



Brand Performance Check

Equip Outdoor Technologies UK Limited

This report covers the evaluation period 01-02-2021 to 31-01-2022

About the Brand Performance Check

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Brand Performance Check Overview

Equip Outdoor Technologies UK Limited

Evaluation Period: 01-02-2021 to 31-01-2022

Member company information	
Headquarters:	Alfreton, Derbyshire , United Kingdom
Member since:	2020-05-01
Product types:	Sports & activewear; Luggage & other travel accessories
Production in countries where Fair Wear is active:	Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Myanmar, Viet Nam
Production in other countries:	Cambodia, Philippines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
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	99%
Benchmarking score	80
Category	Leader

Summary:

Equip shown exceptional progress and met most of Fair Wear's performance requirements. Equip has monitored 99% of its production volume. With a benchmarking score of 80, Equip has been placed in the 'Leader' category.

Corona Addendum:

The outdoor market in the UK was resilient throughout COVID-19 compared to other markets, and a strong, global demand for Equip's products continued in 2021. The disbalance between this demand and the unstable supply was the main challenge for the company in the past financial year. Equip mitigated the challenges by placing orders much earlier, increasing stock in the UK, and using airfreight when unavoidable.

Fair Wear audits were conducted at Equip's main suppliers, in Indonesia and China. Monitoring was done using these as well as BSCI audits for other suppliers. Equip had frequent contact with its suppliers and regularly offered support to solve corrective actions together with the factory. Equip kept track of the COVID-19 situation in all production countries in an excel document which was regularly updated. Equip's local staff also helped in this regard. The document included information about lockdowns, government regulations and infection rates. Internally, colleagues from all relevant departments discuss the situation at the factories. The COVID-19 overview was used to connect country risks and specific suppliers. Equip created a Human Rights Due Diligence Policy, an improvement to the risk assessment process when finding new suppliers. Equip is encouraged to use this system as a basis for the evaluation of existing suppliers as well.

Equip's suppliers in Vietnam were closed during the lockdown in summer 2021. Equip actively followed up with the factory whether wages could be paid, through a supplier questionnaire and collaboration with other members. Equip supported its suppliers by postponing the orders until after the lockdown ended. When capacity was low due to COVID-19, at any suppliers, Equip discussed with them how to deal with this, what orders had priority and whether any orders could be postponed.

The brand invested a lot in its supplier relations despite the pandemic, for example by commissioning Worker Education Programme training at its main suppliers. Fair Wear recommends Equip to continue strengthening its efforts, to take the next steps in remediation of complex issues and working on the topic of living wage. Overall, Equip has made significant progress in its second year of membership and could show follow-up of most requirements, as well as a systematic approach to human rights due diligence.

Performance Category Overview

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

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

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

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

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

1. Purchasing Practices

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity.	80%	Member companies with less than 10% of a production location's production capacity generally have limited influence on production location managers to make changes.	Supplier information provided by member company.	4	4	0

Comment: In the financial year 2021/22, Equip sourced 80% of its FOB at factories where it had more than 10% leverage. This slight decrease compared to the previous year because Equip started working with three new production facilities, while at the same time consolidating its supply chain by exiting some suppliers as well. It is Equip's strategy to maintain high leverage at its key suppliers, as the brand recognises this increases the possibility to influence working conditions.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.1b Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys less than 2% of its total FOB.	10%	Fair Wear provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts.	Production location information as provided to Fair Wear.	3	4	0

Comment: Equip is in the process of consolidating its supplier base. As this is a gradual process, the short-term effect of this process is a slight increase in tail-end suppliers in 2021. Equip has an active policy to reduce factories from the tail end. However, some parts of its products are technical to fabricate and need to be handled in specific factories. Some tail end will therefore always remain.

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.	85%	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.	4	4	0

Comment: In the financial year 2021/2022, 85% of Equip's FOB came from factories with which the brand has a relationship of at least five years. It is part of Equip's strategy to maintain long-term relationships with its suppliers, enabling the suppliers to grow as the brand has been growing.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.3 All (new) production locations are required to sign and return the questionnaire with the Code of Labour Practices before first bulk orders are placed.	Yes	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between production locations and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	2	2	0

Comment: All Equip's factories are asked to sign the Code of Labour (CoLP) practices annually. Equip uses the questionnaire to collect up-to-date information about the suppliers. Equip added three new suppliers to its supplier base in the past financial year. The signed CoLPs for these suppliers were uploaded in the Fair Wear database.

