.

Alchemist has taken further steps to increase its transparency: this includes increased newsletters on the brand's progress with suppliers, press meetings and seminars on sustainable materials. Furthermore, Alchemist has mapped all production within its showroom linked to their agents and production locations, which is currently being developed into an interactive map as part of Alchemist's new website.

For the coming year, FWF recommends Alchemist to have discussions with willing factory management in high-risk production locations, especially those with whom they already have a long-standing business relationship, to pursue the possibility of conducting a FWF audit to verify the progress of their improvements.

#### 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. | 0%     | 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. | 0     | 4   | 0   |

Comment: Alchemist is a growing, but small brand. Their leverage at all suppliers is below 10%. Two third of Alchemists 2015 production volume comes from Portugal, where the company works with small, family businesses who are satisfied with receiving their orders because of the good cooperation.

Recommendation: FWF recommends the member to consolidate its supplier base where possible, and increase leverage at main supplier(s) to effectively request improvements of working conditions.

| 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. | 4%     | 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. | 3     | 4   | 0   |

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

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS   | RESULT | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR  | DOCUMENTATION                                    | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|--|--------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.2 Percentage of production volume from production locations where a business relationship has existed for at least five years. | 56%    | Stable business relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give production locations a reason to invest in improving working conditions. | Supplier information provided by member company. | 3     | 4   | 0   |

Comment: Alchemist has worked with the same production agent in Portugal for more than 10 years and has a long and steady partnership with their Portuguese suppliers. Alchemist is a family based company and believes that they can achieve best results with similar companies, that are small scale and family owned. To offer a complete collection Alchemist had to look for new suppliers elsewhere.

| 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: Alchemist received back signed questionnaires of the Code of Labour Practices

| 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 new suppliers. | Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments. | 2     | 4   | 0   |

Comment: Alchemist had two new production location, in India and Macedonia respectively. Due to close working relationship with their Dutch agent who is a partial owner of the factory, the Macedonian location was not visited. However, regular meetings were hosted, existing audits checked, FWF membership discussed with the agency and a CAP set up for them. The production location in India was visited, and existing audits collected. FWF membership as well as Alchemists mission was also discussed with this supplier.

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS  | RESULT  | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR   | DOCUMENTATION   | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|---|---|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.5 Production location compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner. | Yes, and<br>leads to<br>production<br>decisions | A systemic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decisionmaking. | Documentation of systemic approach: rating systems, checklists, databases, etc. | 2     | 2   | 0   |

Comment: Alchemist integrates social compliance into normal business processes. The company consistently evaluates the supplier base and discusses progress with suppliers. Two third of production takes places in Portugal at factories that are visited twice a year. Social and environmental compliance are always part of the discussions. Because of the low volumes Alchemist is not able to reward well performing suppliers with extra orders, however decision to continue working with supplier is based on willingness to have discussions on transparency, FWF Code of Labour Practices and willingness to make improvements in their factories.

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS   | RESULT  | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR  | DOCUMENTATION                             | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|--|---|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.6 The member company's production planning systems support reasonable working hours. | Strong,<br>integrated<br>systems in<br>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: Alchemist works with a 60 days production lead-time. Alchemist counts back from delivery into the shops towards setting up the collection and takes every step into account concerning the time it takes (yarn dyeing, ordering fabrics, capacity booking, production time (even the amount of garments per production line/run), packing and transport, etc.). Alchemist asks suppliers to inform them about national holidays, to ensure these are taken into account when setting the leadtime. This leadtime always has a two weeks margin.

Alchemist develops a total production lead-time/work plan sheet to be able to know when decisions need to be made without influencing the production lead-time in a negative way. They are in constant communication with their factories and know they sometimes need to decide on colours or sample as earlier, to make sure there is no delay that might cause production over-time in the factories. Product developments and (realistic) lead-times are discussed in mutual understanding with their suppliers.

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS  | RESULT  | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR   | DOCUMENTATION  | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|---|---|--|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime. | No production problems / delays have been documented. | 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. | N/A   | 6   | 0   |

| 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<br>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: Alchemist is aware that wages are bargained collectively in Portugal where two third of their production volume comes from. A target price is given by the factory during the stage of developing a prototype. For products made in Portugal Alchemist knows the cost break down from fabric and accessories and the labour minutes per style and can compare that with their own pricing and minimum wage. Macedonia as a new production location has started off by following country-level policy but hope to be able to compare prices in the future.

