



## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

---

Katharine Hamnett Store Ltd

PUBLICATION DATE: SEPTEMBER 2019

this report covers the evaluation period 01-04-2018 to 31-03-2019

## ABOUT THE BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

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

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

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

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

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

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

## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Katharine Hamnett Store Ltd

Evaluation Period: 01-04-2018 to 31-03-2019

MEMBER COMPANY INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	London, United Kingdom
Member since:	01-05-2018
Product types:	Fashion
Production in countries where FWF is active:	N/A
Production in other countries:	Italy
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	68%
Benchmarking score	59
Category	Good

## Summary:

Katharine Hamnett London, the brand, has shown progress by meeting most of FWF's performance requirements and has monitored 68% in its first year of membership. The brand has also gone above and beyond basic requirements by auditing 36% of its supply chain in FWF low-risk countries. Katharine Hamnett London has a consolidated supplier base and works with a small number of suppliers, with which it has built and maintained strong personal relationships. This allows the member to work effectively on improving working conditions. This, in combination with a score of 59 points, means that Katharine Hamnett London is awarded the 'Good' category.

In the first year of membership, Katharine Hamnett London has implemented significant changes to its due diligence process to support responsible sourcing practices through the use of its supplier database to organise and collate information.

Katharine Hamnett London has strong forecasting and production planning systems in place. Due to the nature of its business, orders must be placed well in advance after samples for the collection have been created. As a result, this allows Katharine Hamnett London's suppliers to be flexible in their production planning, so much so that some suppliers have even requested receiving orders later in the season and this has not been an issue to accommodate.

## PERFORMANCE CATEGORY OVERVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

## 1. PURCHASING PRACTICES

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity.	0%	Member companies with less than 10% of a production location's production capacity generally have limited influence on production location managers to make changes.	Supplier information provided by member company.	0	4	0

**Comment:** Katharine Hamnett London works with a small number of key suppliers. They order small quantities compared to the production locations' total capacity output. The member finds it difficult to have high leverage in factories due to their production volume.

**Recommendation:** FWF recommends the member to consolidate its supplier base where possible, and increase leverage at main production locations to effectively request improvements of working conditions. It is advised to describe the process of consolidation in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.1b Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys less than 2% of its total FOB.	6%	FWF provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts.	Production location information as provided to FWF.	3	4	0

**Comment:** Katharine Hamnett London has a small, consolidated supply chain and distributes the majority of its FOB to key suppliers. They want to use the increased leverage in factories to be able to ask for improvements within their supply chain.

**Recommendation:** FWF recommends the member to consolidate its supply base by limiting the number of production locations in its 'tail end'. To achieve this, members should determine whether production locations where they buy less than 2% of their FOB are of strategic relevance. Shortening the tail will reduce the social compliance risks the member is exposed to and will allow the member to improve working conditions in a more efficient and effective way.

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.	0%	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.	0	4	0

**Comment:** Katharine Hamnett London is only now entering its third year of operation and due to this fact, they do not have any relationships of over five years with suppliers. They do believe in long term relationships with each supplier and are not actively looking for new production locations with most suppliers requesting more orders from them.

**Recommendation:** FWF recommends the member to maintain stable business relationships with suppliers. Long term relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices and give factories a reason to invest in improving working conditions.

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.	No	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.	0	2	0

**Comment:** Most of Katharine Hamnett London's suppliers had already signed the CoLP at the beginning of their membership however, due to some unfortunate technical issues this data was all lost. Not wanting to strain the relationships with certain suppliers, the member delayed asking some for the second copy to be returned. Going forward Katharine Hamnett London will not allow any more bulk orders before the CoLP and questionnaire are signed.

Requirement: Katharine Hamnett London needs to ensure that all production locations sign and return the questionnaire before continuing orders are placed.

