



Brand Performance Check

Schijvens Confectiefabriek

June 2013

This report covers the evaluation period
01/2012 - 04/2013

About the Brand Performance Check

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

FWF's Brand Performance Check is a tool to evaluate and report on the activities of FWF's affiliate members. The Checks examine how affiliate management systems support FWF's Code of Labour Practices.

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

Even if outcomes at the factory level cannot be guaranteed, the importance of good management practices by affiliates cannot be understated. Even one concerned customer at a factory 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 factory 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.

Improvement of supply chains is a step-by-step process, through which affiliates must address many different issues. FWF affiliates vary greatly in management structures, and have different strengths. The Performance Benchmarking system is designed to reflect these differences, and the many different ways that a company can support better working conditions.

During the Brand Performance Check, FWF staff speak to various employees at the affiliate who have important roles to play in the management of supply chains. FWF verifies the actions of affiliates based on several sources including documentation of activities, financial records, the affiliate's supplier register and staff interviews. Following the Brand Performance Check, FWF summarizes findings in this report, which is made public via www.fairwear.org. The FWF Performance Benchmarking Guide provides more information about the indicators and is available for download.

Brand Performance Check Details

Date of Brand Performance Check

27-6-2013

Conducted by:

Kees Gootjes

Interviews With:

Marjolein de Vroed
Jaap Rijnsdorp
Shirley Schijvens

Assistant Purchasing and CSR
Head of Purchasing
Commercial Director and Co-owner

Scoring

Affiliate Benchmarking scores and Performance Benchmarking categories will be published starting in 2014. During 2013, FWF will be testing out the new system and evaluating the appropriate threshold levels for Benchmarking categories.

Schijvens Confectiefabriek

2013 Brand Performance Check

Affiliate Information		
Headquarters:	Hilvarenbeek	Netherlands
Member Since:	March	2010
Product Types:	Workwear	
Production countries:	FWF Active Countries: Bangladesh, China, Portugal, Turkey Other countries: Pakistan, Egypt	
Basic Requirements		
Workplan for this evaluation period was submitted?	Yes	Must be submitted before start of evaluation period
Projected supplier register for this evaluation was submitted?	Yes	Must be submitted before start of evaluation period
Actual supplier register for this evaluation period has been submitted?	Yes	Must be submitted after the end of the evaluation period.
Membership fee has been paid?	Yes	
All suppliers have been notified of FWF membership?	Yes	Schijvens has notified their suppliers in the past and has done it again recently.
Scoring Overview		
% of suppliers under monitoring	23,40%	

Summary	<p>Schijvens was for various internal reasons unable to dedicate enough time to FWF membership in 2012. This is reflected in the BPC. At the same time, however, Schijvens has recently undertaken a significant amount of steps to remedy this situation, including initiating audits and setting up internal processes for better coordinating and streamlining its system that keeps track of labour conditions.</p> <p>FWF has made a number of recommendations in the report, and urges Schijvens to continue on with the initiatives that it has recently taken.</p>
----------------	--

Purchasing Practices

Basic Measures		Comments
% of production in low-risk countries	1.5%	Countries with relatively low risk of labour violations as defined by FWF.

Performance Indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation
1.1 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where affiliate buys at least 10% of production capacity.	43%	Affiliates with less than 10% of a factories' production capacity generally have limited influence on factory managers to make changes.	Supplier register provided by affiliate.
	Comment: Percentage based on Supplier Register provided by Schijvens.		
1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years.	19%	Stable business relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give factories a reason to invest in improving working conditions.	Supplier register provided by affiliate.
	Comment: Percentage based on Supplier Register provided by Schijvens.		
1.3 Labour conditions are considered when selecting new suppliers.	Yes	Including labour conditions considerations in selecting suppliers supports responsible business practices.	Documentation of decisionmaking process; e.g. checklists for buyers, emails, etc.
	Comment: Schijvens introduces FWF membership and what this entails during the introduction for every potential new factory.		
1.4 All new suppliers are required to sign and return the Code of Labour Practices before first orders are placed.	No	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between factories and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.
	Comment: Schijvens does introduce FWF membership, and CoLP are required to be signed. In 2012, however, this was not yet done in a structured manner.		
1.5 Company conducts audits at all new suppliers before placing orders.	No	An important due diligence step. Before placing production orders, affiliates should conduct an audit at all new suppliers to assess risks for CoLP violations.	Audit documentation; must meet FWF audit quality standards.

