



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Manroof GmbH

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2013 to 31-12-2013

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 [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators and is available for download.

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Manroof GmbH

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2013 to 31-12-2013

AFFILIATE INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Zürich, Switzerland
Member since:	26-11-2008
Product types:	Promotional
Production in countries where FWF is active:	China, India, Italy, Portugal
Production in other countries:	Austria, Germany, Slovenia, Spain
BASIC REQUIREMENTS	
Workplan for this evaluation period was submitted?	Yes
Actual supplier register for this evaluation period has been submitted?	Yes
Membership fee has been paid?	Yes
All suppliers have been notified of FWF membership?	Yes
SCORING OVERVIEW	
% of own production under monitoring	92%
Benchmarking score	65
Category	Good

Summary:

Manroof met most FWF's management system requirements to improve working conditions. Manroof monitored 92% of its total purchasing volume, which met FWF's monitoring threshold. Manroof maintained stable relationship with over half of its suppliers. Manroof offered direct financial support to its main suppliers and used a local consultant to follow up on corrective action plans. In 2013, Manroof has focused on improving occupational health and safety in its four main suppliers in China.

As a promotional products company, Manroof found it a challenge to receive written commitments on FWF's code from its external suppliers and own suppliers located in low risk countries. The challenge was because Manroof bought smaller amount from these companies, thus had low leverage.

FWF encouraged Manroof to continue its efforts in China and involve more factories to join the Workplace Education Programme. In addition, Manroof is expected to ensure factories in low risk countries post the Code of Labour Practices.

PERFORMANCE CATEGORY OVERVIEW

Leader: This category is for affiliates who are doing exceptionally well, and are operating at an advanced level.

Good: It is FWF's belief that affiliates who are making a serious effort to implement the Code of Labour Practices—the vast majority of FWF affiliates—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 affiliates will receive a 'Good' rating.

Needs Improvement: Affiliates 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. Affiliates 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: Affiliates 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. Affiliates 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
1.1 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where affiliate buys at least 10% of production capacity	69%	Affiliates with less than 10% of a factories' production capacity generally have limited influence on factory managers to make changes.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	3	4	0

Comment: As a promotional product company, Manroof's volume depended on the order of its customers. The suppliers had their own specialties respectively. Manroof needed to maintain certain level of diversity in its production to attract and maintain customers. It was not realistic for Manroof to further consolidate its suppliers.

1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years	53%	Stable business relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give factories a reason to invest in improving working conditions.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	3	4	0
--	-----	--	---	---	---	---

1.3 All new suppliers are required to sign and return the Code of Labour Practices before first orders are placed.	Yes	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.	2	2	0
--	-----	---	---------------------------	---	---	---

Comment: Manroof informed all suppliers about its FWF membership and required the suppliers to sign the Code of Labour Practices. But suppliers in the low risk country did not always return the signed copy. These factories in Australia, Germany, etc, believed that they complied to European laws and were under the monitoring of government systems. Manroof had low leverage in those suppliers.

1.4 Company conducts human rights due diligence at all new suppliers before placing orders.	Yes	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.	4	4	0
---	-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: Manroof's CEO involved in and made decisions when choosing a new supplier. Working conditions were considered as well as quality, delivery time, price.

Manroof did not audit new supplier, while it required the suppliers to provide existing social audit reports to have a general idea about the working condition.

The CEO visited main suppliers in China every two years. In 2013, he visited all potential new suppliers in China and discussed FWF's requirements .

1.5 Supplier compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	Yes	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.	1	2	0
--	-----	--	---	---	---	---

Comment: As every supplier of Manroof had a different function in production, it was not possible for Manroof to reward a factory for its performance in terms of increasing orders.

Manroof tried to support all its main suppliers to implement FWF's Code of Labour Practices. Manroof had to gradually phase out a supplier in 2013 because the factory refused to make improvements.

1.6 The affiliate's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	General or ad-hoc system.	Affiliate production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at factories.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	2	4	0
---	---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: There was no peak seasons of production for Manroof.

According to client's order, delivery time ranged from 4 to 6 weeks in general. One third of Manroof's products had stable orders. It could inform the suppliers annually.

It was difficult for promotional companies to make advanced planning. Customers of Manroof could not inform earlier on when and how much products were needed. Maximum 10-20% of the customers orders could be planned in advance.

To avoid overtime at main suppliers, Manroof discussed delivery time with customers and the suppliers together before confirming an order. When urgent orders were placed, Manroof would buy from external suppliers, who already had stock for the products.

