

Brand Performance Check Anchor Workwear BV

Publication date: October 2021

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

About the Brand Performance Check

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

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

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

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

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

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

On COVID-19

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

Brand Performance Check Overview

Anchor Workwear BV

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

| Member company information | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Headquarters: | Bergen op Zoom , Netherlands |
| Member since: | 2013-07-01 |
| Product types: | Workwear |
| Production in countries where Fair Wear is active: | Bulgaria, Viet Nam |
| Production in other countries: | Netherlands |
| 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 | 100% |
| Benchmarking score | 53 |
| Category | Good |

Summary:

Anchor Workwear has met most of Fair Wear's performance requirements. With a benchmarking score of 53, and a monitoring threshold of 100%, Anchor Workwear is placed in the 'Good' category.

Corona Addendum:

In 2020, Anchor Workwear was not heavily affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. After seeing an initial decline in turnover after COVID-19 hit, the summer of 2020 helped compensate the initial loss. During the last quarter of 2020, Anchor Workwear's employees were working up to 30% reduced hours. Overall, the brand has closed the year with a slightly higher turnover compared to the previous year.

Anchor Workwear did not cancel any orders in 2020. The brand kept in close daily contact with its suppliers to discuss potential issues. In 2020, there were no factory closures and suppliers were able to continue to pay the wages of workers with support of the brand. At its own suppliers, Anchor Workwear had full insight to the financial situation of the factories and issued prepayments to ensure wages were paid. In dialogue with the third supplier in Vietnam, orders were reduced as the supplier received a large order to produce face masks. The production was moved and prioritised to Anchor Workwear's own suppliers.

Especially in Vietnam, strict COVID-19 measures were in place which suppliers were able to organise and adhere to independently. The measures did not impact the capacity at the production locations significantly. Anchor Workwear was able to take this into account while planning orders thanks to its high leverage and long-standing relationships.

Anchor Workwear does not have a system in place to formally assess the human rights risks at its suppliers and has not identified COVID-19 related risks. Anchor Workwear does not recognise country specific risks to be relevant to apply and assess on its suppliers. At existing production locations, risks are usually assessed through visits of Anchor Workwear's management to the suppliers. In 2020 this was not possible due to the travel restrictions of COVID-19. Instead, Anchor Workwear kept in daily contact with its suppliers through Skype to discuss the situation. Fair Wear recommends mapping out potential risks and verify through additional monitoring tools whether such issues are not present at its suppliers.

Performance Category Overview

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

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

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

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

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

1. Purchasing Practices

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------|--|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity. | 100% | Member companies with less than 10% of a production location's production capacity generally have limited influence on production location managers to make changes. | Supplier information provided by member company. | 4 | 4 | 0 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear works with two main production locations in Bulgaria and Vietnam where it buys 100% of the production capacity of the production location. The brand formally owns the production location in Bulgaria and is connected strongly to the supplier in Vietnam with family ties. At one other production location in Vietnam, Anchor Workwear buys more than 30% of the production capacity. In the Netherlands it works with a small workshop below its office for sampling and small changes.

| 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. | 0% | Fair Wear provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts. | Production location information as provided to Fair Wear. | 4 | 4 | 0 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear has a small workshop in its office in the Netherlands for sampling and small changes where it produces less than 2% of total FOB.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.2 Percentage of production volume from production locations where a business relationship has existed for at least five years. | 65% | 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: Anchor Workwear has a steady and long-term relationship with its suppliers. Anchor Workwear did not start new business relationships in 2020.

| 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: Anchor Workwear did not start any production at a new production location in 2020 and all existing production locations signed and returned the questionnaire with 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 suppliers. | Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments. | 2 | 4 | 0 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear is dedicated to maintaining and growing long business relationships and is reluctant to source at new suppliers. If a new production location would be added, Anchor Workwear would request existing audit reports and visit the factory to assess working conditions before deciding to source there.