Recommendation: FWF recommends that the remaining production volume especially that in India requires an assessment of their prices in relation to costs of minimum wage.

comparison between brands, price comparison - country level policy India - aware of demand, planning together with agency/factory analysis of price margins based on competitors price - style level flexibility

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS   | RESULT               | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR   | DOCUMENTATION   | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|--|----------------------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.9 Member company actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages. | No data<br>available | 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,<br>CAPs, additional<br>emails, FWF audit<br>reports or other<br>documents that show<br>minimum wage issue<br>is reported/resolved. | N/A   | 2   | -2  |

| 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. | Production<br>location level<br>approach | Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to member companies' policies. | Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages. | 4     | 8   | 0   |

Comment: Alchemist conducted a living wage analysis with two other FWF member brands at one of their main suppliers in Portugal. This was a production location approach which eventually showed that this production location is able to pay its employees living wages. Alchemist has used the existing audit reports collected from other production locations (India and Macedonia) and uses this analyse wages.

Recommendation: FWF recommends that Alchemist conduct verification audits at their high risk suppliers either in India or Macedonia.

| 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: 36

## 2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

| BASIC MEASUREMENTS  | RESULT | COMMENTS   |
|---|--------|--|
| % of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)              | 18%    |  |
| % of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled | 68%    | 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     | Implementation will be assessed next Brand Performance Check   |
| Total of own production under monitoring  | 86%    | 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.,<br>demonstrating who<br>the designated staff<br>person is. | 2     | 2   | -2  |

Comment: An external project manager is hired by Alchemist to ensure all FWF requirements and activities are followed up.

| 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<br>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: Alchemist dicusses existing audits with factory representatives, and together work on a CAP and timeline. Alchemist was able to show email proof of ongoing discussions for improvements as well as photos.

| 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. | No Caps<br>Active | 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. | N/A   | 8   | -2  |

| 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. | 67%    | 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: Two-thirds of Alchemist's production is in Portugal which is visited atleast twice a year. Production sites in India were also visited.

Recommendation: FWF recommends to visit the new Macedonian factory, especially as it is a new production location.

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS                                       | RESULT                         | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR  | DOCUMENTATION  | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.6 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected. | Yes and<br>quality<br>assessed | 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. | 2     | 3   | 0   |

**Comment:** Alchemist collected existing audit and assessed their quality. Corrective actions were implemented and a follow up of these CAPs is in place.

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS                                       | RESULT  | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR  | DOCUMENTATION   | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|--|---|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies.                       | None of the specific risk policies apply                | 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. | N/A   | 6   | -2  |
| Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh | Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain |   |   | N/A   | 6   | -2  |
| Compliance with FWF Myanmar policy                           | Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain |   |   | N/A   | 6   | -2  |
| Compliance with FWF guidance on abrasive blasting            | Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain |   |   | N/A   | 6   | -2  |

Comment: Alchemist has been working in Portugal and India for more than ten years thus relies on their industry knowledge of working in these countries. Additionally, audits of production location are collected and assessed before starting collaboration. Alchemist also looks for any other existing certification as proof of commitment by factories.

Recommendation: FWF recommends for Alchemist to review the FWF country studies for India and Macedonia myo

| 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<br>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: Alchemist shares production locations with other FWF member companies in Portugal. In 2016, Alchemist worked alongside Filippa K and Anna van Toor in a project to resolve 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. | Member<br>undertakes<br>additional<br>activities to<br>monitor<br>suppliers | Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws. | Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires. | 2     | 2   | 0   |

Comment: Alchemist worked on a living wage project together with Filippa K and Anne van Toor at one of their main Portugese suppliers.

| 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.  | None                         | 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.                    | No external<br>brands resold | 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.   | N/A   | 2   | 0   |
| 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). | No external<br>brands resold | 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. | N/A   | 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: 15

### 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.,<br>demonstrating who<br>the designated staff<br>person is.        | 1     | 1   | -1  |
|   |        |  |  |       |     |     |
| 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: During visits, worker information sheets are checked. Furthermore agents also act as intermediaries who collect evidence of posted worker information sheets in factories.

| 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. | 0%     | 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. | 1     | 4   | 0   |

Comment: Alchemist has not managed to conduct audits on their production location due to low leverage at locations.