1.7 Degree to which affiliate mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Intermediate efforts	Some production delays are outside of the control of affiliates; however there are a number of steps that can be taken to address production delays without resorting to excessive overtime.	Documentation of root cause analysis and positive steps taken to manage production delays or improve factory processes.	3	6	0
--	----------------------	--	---	---	---	---

Recommendation: A production planning system can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at factories. Whenever possible, Manroof should maintain a forecasting system and production planning system that enables good planning at production level and avoids late design or quality changes, as well as help to limit the effects of peaks in demand.

Comment: In November 2013, Manroof CEO and a Chinese consultant visited the factories and discuss OT issues. It was quite difficult for most factories producing for Manroof, as they were not only working for Manroof but also a number of other brands, which did not support advanced planning to reduce overtime.

Manroof decided to hire a local consultant to give advice to the factories regularly. As an incentive, Manroof also offered money for the factories to make changes in other labour standards.

1.8 Affiliate's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.	Country-level policy	The first step towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages - and towards implementation of living wages - is to know the labour costs of garments.	Formal systems to calculate labour costs on per-product or country/city level.	2	4	0
--	----------------------	--	--	---	---	---

Requirement: Manroof needs to develop a pricing policy where it knows the labour cost of garments and which allows the payment of at least legal minimum wages in production countries.

Comment: Manroof believed that its price was higher than average. It had stable suppliers for specific products. Based on trust, Manroof often agreed with the prices raised by the suppliers.

Manroof has decided to prioritise issues of occupational health and safety in 2013, and then work on increasing wages.

1.9 Affiliate actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages.	No minimum wage problems reported	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.	2	2	-2
---	-----------------------------------	--	---	---	---	----

Comment: One factory was audited in India during this reporting period. Minimum wages were paid to workers.

1.10 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.	0	0	-1
---	----	--	--	---	---	----

1.11 Degree to which affiliate assesses root causes of wages lower than living wages with suppliers and takes steps towards the implementation of living wages.	Factory-level approach	Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to affiliates' policies.	Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages.	4	8	0
---	------------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Recommendation: FWF appreciates Manroof's initiative towards paying living wages.

FWF encourages Manroof to discuss with more suppliers about possibilities to work towards higher benchmarks. FWF has developed experience with approaches that ensure that production workers in the selected facility take full benefit from the additional amounts that are committed to wage increases. FWF could give companies specific guidance on process rollout on request.

FWF advises companies to avoid the concept of a one-time charitable contribution, and strongly recommends affiliates commit to a long term process that leads to sustainable implementation of living wages. In case Manroof is interested to develop a joint approach to improve wages at a shared supplier, FWF is in the position to give advice on measures that need to be taken by the affiliates to ensure compliance with anti-trust/anti-competition legislation in relevant jurisdictions

Comment: Manroof used the audit reports and wage ladder to discuss with suppliers on living wages.

Manroof has made suggestions to a Chinese supplier on paying living wages. Manroof offered to pay the gap between the current wages and living wages of all workers at one supplier in China. The supplier had about 30 workers and the wage was just above minimum wages.

The factory did not agree with Manroof's offer. The management staff felt that they would not be able to have full control over the workforce, once there is a significant increase in wage.

The factory eventually decided not to work with Manroof as it could not meet the expectation.

1.12 Affiliate sources from an FWF factory member.	No	When possible, FWF encourages affiliates to source from FWF factory members. On account of the small number of factories this is a 'bonus' indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an affiliate's score.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	N/A	1	0
1.13 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the affiliate.	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 affiliate's score.	Supplier information provided by affiliate.	N/A	2	0

PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 40

Earned Points: 26

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	79%	
% of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented	13%	FWF low risk policy should be implemented. 0 = policy is not implemented correctly. N/A = no production in low risk countries.
Total of own production under monitoring	92%	Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 90% Measured as a percentage of turnover.

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

Comment: CEO of Manroof is responsible to following up on monitoring working conditions.

2.2 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans	Intermediate	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.	4	8	-2
---	--------------	---	---	---	---	----

Comment: In this reporting period, one factory located in India was audited. The factory is a common supplier of four FWF affiliates. Manroof supported the group to communicate with the factory to improve working conditions.

In addition, Manroof concerned about workers' health in the suppliers in China. It offered 1,500 USD to a factory to make improvements on OSH and cover medical check up for workers.

At another factory in China, Manroof offered in total 30,000 USD to be paid in three years to make improvements in the factory to implement the corrective action plans. But the factory was not willing to make further steps. Manroof had to phase out the supplier.