Anchor Workwear does not have a system in place to formally assess the human rights risks at its suppliers. Anchor Workwear does not recognise country specific risks to be relevant to its suppliers. At existing production locations, risks are usually assessed through visits of Anchor Workwear's management to the suppliers. In 2020 this was not possible due to the travel restrictions of COVID-19. Instead, Anchor Workwear kept in daily contact with its suppliers through Skype, especially with its two main production locations where they hold 100% leverage in Bulgaria and Vietnam. Anchor Workwear assumes working conditions are not at risk with the close contact it holds with suppliers. No risks were flagged with the brand by suppliers. At its other supplier in Vietnam, Anchor Workwear feels confident about safe and decent working conditions as it knows the supplier well and the supplier is certified with SA8000. Anchor Workwear relies on information given by the suppliers to identify potential human rights' risks. This is done daily while being in contact with management, during visits Anchor Workwear's management also speaks to workers. In 2020, this was not possible.

Requirement: A formal process should exist to evaluate the risks of labour violations in the production areas Anchor Workwear is operating. This evaluation should influence the decision on whether to place orders, how to prevent and mitigate risks, and what remediation steps may be necessary.

Recommendation: The member is recommended to have frequent meetings with its suppliers to check areas of risk and closely monitor the COVID-19 situation and its challenges. To help the conversation, Anchor Workwear could use the ETI/FW brand/supplier conversation framework that is referred to in the 'Handbook COVID-19 Lost wages and jobs series'.

A COVID-19 risk assessment should include country specific information regarding the lockdown and supplier specific information regarding its financial impact. It should link the changes in the member's purchasing practices to its impact on suppliers. This risk assessment should serve as the basis for dialogue between the member and supplier. Additionally, members are encouraged to be aware of the COVID-19 guidance issued by local authorities in their production countries.

| 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: Anchor Workwear travels each year to its main production locations in Bulgaria and Vietnam and discusses the working conditions with factory management and workers in the factory. As no visits were possible in 2020, this was facilitated on Skype. There are no formal notes of these meetings and there is no systematic follow up. Anchor Workwear feels confident the Code of Labour Practices are the standard after working together for many years.

Anchor Workwear does not keep an overview of any evaluation and does not reward suppliers based on their performance. It has committed to producing in the current production locations and is not planning to leave.

In 2020, Anchor Workwear did not cancel any orders in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The suppliers had to implement measures such as social distancing, wearing face masks and washing hands regularly. The suppliers were able to organise this themselves.

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 Anchor Workwear BV consistently evaluates the entire supplier base and includes information into decision-making procedures.

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

Fair Wear recommends Anchor Workwear to start documenting the annual evaluation visits to its main production locations to keep track of implemented changes and improvements per production location.

| 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: Anchor Workwear has regular contact with its suppliers about their production planning. It knows the production capacity of its main suppliers and knows the standard minutes needed per style at two of its major suppliers, for the third supplier it has agreed on a number of labour minutes the supplier can achieve.

Anchor Workwear is able to plan the number of production minutes per supplier based on the available capacity within the factories. Given the high leverage and long term business relationships at production locations owned by Anchor Workwear, the factories are able to accurately plan orders, taking the production capacity of the respective supplier into account. Production is planned in 4-week blocks at each of its production locations, taking available capacity into account. The production process from material to end product is clear for persons in the office and working directly with the factories. If at an early stage in the process extra time is needed, Anchor Workwear's clients are informed about delays.

| 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 |

Comment: No production delays and excessive overtime have been found.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|----------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.8 Member company can demonstrate the link between its buying prices and wage levels in production locations. | Advanced | Understanding the labour component of buying prices is an essential first step for member companies towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages – and towards the implementation of living wages. | Interviews with production staff, documents related to member's pricing policy and system, buying contracts. | 4 | 4 | 0 |

Comment: For its two main production locations, Anchor Workwear has direct insight into operating costs, labour costs and minutes per item which is updated annually. The price per minute is updated when labour costs rise. The brand is able to link the prices it pays to the wages workers get. The company has not yet used this information to calculate how it contributes to higher wages at their production locations.