**Recommendation**: FWF recommends Alchemist propose verification audits at the Macedonian. Furthermore, Alchemist should distribute cards workers in Macedonia.

| 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<br>complaints<br>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<br>complaints or<br>cooperation<br>not possible /<br>necessary | of other customers by the FWF member | Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc. | N/A   | 2   | 0   |

## COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 7

#### 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: All staff at Alchemist is informed about FWF membership. Sales staff are given an introduction with the information and brochures available from FWF, to share the story behind the clothes.

| 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: The production manager and the external FWF project manager both joined FWF's annual conference. All staff are usually updated about activities that are implemented for FWF membership. Sales staff, freelancers and other staff in contact with suppliers are all highly knowledgeable of FWF requirements.

| 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 +<br>actively<br>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 a crucial part of Alchemist's sourcing strategy. They support the selection of suppliers and are able to track progress. Agents are informed and actively support the implementation of FWF membership requirements by discussing information about FWF with the suppliers and asking them for additional information such as audit reports.

| 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) | 0%     | Lack of knowledge and skills on best practices related to labour standards is acommon 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. | 0     | 6   | 0   |

| 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<br>production is<br>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

#### 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: Nearly 15% of Alchemist's 2016 production volume came from one Turkish supplier. This factory was unwilling to share information about labour standards or possible subcontracting with the member and therefore Alchemist discontinued their relationship with them. The however were able to collect their audit report despite unwillingness to set up any CAP or follow-up.

| 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: Given the small number of employees in the company, all staff is informed about working conditions at suppliers and information is easily shared.

#### INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 4

### Additional comments on Information Management:

In 2016, Alchemist started a large social media campaign as well as increasing their transparency through newsletters, press events and visit of larger resellers and consumers to inform them of the Alchemist mission, approach and their FWF membership.

#### 6. TRANSPARENCY

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS  | RESULT   | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR  | DOCUMENTATION  | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|---|--|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 6.1 Degree of member company compliance with FWF Communications Policy. | Minimum<br>communications<br>requirements<br>are met AND no<br>significant<br>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: Alchemist complies to the FWF Communication Policy.

| 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   |

Recommendation: Alchemist is already looking into publishing agents and a interactive map for consumers online where production locations are disclosed, FWF commends this effort and encourages that it publish this information.

| 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<br>and accurate<br>report<br>submitted to<br>FWF | The social report is an important tool for members to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders. Member companies should not make any claims in their social report that do not correspond with FWF's communication policy. | Social report that is in line with FWF's communication policy. | 1     | 2   | -1  |

Comment: Alchemist publishes social report on their website.

## TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 6

#### 7. EVALUATION

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS   | RESULT | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR  | DOCUMENTATION   | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|--|--------|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 7.1 Systemic annual evaluation of FWF membership is conducted with involvement of top management                           | Yes    | An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company.   | Meeting minutes,<br>verbal reporting,<br>Powerpoints, etc.  | 2     | 2   | 0   |
|  | I      | T   | I   |       |     |     |
| 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. | 50%    | 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. | 4     | 4   | -2  |

Comment: Alchemist invested in visiting and having discussions with management at high risk areas.

Recommendation: Alchemist can still make more use of the FWF country studies, contact the local stakeholders and make more inquiry of local legislation. Furthermore, verification audits can be requested to factories.

#### **EVALUATION**

Possible Points: 6

## RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

Alchemist would like to see a database list of all FWF shared factories created for the willing members.

## SCORING OVERVIEW

| CATEGORY                       | EARNED | POSSIBLE |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Purchasing Practices           | 22     | 36       |
| Monitoring and Remediation     | 13     | 15       |
| Complaints Handling            | 4      | 7        |
| Training and Capacity Building | 5      | 11       |
| Information Management         | 4      | 7        |
| Transparency                   | 4      | 6        |
| Evaluation                     | 6      | 6        |
| Totals:                        | 58     | 88       |

#### BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

66

#### PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

#### BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

#### Date of Brand Performance Check:

29-05-2017

Conducted by:

Sandra Gonza, Maargreet Vrieling

Interviews with:

Caroline Mewe (CEO)
Annelies van Tiggelen (Production Manager)
Marie-Claire Mulder (External FWF project manager)