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

Comment: All suppliers have a personal relationship with the Managing Director for over a decade in most cases and have long-time personal relationships. A process has been written for sourcing in new production locations. The sustainability team has a record of risk assessments it has collected and shares with the team regularly. Before production takes place a visit is always conducted at the site, the supplier is then informed of FWF membership and the CoLP. Existing audit reports are requested. Audits are being arranged for all suppliers in due course. For the first year membership as there were no 'new' suppliers, all current suppliers were informed of FWF and the CoLP embedding this into the new process of bulk orders.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Katharine Hamnett London to ensure that the supplier platform cannot select and place production at new or different production locations before the member has agreed. FWF recommends putting this agreement with the intermediary platform in writing. Furthermore, FWF recommends the member to develop a responsible sourcing strategy towards the selection of new production locations.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.5 Production location compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	Yes	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:** All suppliers that Katharine Hamnett London currently works with are checked by and adhere to the Italian law and requirements for production facilities. The evaluation of the CoLP is not currently done systematically, but instead in a more intuitive way in implemented, due to the fact the facilities are visited in person by staff. A new database has been built for all production staff to use that is better able to keep track of things systematically and to help embed all processes more methodically.

**Recommendation:** Katharine Hamnett London is encouraged to make more explicit how social compliance in the supplier rating system in which quality, relationship, price, and planning are assessed is weighted and how compliance with CoLP leads to production decisions.

As it is not always possible to reward suppliers with more volumes, the member could look into other incentives that reward supplier's commitment towards the CoLP. An example would be to offer training for skill building/capacity development, placing more NOS styles.

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:** Being a high fashion brand Katharine Hamnett London's production cycle is somewhat different in that final samples are created, and shown as full individual garments at fashion shows. After which orders are placed by buyers at the first and ongoing shows by department stores and other resellers. Forecasting then starts to trend orders and by the second last show, bulk orders are almost complete but indicative enough to be communicated to suppliers in advance of deadlines. Each garment during the sampling creation stage has the exact labour minute calculation known and these are used to calculate quantities production capacities for suppliers. In most cases, fabrics are ordered ahead of time and sent to CMT locations or a carryover fabric is used. This allows for order placing to be very accurate and for suppliers to stagger production depending on quantities for the delivery date which varies for the location of each buyer, for example, the US, Europe or Asian markets. Suppliers are always communicative regarding unrealistic lead times and this is accommodated and adjusted by the member in due course. Overstock issues are uncommon, however, should this happen these items are then able to be sold on the company webstore.

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:** There have not been any excessive overtime findings in production locations. All of Katharine Hamnett London's items have exact labour minutes calculated and shared with suppliers. When suppliers receive orders, they immediately create a program and share it with Katharine Hamnett London. If the supplier cannot complete the full order, they will shift orders to other suppliers to not overload individual suppliers, otherwise, discussions with sales department take place to see if customers can move delivery dates.

**Recommendation:** FWF recommends cooperating with other customers at the factory to increase leverage when trying to mitigate excessive overtime hours.

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.	Intermediate	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.	2	4	0

**Comment:** Katherine Hamnett knows the labour minutes required for each garment and the overall costs associated through Italian labour laws for wages and will ask for the code of conduct and/or collective bargaining agreement contract. They use detailed cost breakdown sheets but they do not have full labour cost breakdowns for each garment.

Recommendation: Katharine Hamnett London could discuss with suppliers to learn more about how wages are set in Italy with their suppliers to gain greater insights to ensure they are working towards living wages.

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.	No problems reported/no audits	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage or minimum wage payments cannot be verified, FWF 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, FWF Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a FWF auditor, or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	N/A	0	-2

Comment: No issues found either informally during factory visits or in audits.

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: Every supplier has different payment terms. Any late payments are negotiated and arranged individually upfront and agreed with the supplier first.

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.	Member sources in low-risk countries only	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	N/A	6	0

Comment: No issues in low-risk audits were flagged.

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

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	4	0

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	Member sources in low-risk countries only	FWF 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.	N/A	3	0

Comment: As a first year member, Katharine Hamnett London has not yet worked on this issue in 2018.

## PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 32

Earned Points: 12

## 2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	0%	
% 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.)
Meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	N/A	1st or 2nd year member and tail-end monitoring requirements do not apply.
Requirement(s) for next performance check		
Total of own production under monitoring	68%	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 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:** There is a designated Sustainability Manager responsible for FWF membership at Katharine Hamnett London. The Manager of Production is very closely involved in all things CSR which relate to sourcing and buying decisions.