There were no extra costs due to COVID-19 identified and taken into account in pricing.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Anchor Workwear to work towards the same level of transparency on wage levels at its non-owned supplier in Vietnam.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.9 Member company actively responds if production locations fail to pay legal minimum wages and/or fail to provide wage data to verify minimum wage is paid. | Yes | If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage or minimum wage payments cannot be verified, Fair Wear member companies are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law. Payment below minimum wage must be remediated urgently. | Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, Fair Wear Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a Fair Wear auditor, or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved. | 0 | O | -2 |

Comment: In 2020, there were no factory closures and no orders were cancelled by Anchor Workwear. As the brand has 100% leverage at two suppliers and insight into the third supplier in Vietnam. There was no risk that legal minimum wage could not be paid.

For piece rate workers in Bulgaria, the minimum of legal minimum wage was always paid even though some workers did not finish a sufficient amount of garments.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--------|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.10 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by member company. | No | Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on production locations and their ability to pay workers on time. Most garment workers have minimal savings, and even a brief delay in payments can cause serious problems. | Based on a complaint or audit report; review of production location and member company financial documents. | 0 | 0 | -1 |

Comment: In 2020, no evidence of late payments was found.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--------------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.11 Degree to which member company assesses and responds to root causes for wages that are lower than living wages in production locations. | Insufficient | Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach | Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: Internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc | 0 | 6 | 0 |

Comment: Most workers at Anchor Workwear's production locations earn between the legal minimum wage and the next living wage estimate as referred to in the wage ladder of the audit report. At the production location in Bulgaria, at least half of the workers earn lower than the living wage estimate.

At its supplier in Vietnam where Anchor Workwear has 20% leverage, the wages are set by the supplier itself. The brand does not review how the wages are set but trust the supplier to make sure it is sufficient.

Anchor Workwear has not determined a target wage or discussed how to finance wage increases to the next living wage estimate at their production locations.

Requirement: Anchor Workwear must assess the root causes of wages that are lower than living wages, taking into account its leverage and effect of its own pricing policy. Anchor Workwear is expected to take an active role in discussing living wages with its suppliers, especially given its high leverage and ownership. The Fair Wear wage ladder can be used as a tool to implement living wages, to document, monitor, negotiate and evaluate the improvements at its suppliers.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Anchor Workwear to involve worker representatives and local organisations in assessing root causes of wages lower than living wages. It is advised that the outcomes of the root cause analysis are discussed internally and with top management, to form a basis for an embedded strategy.

| 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). | 31% | Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an member company's score. | Supplier information provided by member company. | 1 | 2 | 0 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear owns one of its production facilities based in Bulgaria, responsible for 31% of its total FOB.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.13 Member company determines and finances wage increases. | None | Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach. | Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc. | 0 | 6 | 0 |

Comment: Wages in Anchor Workwear's production locations are relatively high. In Bulgaria, half of the production workers earn above a local living wage estimate and in Vietnam workers earn above the Global Living Wage Coalition estimate. Anchor Workwear has calculated what price increase is needed to reach the next living wage estimate, Asian Floor wage, for its production location in Vietnam. Anchor Workwear concluded that the gap to the Asian Floor wage estimate is too big to be covered.

Anchor Workwear has not determined how they could increase the wages of all workers at the production location in Bulgaria towards the living wage estimate. Any increase of wages is determined by input from the suppliers including inflation. This is not to work towards a specific target wage, but in dialogue with the suppliers wage increases are set. The increase is financed fully by Anchor Workwear.

Requirement: Anchor Workwear buys exclusively at one production location and owns a production location, the member company has full influence over the wages and should be able to cost for a living wage.