1.6 Affiliate sources from an FWF factory member.	No	When possible, FWF encourages affiliates to source from FWF factory members. The small number of factories in the programme means sourcing from FWF factory members cannot be a requirement.	Supplier register provided by affiliate.
1.7 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the affiliate.	0%	Owning a supplier provides clear accountability for and direct influence over working conditions. It reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations.	Supplier register provided by affiliate.
Schijvens does not own any of its suppliers.			
1.8 Supplier compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systemic 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.
Comment: Schijvens is in the process of evaluating compliance with CoLP in a systematic manner. Recommendation: Schijvens needs to develop this system in order to make sure it continues to comply with FWF membership			
1.9 The affiliate's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	Strong, integrated systems in place.	Affiliate production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at factories.	Documentation of robust planning systems.
Comment: Although not written down or codified, Schijvens was able to demonstrate that it works to reduce/prevent overtime at a systematic level by knowing the production capacities of the factories and planning accordingly. Recommendation: FWF recommends that Schijvens further codify and structure a system for reducing and preventing overtime.			
1.10 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where excessive overtime is found by FWF.	100%	Excessive overtime is one of the most common labour rights violations in high-risk production countries. It is often caused by poor production planning by brands.	Audits conducted by FWF auditors; Complaints filed via the FWF worker helpline.
Comment: 1 audit was conducted in 2012, and a number of excessive overtime issues were found.			
1.11 Degree to which affiliate analyses and mitigates root causes of excessive overtime, if found.	Reactive approach.	Affiliate production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at factories.	Examples of root cause analyses and resulting changes in production planning/policy.
Comment: Schijvens discussed overtime issue with audited factory.			
1.12 Affiliate's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.	Affiliate can demonstrate a pricing policy based on country level data.	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.

	<p>Comment: Schijvens works on open pricing with its factories in order to gain insight into the cost of labour. These calculations do not yet provide an indication whether the labour costs allow for the payment of minimum wages.</p> <p>Recommendation: Work to link open pricing strategy with knowledge of legal minimum wages in each production country.</p>		
1.13 Affiliate actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages.	N/A	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage, FWF affiliates are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, FWF audit reports or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.
	<p>Comment: No audits in 2012 showed that suppliers failed to pay legal minimum wages.</p>		
1.14 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by affiliate.	No	Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on factories 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 factory and affiliate financial documents.
1.15 Degree to which affiliate assesses root causes of wages lower than living wages with suppliers.	No efforts shown.	Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to affiliates' policies.	Wage ladders, correspondance with supplier, other relevant documentation.
	<p>Comment: Currently Schijvens has not yet researched the root cause analysis of payment below local stakeholders estimates of living wages.</p> <p>Recommendation: FWF encourages the affiliate to discuss with suppliers about possibilities to work towards higher benchmarks.</p>		

Purchasing Practices Comments:

Monitoring & Remediation

Basic Measures		Comments
% of own production under monitoring	23,40%	Measured as a percentage of turnover.
Minimum monitoring threshold based on years of membership:	90% (does not meet threshold)	1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 90%

Performance Indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation
2.1 Specific staff person is designated to follow up on problems identified by monitoring system.	Yes	Followup is a serious part of FWF membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.
2.2 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans.	An in-depth effort has been made to address most or all CAPs.	FWF considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that affiliates can do towards improving working conditions.	Documentation of remediation and followup actions taken by affiliate
	Comment: As mentioned above, only one audit took place in 2012 and the supplier went bankrupt shortly after. Nevertheless, significant efforts were made to address the CAP and other issues. In 2013, a large number of audits will take place.		
2.3 Percentage of production volume from suppliers that have been visited by the affiliate in the past financial year.	75-89%	Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by affiliate staff or local representatives. They reinforce to factory managers that affiliates are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices.	Affiliates should document all factory visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.
	Comment: Schijvens estimated that it visited between 80-90% of suppliers in 2012.		
2.4 Existing audit reports are collected.	Yes	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.
	Comment: Schijvens has worked to collect existing audits.		

2.5 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner.	N/A	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.
Comment: CAP findings were discussed in a timely manner, but had limited value as factory went bankrupt.			
2.6 A structured approach is used to address issues that occur at multiple suppliers.	N/A	Issues that occur in multiple factories often need to be addressed in a systemic manner, especially when the root causes are located in brand management choices.	Documentation of a systemic approach: root cause analyses, productivity assessments, guidance documents, internal system changes, etc.
Comment: no multiple audits took place in 2012.			
2.7 Affiliate cooperates with other customers in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers.	N/A	Cooperation between customers increases leverage and chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the changes 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.
Comment: As far as FWF/Schijvens is aware, there were no shared audited suppliers in 2012.			
2.8 Monitoring requirements are fulfilled for production in low-risk countries.	Yes - No	Low risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with basic standards.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.
Comment: In 2012, Schijvens did not fulfill the monitoring requirements for low-risk countries.			
2.9 External brands resold by the affiliate who have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire. (% of external sales volume)	N/A	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.
Comment: Schijvens' use of external brands is so insignificant, that it is deemed N/A.			
2.10 External brands resold by affiliates that are members of another credible initiative. (% of external sales volume)	N/A	FWF believes affiliates who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to stock external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously.	Supplier register; Documentation of sales volumes of products made by FWF or FLA members.
Comment: Schijvens' use of external brands is so insignificant, that it is deemed N/A.			