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

Comment: The member is currently using a third-party organisation to audit their Italian factories. To date, they have audit five factories covering 26% of FOB.

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

Comment: When Katharine Hamnett London receives an audit report it is reviewed and passed on to the supplier. The Sustainability Manager together with the Production team agrees on timelines together with the factory first by email and audit findings are also discussed at Director level.

Recommendation: To make follow up more effective, discussions with the audit team would be recommended to learn about more specific issues faced in the supply chain and to work on proactive ways to resolve them.

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

**Comment:** During the Brand Performance Check, Katharine Hamnett London could show that some corrective actions had been both followed up on and remediated. CSR and Production staff first communicate CAP findings with the supplier via email, additionally any serious findings with production staff who visit the location.

**Recommendation:** To facilitate remediation, the member could consider:

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



PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.5 Percentage of production volume from production locations that have been visited by the member company in the previous financial year.	100%	Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by member company staff or local representatives. They reinforce to production location managers that member companies are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices.	Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	4	4	0

**Comment:** The Manager of Production and other staff visit all locations regularly throughout the year during production times.

**Recommendation:** FWF recommends to document the outcome of visits and ensure checking whether the CoLP is posted is part of every visit. Reporting back to the whole team on the discussions will help towards setting up an integrated system for improving working conditions. FWF has developed a Health & Safety Guide that can be used during these visits.

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	0

**Comment:** The member has asked for external or previous reports but the supplier did not have or did not want to share.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies.	Average score depending on the number of applicable policies and results	Aside from regular monitoring and remediation requirements under FWF membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. FWF requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by FWF.	Policy documents, inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories, reports of meetings with suppliers, reports of additional activities and/or attendance lists as mentioned in policy documents.	3	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	Intermediate			3	6	-2

Comment: Italy: Started looking into it and the fact that they are auditing their suppliers shows a proactive approach to discovering any possible issue within the supply chain.

Recommendation: For Italy risks to be aware of are irregular and migrant employment due to the lack of labour law protection and monitoring.

Due diligence is about a continuous assessment of country risks and deciding what the monitoring activities should be to address those risks.

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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.9 Percentage of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	50-100% AND member undertakes additional activities to monitor suppliers	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws. FWF has defined minimum monitoring requirements for production locations in low-risk countries.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	3	3	0

Comment: 100% of Katharine Hamnett London's supply chain is based in low-risk countries.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits at tail-end production locations (when the minimum required monitoring threshold is met).	No	FWF 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 FWF 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.	No external brands resold	FWF believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of FWF or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	N/A	2	0

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.12 External brands resold by member companies that are members of another credible initiative (% of external sales volume).	No external brands resold	FWF believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods.	External production data in FWF's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by FWF or FLA members.	N/A	3	0

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

---

## MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 25

Earned Points: 18

---

### 3. COMPLAINTS HANDLING

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

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

Comment: The Sustainability Manager and Manager of Production are designated to address any complaints that may be filed.

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 FWF 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: Katharine Hamnett London staff regularly check during factory visits whether the Worker Information Sheet is posted at an accessible location in the factory and records this. All factories have been informed of FWF membership and factory management received a presentation from staff about FWF membership.

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.	All production in low-risk countries	After informing workers and management of the FWF CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural worker-management dialogue.	Training reports, FWF's data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	6	0

Comment: Awareness training is raised internally and also by agents.

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

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

---

## COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 3

Earned Points: 3

---



## 4. TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.1 All staff at member company are made aware of FWF membership.	Yes	Preventing and remediating problems often requires the involvement of many different departments; making all staff aware of FWF membership requirements helps to support cross-departmental collaboration when needed.	Emails, trainings, presentation, newsletters, etc.	1	1	0

Comment: Katharine Hamnett London's office is small and has an active involvement of all employees with the FWF membership. An introductory training session on FWF membership was given at the beginning of their membership. Any issues are easily and readily discussed in both formal meetings with upper management and also informal conversations. Training on the FWF membership and requirements was also conducted at their sourcing company in Italy for the staff that regularly visit production locations.