Recommendation: Anchor Workwear could look into what in-between steps could be taken with its production locations to address wages below a living wage. In determining what is needed and how wages should be increased, it is recommended to involve worker representation.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.14 Percentage of production volume where the member company pays its share of the target wage. | 50% | Fair Wear member companies are challenged to adopt approaches that absorb the extra costs of increasing wages. | Member company's own documentation, evidence of target wage implementation, such as wage reports, factory documentation, communication with factories, etc. | 4 | 6 | 0 |

Comment: In Anchor's production location in Vietnam, all workers earn above the living wage estimate provided by the Global Living Wage Coalition for Rural Vietnam. In Bulgaria, half of the production workers earn above a local living wage estimate.

Recommendation: Anchor Workwear is encouraged to pay its share of the next living wage estimate at the production location in Vietnam and increase workers wages for all workers at the production location in Bulgaria.

Purchasing Practices

Possible Points: 46

Earned Points: 28

2. Monitoring and Remediation

| Basic measurements | Result | Comments |
|--|--------|--|
| % of production volume where an audit took place. | 100% | |
| % of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled. | 100% | To be counted towards the monitoring threshold, FWF low-risk policy should be implemented. See indicator 2.9. (N/A = no production in low risk countries.) |
| Member meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations. | Yes | |
| Requirement(s) for next performance check | | |
| Total monitoring threshold: | 100% | Measured as percentage of production volume (Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100%) |

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------|--|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.1 Specific staff person is designated to follow up on problems identified by monitoring system. | Yes | Followup is a serious part of Fair Wear membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis. | Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is. | 2 | 2 | -2 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear's head of operations and management is in charge of responding and following up on any problems identified within their suppliers, supported by the purchasing manager for production in Vietnam.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.2 Quality of own auditing system meets FWF standards. | Member makes use of FWF audits and/or external audits only | In case Fair Wear teams cannot be used, the member companies' own auditing system must ensure sufficient quality in order for Fair Wear to approve the auditing system. | Information on audit methodology. | N/A | 0 | -1 |

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--------|--|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.3 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory and worker representation where applicable. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner. | Yes | 2 part indicator: Fair Wear audit reports were shared and discussed with suppliers within two months of audit receipt AND a reasonable time frame was specified for resolving findings. | Corrective Action Plans, emails; findings of followup audits; brand representative present during audit exit meeting, etc. | 2 | 2 | -1 |

Comment: Audit reports and CAP findings are shared with the factory and progress is monitored during factory visits as well by Skype and email. Audit reports are not shared with worker representatives through Skype but only during visits, which did not happen in 2020.

Recommendation: In case worker representation is applicable in the factory, the CAP should be shared with worker representatives also when not visiting and they should be involved in setting the time frame for realising improvements.

| 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 | Fair Wear considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that member companies can do towards improving working conditions. | CAP-related documentation including status of findings, documentation of remediation and follow up actions taken by member. Reports of quality assessments. Evidence of understanding relevant issues. | 4 | 8 | -2 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear makes use of its local staff as well as regular visits to monitor the progress of agreed timelines of follow-up and remediation. All CAPs of the initial audit at the production location in Bulgaria were reported as resolved by the verification audit. From the Fair Wear audits done in 2018 in Vietnam, some issues were still open in 2020, mainly related to occupational health and safety. The supplier did not conduct a occupational health and safety risk assessment as required by law, there has not been a safety training for staff, internal safety audits and fire system approval and acceptance documents were missing and there were no automatic fire alarm systems. These findings were planned to be resolved in 2020 but didn't happen because it was on hold due to COVID-19. Anchor Workwear would like to hire external consultants to follow up on CAPs, since its suppliers' management lacks expertise.

There was another open finding in Vietnam about Freedom of Association as there was no independent union and/or independent worker committee. Anchor Workwear is not opposed workers organising this as such but does not believe stimulating the process is useful as issues should be addressed directly with management. Anchor Workwear believes there's no added value for workers to be elected as it has no clear indication that workers have a need for this. If so, Anchor Workwear would be open to this.

As Anchor did not focus its due diligence efforts on pandemic related risks, no COVID-19 related issues were identified on which the brand could follow up.

Recommendation: The feedback and supportive evidence that is sent by suppliers can be complex and difficult to interpret when unfamiliar with the local laws and expertise. It's advised to work with the external consultants to solve urgent issues related to occupational health and safety as soon as possible.