Monitoring Comments:

Complaints Handling

Basic Measures		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
Number of worker complaints in process of being resolved.	N/A	
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check.	N/A	

Performance Indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation
3.1 A specific employee has been designated to address worker complaints.	Yes	Followup is a serious part of FWF membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.
3.2 System exists to check that the Worker Information Sheet is posted in factories.	No	The Worker Information Sheet is a key first step in alerting workers to their rights.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from factory visits, etc.
	Comment: At this point in time, no system exists to check that WIS are posted. Recommendation: FWF recommends that Schijvens sets up a system to ensure that this is done.		
3.3 Percentage of audited factories 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 factory-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.	Percentage of audited factories where at least 50% of interviewed workers indicate awareness of the FWF complaints mechanism.
	Comment: Audit report does not state that workers at the one audited factory in 2012 were aware of FWF worker helpline.		
3.4 All complaints received from factory workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure.	N/A	Involvement by the FWF affiliate is crucial in resolving a complaint at a supplier.	Documentation that affiliate has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process.

3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers	N/A	Because most factories supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the FWF affiliate can be critical in resolving a complaint at a	Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc.

Complaints Comments

--

Training & Capacity Building

Performance Indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation
4.1 Staff at affiliate is made aware of FWF membership requirements.	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.
Comment: FWF has presented at the organization, and FWF membership is known throughout the organization.			
4.2 Advanced training is provided to staff in direct contact with suppliers on CoLP 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.
Comment: Schijvens has taken efforts to ensure that relevant staff are aware of FWF membership requirements.			
4.3 Agents are informed of CoLP requirements and act to support their implementation.	Yes	Agents have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is the responsibility of affiliate to ensure agents actively support the implementation of the CoLP.	Correspondence with agents, trainings for agents, FWF audit findings.
Comment: Agents are informed about FWF membership.			
4.4 Factory participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume).	0%	Lack of knowledge on best practices related to labour standards is a common issue in factories. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards sustainable improvements.	Documentation of relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education Programme.
Comment: Schijvens is organizing a WEP at a factory in a WEP country in 2013.			
4.5 Factory participation in trainings (where WEP is not offered; by production volume).	0%	In areas where the Workplace Education Programme is not yet offered, affiliates may arrange trainings on their own. Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator.	Curricula, other documentation of training content, participation and outcomes.
Comment: At this point in time, Schijvens is not planning on organizing a training session at a factory in a non-WEP country.			



Training & Capacity Building Comments

--

Information Management

Performance Indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation
5.1 Supplier register for the previous financial year is verified as being complete and accurate.	Yes	Any improvements to supply chains require affiliates to first know all of their suppliers.	Completed supplier register; Financial records of previous financial year.
5.2 A system exists to allow purchasing, CSR and other relevant staff to share information with each other about working conditions at suppliers.	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.
	Comment: Schijvens has recently set up a system to share working conditions information among relevant staff.		

Information Management Comments:

Transparency

Performance Indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation
6.1 Communication about FWF membership adheres to the FWF communications policy.	Yes	FWF membership should be communicated in a clear and accurate manner. FWF guidelines are designed to prevent misleading claims.	Logo is placed on website; other communications in line with policy. Affiliates may lose points if there is evidence that they did not comply with the communications policy.
Comment: Schijvens communicates in an effective manner on FWF membership.			
6.2 Affiliate engages in advanced reporting activities.	Yes	Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of FWF's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Affiliate publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.
Comment: Schijvens publishes the Brand Performance Checks on its website.			
6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on affiliate's website	Not done.	The Social Report is an important tool for brands to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders.	Report adheres to FWF guidelines for Social Report content.
Comment: Schijvens has not submitted a Social Report for 2012.			

Transparency Comments:

Evaluation

Performance Indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation
7.1 Systemic annual evaluation of FWF membership is conducted with involvement of top management.	Yes	An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.
Comment: FWF was able to verify that FWF is evaluated regularly with involvement of top management.			
7.2 Percentage of required changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by affiliate.	67%	In each Brand Performance Check report, FWF may include requirements for changes to management practices. Adherence to these requirements is an important part of FWF membership.	Affiliate should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.
Comment: Schijvens followed up on 67% of the requirements of the previous BPC.			

Evaluation Comments:

Comments to FWF

This area provides an opportunity for affiliates to provide feedback to FWF.