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.	Advanced	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.	4	4	0

Comment: Equip used the financial year 2021/22 to formalise its due diligence procedures and put them on paper in its new human rights due diligence policy. This policy outlines the steps Equip takes before selecting a new supplier. This includes a risk assessment, where the brand considers five categories on which it rates the potential suppliers. The category 'compliance' includes the working conditions at the factory. Equip bases the score in this category on audit reports. The other categories are technical & quality, costs, communication and risks. The 'risks' category includes country risks and as such Equip connects the general risks in a potential sourcing country to its purchasing practices. The 'Communication' category also includes the communication with the CSR team. Based on the scores in each category, Equip creates a scorecard for the potential supplier which clearly maps out what the risks are of engaging with this supplier.

In 2021, Equip completed this process from start to end when selecting a new supplier in a new country. Two suppliers were compared using the score cards, and one of them was selected to work with. Formally, the CEO has the final say about which suppliers are added, but through the process of creating the score cards, the CSR and buying team have a strong voice in this as well. Equip also presented its new HRDD policy to other member brands, on request of Fair Wear.

To keep track of risks at the existing production locations, Equip relied on audit reports (mainly Amfori/BSCI) as well as human rights development bulletins from the Business & Human Rights Resource Center. Normally, the Equip team would regularly travel to the factories and visit them personally, but in 2021/22 this was not possible because of the pandemic. The CSR team maintained an overview of the COVID-19 situation in the various production countries and the situation at the suppliers, connecting information from the news and audit reports to the current situation at the factories, including infection and vaccination rates, restrictions, and government regulations in place.

Frequent contact was maintained through video calls and Equip's local teams in China and Vietnam were informing the headquarter's staff about the situation in the factories regularly. Besides that, Fair Wear audits were done at the main suppliers in Indonesia and China. The information retrieved through all this activity was discussed in monthly 'supply chain meetings' with all staff in contact with factories, such as purchasing and product development. The main risk which Equip identified was the lockdown in Vietnam and the possible 3-on-site scheme where workers would have to live on the factory premises. As the Vietnamese factory decided against this, the factory was closed for about six weeks, which then led to a risk of lost wages (see 1.9). Equip started visiting the factories again when possible in 2022.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.5 Production location compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	Yes, and leads to production decisions	A systemic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decisionmaking.	Documentation of systemic approach: rating systems, checklists, databases, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Equip monitors some elements of its suppliers' performance, and is constantly working with suppliers on improving working conditions and following up on any open corrective action plans. How this is going is regularly discussed within the brand. However, the evaluation of suppliers' progress on implementing the Code of Labour Practices is not yet documented and not done systematically, it mainly focuses on the most important suppliers. The informal evaluation is generally connected to purchasing decisions, and Equip also rewarded its Indonesian supplier, which has improved significantly in the past years, with extra orders in 2021/22.

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

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: Equip produces two ranges each year, an Autumn/Winter range and a Spring/Summer range. Over 62% of production volume comes from suppliers where Equip has a continuous production plan. Equip has a production cycle of 18 months, with two seasonal launches a year. Equip is transparent about the production forecast and informs the manufacturing partners as early as possible about any revisions. This continuous production plan reduces production pressure and hence limits the risk of causing excessive overtime. Equip further avoids production pressure by working with several 'buys' per order. This means that the factories receive bigger blocks of orders which are placed at one moment. Equip's lead time is about five months, and there is always sensitivity time built into the expected delivery dates. During one 'buying block', the brand always ensures to ask for the products which are needed first, first. Next to that, about half of the orders have more flexibility and can be produced when it is most convenient for the factory. Equip can do this because the brand maintains larger stock in the UK, giving the brand more flexibility in the delivery of products.

Furthermore, Equip is aware of the exact capacity of its main suppliers and knows the number of lines the factories use for the production of Equip products. Equip's buying department has continuous contact with the factories about capacity, how production is coming along and whether the factory needs any extra time or is actually done early. The brand also takes local holidays, such as Eid and Chinese New Year, into account when planning.