Fair Wear also recommends Anchor Workwear to gradually ensure factories establish independent worker representation and involve these representatives in monitoring and remediation of findings. A first step could be to introduce the WEP Communication training at its main supplier in Vietnam. This will also help the functioning of the dialogue meetings that are required by local legislation

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|----------------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.5 Percentage of production volume from production locations that have been visited by the member company in the previous financial year. | not applicable | Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, brands could often not visit their suppliers from March - December 2020. For consistency purposes, we therefore decided to score all our member brands N/A on visiting suppliers over the year 2020. | Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor. | N/A | 4 | 0 |

Comment: As visits were often not possible between March and December 2020, all members receive an N/A score on this indicator.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|---|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.6 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected. | No existing reports/all audits by FWF or FWF member company | 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. | N/A | 3 | O |

Comment: All of Anchor Workwear's production locations are audited by Fair Wear.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies. | Average insufficient result on relevant policies | Aside from regular monitoring and remediation requirements under Fair Wear membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. Fair Wear requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by Fair Wear. | Policy documents, inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories, reports of meetings with suppliers, reports of additional activities and/or attendance lists as mentioned in policy documents. | -2 | 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 |
| Compliance with FWF guidance on risks related to Turkish garment factories employing Syrian refugees | Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain | | | N/A | 6 | -2 |
| Other risks specific to the member's supply chain are addressed by its monitoring system | Insufficient | | | -2 | 6 | -2 |

Comment: As described in 1.4, Anchor Workwear does not have a formal system in place to assess human right risks and therefore follow up on risks has been limited. In 2020, Anchor Workwear shared resources on health and safety with its suppliers and verified COVID-19 safety measures were in place at suppliers through Skype.

In 2020, there were no factory closures at Anchor Workwear's suppliers. The suppliers were able to continue to pay the wages of workers. Anchor Workwear checked the financial overview of its two main suppliers in Vietnam and Bulgaria and made prepayments to ensure wages were being paid, which were settled with the following invoices. The brand prioritised its production at the suppliers where it holds 100% leverage. The other supplier in Vietnam received a large orders for face masks and through that was able to compensate the reduced orders of Anchor Workwear. In Vietnam there were strict COVID-19 measures in place. Anchor Workwear did not make use of any alternative monitoring tools.

Requirement: Anchor Workwear's monitoring system should identify and address high risk issues that are specific to the member's sourcing practices. Fair Wear provides policies and country-specific requirements to member companies. Priorities in remediation efforts are guided by these policies.

Please note that following Fair Wear's policy for repeated non-compliance in Fair Wear's Brand Performance Checks, members that receive an insufficient or -2 score on this indicator for the second year in a row, will be placed in the 'Needs Improvement' category.

Recommendation: Knowing the country specific risks facilitates the starting point for discussing this with suppliers. Member companies can agree on additional commitments that are required to mitigate risks. Anchor Workwear can provide additional measures for support and integrate that in the monitoring system.

| 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. | No CAPs active, no shared production locations or refusal of other company to cooperate | 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. | N/A | 2 | -1 |

Comment: No shared production locations.

| 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. | 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. Fair Wear has defined minimum monitoring requirements for production locations in low-risk countries. | Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of Fair Wear membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires. | 2 | 2 | O |

Member undertakes additional activities to monitor suppliers.: N/A (N/A)

Comment: Anchor Workwear has a workshop within its office in the Netherlands, where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled, but no additional activities to monitor have taken place.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits at tail-end production locations (when the minimum required monitoring threshold is met). | No | Fair Wear encourages its members to monitor 100% of its production locations and rewards those members who conduct full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold. | Production location information as provided to Fair Wear and recent Audit Reports. | N/A | 2 | 0 |

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.11 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from external brands resold by the member company. | Yes, and member has collected necessary information | Fair Wear believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of Fair Wear or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods. | Questionnaires are on file. | 2 | 2 | O |