2.3 Percentage of production volume from suppliers that have been visited by the affiliate in the past financial year	78%	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.	4	4	0
---	-----	---	---	---	---	---

2.4 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	No existing reports/all audits by FWF or FWF affiliate	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	0
--	--	---	--	-----	---	---

Comment: Manroof only worked with FWF local audit team to audit its suppliers.

2.5 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory. Improvement timelines are established in a timely manner	Yes	FWF audit reports should be shared and discussed with suppliers within two months of audit receipt. Timely sharing of information and agreement on corrective actions is essential for improvement. A reasonable time frame should be specified for resolving findings.	Corrective Action Plans, emails; findings of followup audits; brand representative present during audit exit meeting, etc.	2	2	-1
--	-----	---	--	---	---	----

Comment: Manroof shared the CAP with factories within three months upon receiving the audit report. The CAPs were discussed with the factory management directly.

2.6 High risk issues specific to the affiliate's supply chain are identified and addressed by the monitoring system.	Intermediate Capacity	Different countries and products have different risks associated with them; monitoring systems should be adapted to allow appropriate human rights due diligence for the specific risks in each affiliates' supply chain.	Documentation may take many forms; additional research, specific FWF project participation; extra monitoring activities, extra mitigation activities, etc.	3	6	0
--	-----------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Recommendation: FWF suggests that Manroof analyses whether findings from a factory audit could occur at other suppliers as well. This will lead to a preventive approach where issues are addressed in a systematic manner. The analysis should focus on own brand practices as well as regional or country specific issues.

Comment: In China, Manroof decided to focus on occupational health and safety in 2013. It had worked with a consultant and provided financial supports to its main suppliers in China on this issue, as well as living wages and reduce overtime (See 2.2 for more details).

In India, Manroof worked with three other FWF member companies on the Workplace Education Programme to prevent and reduce violence against women at work.

2.7 Affiliate cooperates with other customers in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers	Information sharing	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.	1	2	-1
---	---------------------	---	--	---	---	----

Comment: Manroof worked with other FWF members in communication with a shared supplier in India to follow up on training and CAPs.

2.8 Monitoring requirements are fulfilled for production in low-risk countries	Yes	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.	2	2	0
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---

Requirement: Manroof is expected next year to make sure the Code of Labour Practices is posted in its suppliers in Italy, Slovenia, Portugal and Spain.

Manroof is expected to visit at least the most important supplier located in Germany.

Comment: 13% of Manroof's purchasing volume was made in low risk countries. Manroof had low leverage in these factories.

According to Manroof, it was not realistic to visit all the production sites in low risk countries. Nearly all production was made in Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands and Austria. Other production sites in Slovenia, Spain, Italy and Portugal made up less than 1% in total. With all suppliers Manroof maintained good communication.

Manroof decided to focus its work and resources in high risk countries in China and India instead.

Based the above situation, FWF considered Manroof had met the low risk monitoring requirement. However, FWF encouraged Manroof to make more effort on selected suppliers in Europe.

2.9 External brands resold by the affiliate who have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire. (% of external sales volume)	64%	FWF believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of FWF or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	2	3	0
--	-----	--	-----------------------------	---	---	---

Requirement: FWF affiliate should receive a completed and returned questionnaire from external brands resold by the affiliate.

Comment: It was a challenge for Manroof to request external suppliers to return questionnaires, as Manroof only purchased a small amount from each external supplier.

The external suppliers were informed about Manroof's FWF membership and requirements.

2.10 External brands resold by affiliates that are members of another credible initiative. (% of external sales volume)	32%	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.	0	3	0
---	-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: 32% of Manroof's external production was from a FWF member company.

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 32

Earned Points: 20

3. COMPLAINTS HANDLING

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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.1 A specific employee has been designated to address worker complaints	Yes	Followup is a serious part of FWF membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	1	1	-1
3.2 System exists 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 factory visits, etc.	2	2	0

Requirement: Manroof is expected next year to make sure the Code of Labour Practices is posted in its suppliers in Italy, Slovenia, Portugal and Spain.

Comment: In China and India, Manroof checked the Worker Information Sheet through audits and regular factory visits. Such a system in low risk countries was not yet established.

3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	100%	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. Factory participation in the Workplace Education Programme also count towards this indicator.	Percentage of audited factories where at least 50% of interviewed workers indicate awareness of the FWF complaints mechanism + percentage of factories in WEP programme.	4	4	-2
--	------	--	--	---	---	----

Comment: One factory was audited by FWF in 2013 in India. The workers in the factory were informed about FWF through regular training of Workplace Education Programme.