COVID-19 disrupted Equip's supply chain throughout 2021, and Equip accepted delays caused by the pandemic. The brand orders the fabric and started doing this much earlier, as a lot of delays were also caused by delay in raw material. At some facilities, capacity had to be decreased because of COVID-19. Equip maintained dialogue with its suppliers and asked them to prioritize certain products and pushed production of others back. Equip did not cancel any orders but kept its order volumes at the factories as much as possible as they were, to avoid losing the workforce, and because materials were already at the facilities. When factories were increasing capacity again, Equip stayed in close contact to monitor the working hours and overtime.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Intermediate efforts	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.	3	6	0

Comment: One Fair Wear audit identified excessive overtime at Equip's main Chinese supplier. This audit was conducted in December 2021, but Equip was able to demonstrate during the performance check that the finding had been followed up actively still within the financial year under review, and is continuously being followed up in the current financial year. Equip realised the factory is at the top of its capacity, and the brand is supporting the supplier in setting up satellite factories in the area as a structural solution to this issue. The Corrective Action Plan (CAP) which Equip could show during the performance check included positive feedback from the supplier about Equip's involvement and support in dealing with the finding of excessive overtime and lack of capacity. Equip identified the biggest root cause for production pressure is delay in material delivery, and moved its material orders up by three months. If not otherwise possible, Equip paid for airfreight of goods. Equip makes a distinction between root causes which the brand has control over, such as material delivery, and root causes which are not in the brand's control, such as worker shortages. The latter were not yet addressed in 2021.

Recommendation: If excessive overtime persists, Equip Outdoor Technologies UK Limited could hire local experts to analyse root cause of excessive overtime in cooperation with the supplier. Fair Wear could recommend qualified persons upon request.

Fair Wear also 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: Following Fair Wear's requirement in the previous performance check, Equip started working on the topic of living wage in 2021. Equip collected information about the wage levels at its factories through audits and compared these wage levels to the living wage estimates available. Equip used the BSCI cost of living estimates from audits for this comparison, and from this comparison noted that some suppliers are close to this amount. Equip does recognise that Fair Wear does not accept this as a living wage estimate, but sees this as a step towards getting a clearer understanding of the wage levels at its suppliers.

As Equip buys the fabric and trims directly from the material suppliers, the brand pays CMT prices which include only labour costs, overhead and profit. In 2021, the development team created insight in the percentage of labour cost within this CMT price for all carry-over styles. Changes in legal minimum wages are tracked by the brand and are always taken into consideration in the costing process. There is no negotiation taking place on the prices after they have been set, but when a price is too high for Equip, product complexity is changed to lower the cost. The brand does not have insight into the labour minutes it takes to sew the products as it considers this business-sensitive information on which it prefers to trust the supplier.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Equip to expand its knowledge of cost breakdowns of all product groups. A next step would be to calculate the labour minute costs of its products to be able to calculate the exact costs of labour and link this to its own buying prices, for example by using the Fair Price app. The Fair Price app includes the possibility for the factory to calculate fact-based prices without disclosing the standard allowed minutes to the brand. Equip could consider offering training by a local representative on Fair Price to its suppliers. Such training is available in all Fair Wear countries.

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

Comment: In 2021, two Fair Wear audits were conducted at Equip's main suppliers, in China and Indonesia. Both audits found issues regarding the payment of legal minimum wages. Equip actively followed up on these findings. In Indonesia, the factory was paying a regional minimum wage, which was allowed by the government but which was lower than the district legal minimum wage. This makes it difficult to cover the missed wages, as the factory is not legally in the wrong. Equip is still discussing this issue with the factory, which is willing to make improvements upon the brand's request. Equip's CEO also followed up on this during his travels to the country and Equip plans to start a living wage project in this factory, which would mean gradually increasing the wages in any case beyond legal minimum wage.

The other supplier, in China, was not correctly keeping track whether piece rate wages were meeting at least the legal minimum wage. Equip followed up with the supplier to ensure the system was improved and collected evidence that, when piece rate wages are below legal minimum wage, this is now being topped up to meet the legal minimum wage.

The COVID-19 pandemic caused long-term factory closure in one factory Vietnam. The supplier did not work with the 3-on-site scheme, by which government allowed factories to continue operations while workers would not leave the premises at all. Equip's suppliers let workers stay home and closed the factory. Equip checked with the factory what impact this had on wages being paid to the workers and identified that workers received wages for the first period of the lockdown, through government support. For the period when workers did not receive legal minimum wage, Equip addressed this by connecting with other Fair Wear members at the same supplier, to discuss what alternative forms of remediation could be implemented. As Equip has less than 1% leverage at one supplier in Vietnam, and 8% at the other, the brand's possibilities to on its own compensate missed wages of 1500 workers were limited. This follow-up process is still ongoing. Equip committed to keeping its orders at the suppliers, and moved a part of production to earlier in the year to ensure there would be work when the factory opened up again, and generally increased production at this facility. Equip accepted delays which were a consequence of the whole situation. Equip's other supplier in Vietnam is located in an area which was not affected by the lockdown.