Comment: Anchor Workwear has one external brand, it has signed and returned the questionnaire and shared additional information about its approach to social compliance.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.12 External brands resold by member companies that are members of another credible initiative (% of external sales volume). | 0% | Fair Wear believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods. | External production data in Fair Wear's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by Fair Wear or FLA members. | 0 | 3 | O |

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------------|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 2.13 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from licensees. | No licensees | Fair Wear believes it is important for member companies to know if the licensee is committed to the implementation of the same labour standards and has a monitoring system in place. | Questionnaires are on file. Contracts with licensees. | N/A | 1 | 0 |

Monitoring and Remediation

Possible Points: 25

Earned Points: 10

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 Fair Wear membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis. | Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is. | 1 | 1 | -1 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear's head of operations and management is in charge of responding on worker complaints, supported by the purchasing manager for production in Vietnam.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--------|--|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 3.2 Member company has informed factory management and workers about the FWF CoLP and complaints hotline. | Yes | Informing both management and workers about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and complaints hotline is a first step in alerting workers to their rights. The Worker Information Sheet is a tool to do this and should be visibly posted at all production locations. | Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from production location visits, etc. | 2 | 2 | -2 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear usually visits its suppliers annually and during these visits it verified whether the Worker Information Sheets are posted. This was not possible in 2020 but was facilitated on Skype instead.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--------|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 3.3 Degree to which member company has actively raised awareness of the FWF CoLP and complaints hotline. | 31% | After informing workers and management of the Fair Wear CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural workermanagement dialogue. | Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes. | 4 | 6 | 0 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear organised a WEP Basic training at its main production location in Bulgaria in 2018. The brand did not share the Fair Wear COVID-19 worker information video which was available for Bulgaria.

Recommendation: Anchor Workwear could consider implementing additional activities to raise awareness about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and Fair Wear complaint helpline next to providing good quality training. This could include providing the Fair Wear worker information cards to workers during visits or when handing out pay slips, making use of Fair Wear Factory Guide, stimulating peer-to-peer learning among workers and ensuring factory management regularly informs workers, in particular new workers, about their rights and available grievance mechanisms.

| 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 Fair Wear member company can be critical in resolving a complaint at a supplier. | Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc. | N/A | 2 | O |

Complaints Handling

Possible Points: 9

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

Comment: Anchor Workwear is a small company with seven people. During the monthly staff meeting, everyone is updated on Fair Wear membership.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|--------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 4.2 All staff in direct contact with suppliers are informed of FWF requirements. | Yes | Sourcing, purchasing and CSR staff at a minimum should possess the knowledge necessary to implement Fair Wear requirements and advocate for change within their organisations. | Fair Wear Seminars or equivalent trainings provided; presentations, curricula, etc. | 2 | 2 | -1 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear's head of operations and management and the purchasing manager are in direct contact with suppliers and are aware of Fair Wear 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. | Member does not use agents/contractors | Agents have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is the responsibility of member company to ensure agents actively support the implementation of the CoLP. | Correspondence with agents, trainings for agents, Fair Wear audit findings. | N/A | 2 | 0 |

Comment: None of the suppliers of Anchor Workwear have participated in training programmes that support transformative processes.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Anchor Workwear to implement training programmes that support factory-level transformation such as establishing functional internal grievance mechanisms, improving worker-management dialogue and communication skills or addressing gender-based violence. Training assessed under this indicator should go beyond raising awareness and focus on behavioural and structural change to improve working conditions. To this end, members can make use of Fair Wear's WEP Communication or Violence and Harassment Prevention modules or implement advanced training through external training providers or brand staff. Non-Fair Wear training must follow the standards outlined in Fair Wear's guidance and checklist available on the Member Hub.