3.4 All complaints received from factory 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. Affiliate involvement is often essential to resolving issues.	Documentation that affiliate has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process.	N/A	6	-2
--	------------------------	---	---	-----	---	----

3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers	No complaints or cooperation not possible / necessary.	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 supplier.	Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc.	N/A	2	-2
--	--	--	--	-----	---	----

COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 7

4. TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.1 All staff 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.	1	1	-1
4.2 Ongoing training in support of FWF requirements is provided to staff in direct contact with suppliers.	No	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.	0	2	0

Recommendation: FWF recommends Manroof to participate in the Well Made project FWF offers. In the free sessions apparel employees, such as designers, purchasers and sales people can learn what they can do in their day-to-day work to improve working conditions in clothing factories.

Comment: CEO of Manroof made decisions on purchasing. He was also the person to follow up on CSR issues at the suppliers. Other production staff were aware of FWF, but no advanced training was received.

4.3 All sourcing contractors/agents are informed about FWF's Code of Labour Practices.	Affiliate does not use agents	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.	N/A	2	-2
--	-------------------------------	---	---	-----	---	----

4.4 Factory participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume)	1%	Lack of knowledge and skills 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.	1	6	0
---	----	--	--	---	---	---

Recommendation: Manroof is recommended to enroll a greater number of its suppliers in FWFs Workplace Education Programme (WEP), which offers trainings factories producing for FWF members. WEP trainings contribute to social dialogue between workers and management. The introductory training of WEP builds awareness of labour standards and strengthens dispute handling mechanisms. It is available to FWF members free of charge.

Comment: A factory located in India participated in WEP.

4.5 Factory participation in trainings (where WEP is not offered; by production volume)	All production is in WEP areas.	In areas where the Workplace Education Programme is not yet offered, affiliates 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: 9

Earned Points: 2

5. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
5.1 Level of effort to identify all production locations and update supplier information.	Intermediate	Any improvements to supply chains require affiliates to first know all of their suppliers and production locations.	Supplier information provided by affiliate. Financial records of previous financial year. Documented efforts by affiliate to update supplier information from its monitoring activities.	3	6	-2

Recommendation: The supplier register of the previous financial year has to be complete and accurate; production locations of all suppliers must be listed, including subcontractors.

Comment: Manroof audited and visited main suppliers in China according to FWF's requirements. It had identified subcontractors in its suppliers register and audited the subcontractors.

However, since Manroof did not visit factories in Portugal, Italy and etc, it is not able to ensure no subcontractors were used in those factories.

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.	1	1	-1
--	-----	--	---	---	---	----

Comment: CEO of Manroof directly communicate with factories on CSR issues. He also lead the production department.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 4

6. TRANSPARENCY

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
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.	1	1	-2

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.	1	1	0
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comment: Manroof published the performance check report by FWF on its website.

6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on affiliate's website	Published on affiliate's website	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.	2	2	-2
---	----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----

TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 4

Earned Points: 4

7. EVALUATION

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
7.1 Systemic annual evaluation of FWF membership is conducted with involvement of top management	Yes	An annual evaluation involving top management ensures that FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	2	2	0
7.2 Percentage of required changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by affiliate	70%	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.	6	8	-4

Comment: Manroof had followed up on the following requirements from last year:

- Making sure the suppliers be transparent on the overtime records.
Manroof hired local consultant to communicate with the factories to convince them on being transparent in the records.
- Visiting factories in low risk countries and making sure the Code of Labour Practices is posted.
Due to limitation mentioned on 2.8, Manroof did not make significant steps to meet this requirement.
- Making sure workers know about FWF helpline.
In the factory in India, workers were aware of FWF's helpline.
- Involving more factories to join WEP.
One supplier in India joined WEP in 2013.
- Including all external suppliers in the database.
Manroof had included all suppliers in the database.

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 10

Earned Points: 8

Additional comments on Evaluation:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	26	40
Monitoring and Remediation	20	32
Complaints Handling	7	7
Training and Capacity Building	2	9
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	4	4
Evaluation	8	10
Totals:	71	109

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS ÷ POSSIBLE POINTS)

65

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

15-07-2014

Conducted by:

Juliette Li

Interviews with:

Jacques von Mandach, CEO

Audit Summary:

Publication of the audit summary section previously included in Brand Performance Checks has been suspended while Fair Wear Foundation develops a new information system to manage and summarize the data. Future Brand Performance Checks will include improved usability and transparency for audit data.