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

Comment: Katharine Hamnett London's team on the ground in Italy is trained and informed about FWF. Conference calls regularly take place discussing FWF. Senior staff make this an important point to be always be considered in production decisions.

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

Comment: One agent is currently employed and has been trained on FWF and the CoLP and works very closely with the Italian sourcing company owned by Katharine Hamnett London. The Public Relations teams were also trained about how to speak about FWF to press.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.4 Factory participation in training programmes that support transformative processes related to human rights.	All production in low-risk countries	Complex human rights issues such as freedom of association or gender-based violence require more in-depth trainings that support factory-level transformative processes. FWF has developed several modules, however, other (member-led) programmes may also count.	Training reports, FWF's data on factories enrolled in training programmes. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	6	0

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

Comment: Katharine Hamnett London only sources in low-risk countries.

---

## TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 5

Earned Points: 5

---

## 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:** Katharine Hamnett London has invested time and effort in identifying production locations. Asking about subcontracting is a step in all conversations with a supplier. Understanding the production processes in great detail allows the member to know if all production is taking place at site visits, which take place monthly.

**Recommendation:** Katherine Hamnett London is advised to develop a systematic approach to complete the production location list. Part of the approach can be:

1. Automatically include information from the questionnaire, audit reports and complaints
2. Business relationships with agents include transparency of production locations.
3. Agreements with factories on the use of subcontractors stating clearly that when subcontractors are used, they are included in the monitoring system and information is shared on the subcontracted production process.

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: Upper management is involved with all CSR decisions and the Sustainability manager has fortnightly meetings with the Creative Director to update on all ongoing projects or issues. Discussions around industry norms and what competitors are doing also takes place so that the member ensure they are doing the most they can.

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 4

## 6. TRANSPARENCY

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

Comment: Katharine Hamnett London complies with the FWF communications policy and communicates about FWF on its website and social media channels. The member has also presented information to those customers buying and reselling their products.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities	No	Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of FWF's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	0	2	0

Comment: Katherine Hamnett London is in their first year has not yet engaged in any advanced reporting activities.

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	For new member companies	The social report is an important tool for members to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders. Member companies should not make any claims in their social report that do not correspond with FWF's communication policy.	Social report that is in line with FWF's communication policy.	N/A	2	-1

## TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 4

Earned Points: 2

## 7. EVALUATION

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

Comment: Upper management is highly involved in FWF membership. FWF membership is integrated into decisions on management level.

The Managing Director, Managing Design Director and Finance will go through the report annually. Looking at resources requirements for FWF membership. Also reflecting on current achievements and learnings from FWF for the year and to use the Brand Performance Check to formulate plans on the coming year.

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.	No requirements were included in previous Check	In each Brand Performance Check report, FWF may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of FWF membership and its process approach.	Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	N/A	4	-2



---

## EVALUATION

Possible Points: 2

Earned Points: 2

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

- Alerts in the member hub for deadlines or reminders.
- Introduction paper for suppliers explaining FWF. Explaining the business case for FWF membership and complying and the help that it can give.
- Communications policy is really helpful.
- For sales: any kind of help for sales agent information for eg. B2B packs.

## SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	12	32
Monitoring and Remediation	18	25
Complaints Handling	3	3
Training and Capacity Building	5	5
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	2	4
Evaluation	2	2
Totals:	46	78

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

59

### PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

## BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

25-07-2019

Conducted by:

Brigitta Danka & Sandra Gonza

Interviews with:

Marzia Narduzzi - Managing Director, Filanda

Lionel Copley - Managing Design Director

Claudia Aspidi - Commercial Director

Phoebe Jordan - Finance

Ivan Dauriz - Head of Innovation & Special Projects

Amelia Hagelin - Marketing Manager

Marc Morgan - PR Manager

Davide Rossi - Online Store Manager

Kellie Dalton - Sustainability Manager