Fair Wear offers the WEP communication programme in Vietnam, this programme could be a good next step for the main supplier in Vietnam.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 4.5 Degree to which member company follows up after a training programme. | No training programmes have been conducted or member produces solely in low-risk countries | After factory-level training programmes, complementary activities such as remediation and changes on brand level will achieve a lasting impact. | Documentation of discussions with factory management and worker representatives, minutes of regular worker-management dialogue meetings or anti-harassment committees. | N/A | 2 | 0 |

Training and Capacity Building

Possible Points: 9

Earned Points: 3

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: Most of Anchor Workwear's production takes place at its own production location in Bulgaria or at the production location in Vietnam where it has 100% leverage. Anchor Workwear knows the capacity minutes and has insight into whether subcontractors need to be used. With its other Vietnamese production location, it has been discussed several times that subcontractors should not be used for Anchor Workwear's production. During production this has been checked and it has been verified that this is not the case.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Anchor to set up an agreement with Vietnamese suppliers stating that outsourcing can only be done prior to orders with explicit agreement from Anchor and only at locations approved by the member.

| 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: Anchor Workwear's head of operations and management and its purchasing manager are the ones in direct contact with suppliers and regularly update each other on working conditions at production locations.

Information Management

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 4

6. Transparency

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|---|--|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 6.1 Degree of member company compliance with FWF Communications Policy. | Minimum communications requirements are met AND no significant problems found | Fair Wear's communications policy exists to ensure transparency for consumers and stakeholders, and to ensure that member communications about Fair Wear are accurate. Members will be held accountable for their own communications as well as the communications behaviour of 3rd-party retailers, resellers and customers. | Fair Wear membership is communicated on member's website; other communications in line with Fair Wear communications policy. | 2 | 2 | -3 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear communicates about Fair Wear on its website and the logo is included in the email signature of its employees.

| Performance indicators | Result | Relevance of Indicator | Documentation | Score | Max | Min |
|--|---|---|--|-------|-----|-----|
| 6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities. | Published Brand Performance Checks, audit reports, and/or other efforts lead to increased transparency. | Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of Fair Wear's work and shares best practices with the industry. | Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List. | 1 | 2 | 0 |

Comment: Anchor Workwear's Brand Performance Check is published 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 submitted to FWF AND published on member's website. | The social report is an important tool for members to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders. Member companies should not make any claims in their social report that do not correspond with Fair Wear's communication policy. | Social report that is in line with Fair Wear's communication policy. | 2 | 2 | -1 |

Comment: The social report of 2020 is published on Anchor Workwear's website.

Transparency

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 5

7. Evaluation

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

Comment: Top management is responsible for Fair Wear membership. Results of the Brand Performance Check, audits, complaints are discussed by the management team. The reasons for becoming a Fair Wear member were to show external verification of Anchor Workwear's efforts to improve labour conditions.

| 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. | 0% | In each Brand Performance Check report, Fair Wear may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of Fair Wear membership and its process approach. | Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check. | -2 | 4 | -2 |

Comment: There were two requirements related to indicators 1.11 and 1.5 relevant to 2020. Both of these requirements were not followed up by Anchor Workwear. The brand did not agree with the need to improve as mentioned in these requirements.

Requirement: It is required to work towards remediation of previous requirements from the last Brand Performance Check. Further engagement needs to be taken with regard to the following requirements mentioned in the last Brand Performance Check.

Evaluation

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 0

Recommendations to Fair Wear

Anchor Workwear feels that the process of performance checking is inefficient and bureaucratic. As the performance checker of Fair Wear differs each year, it's not seen as an efficient process. Anchor Workwear would like Fair Wear to recognise the differences of its company better to fit with its way of working and addressing labour issues.

Scoring Overview

| Category | Earned | Possible |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Purchasing Practices | 28 | 46 |
| Monitoring and Remediation | 10 | 25 |
| Complaints Handling | 7 | 9 |
| Training and Capacity Building | 3 | 9 |
| Information Management | 4 | 7 |
| Transparency | 5 | 6 |
| Evaluation | 0 | 6 |
| Totals: | 57 | 108 |

Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

53

Performance Benchmarking Category

Good

Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

30-06-2021

Conducted by:

Kathleen Gabriel