Requirement: Members should support workers who are owed outstanding wages, severance or other legally required benefits and follow the guidance in the 'Handbook: Covid-19 Lost wages and jobs series'.

Recommendation: Equip is recommended to conclude the discussion on this topic with other members sourcing in Vietnam and come up with a concrete action plan to support workers who missed wages in 2021.

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: Payment terms differ per supplier, as Equip is flexible in meeting the requirements of suppliers. Equip pays all orders upon receiving the bill of lading, usually within a couple of days. Equip could demonstrate in its system that payments were made quickly. In case suppliers asked for it, Equip prepaid parts of orders. This was mostly the case for new suppliers.

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.	Intermediate	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	4	6	0

Comment: The comparative analysis of wage levels (see 1.8) which Equip conducted, showed that wages at some suppliers are relatively high, while at others they are still far off from the living wage estimate. Equip has started assessing the root causes for wages being below living wage in general, and identified the sourcing country as well as the complexity of the product play a role. More complex products are generally made by more skilled workers, who earn higher wages. Equip has started the conversation about this topic with some of its suppliers, but prefers to discuss the topic in physical meetings which is possible again in 2022. The strategy to do this is also supported by Equip's board and higher management. Equip has identified it wants to start this working actively on the topic with its main supplier in Indonesia, which is eager to work on improvements with Equip.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages Equip to discuss with suppliers about different strategies to work towards higher wages. It is advised to start with suppliers where the member is responsible for a large percentage of production and long term business relationship.

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).	4%	Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an member company's score.	Supplier information provided by member company.	1	2	0

Comment: Equip is proud to own and run a production location in the UK, next to the office. Some employees work for over 30 years at this factory.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.13 Member company determines and finances wage increases.	Intermediate	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.	2	6	0

Comment: Equip has not yet determined a target wage to work towards with its factories, but the CSR team has started the internal discussion about this topic. The brand has selected the main supplier with which it wants to start working on living wages and an internal presentation for relevant staff, including the company's board, was done. Any wage increases at factory level will be coming back to the consumer prices, but a more concrete strategy on how this would look is still in development.

Recommendation: Fair Wear advises companies to avoid the concept of a one-time charitable contribution. We strongly recommend members to integrate the financing of wage increases it in its own systems, herewith committing to a long term process that leads to sustainable implementation of living wages.

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.	4%	Fair Wear member companies are challenged to adopt approaches that absorb the extra costs of increasing wages.	Member company's own documentation, evidence of target wage implementation, such as wage reports, factory documentation, communication with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: Equip pays its employees at the production location in Derbyshire the UK's National Living Wage.

Purchasing Practices

Possible Points: 52

Earned Points: 37

2. Monitoring and Remediation

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
% of production volume where an audit took place.	95%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	4%	To be counted towards the monitoring threshold, FWF low-risk policy should be implemented. See indicator 2.9. (N/A = no production in low risk countries.)
Member meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	First or second year member and tail-end monitoring requirements do not apply	1st or 2nd year member and tail-end monitoring requirements do not apply.
Requirement(s) for next performance check		
Total monitoring threshold:	99%	Measured as percentage of production volume (Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100%)

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

Comment: Equip has a CSR Manager who is responsible for the follow-up on problems identified by the monitoring system. A CSR Coordinator supports the CSR manager.

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

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

Comment: Equip always shares the audit reports with factory management. Two Fair Wear audits were conducted in 2021. Equip shared the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) with management and set up a meeting to discuss the timeline for improvements. Equip requested the factory to share the CAP in local language with the worker representation, who were also present during the audit exit meeting.

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.	Intermediate	Fair Wear considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that member companies can do towards improving working conditions.	CAP-related documentation including status of findings, documentation of remediation and follow up actions taken by member. Reports of quality assessments. Evidence of understanding relevant issues.	6	8	-2

Comment: Equip keeps track of the statuses of all CAPs in its supply chain overview. After an audit has taken place, Equip schedules a meeting with the supplier to discuss the outcome and prioritise findings. Together with the factory management, the brand comes up with a plan to follow up on the audits. The brand also checks what support the factory needs to follow up on issues, making much of the process a shared responsibility. The brand uses the excel CAP report to keep track of follow-up status, sending the report back and forth and agreeing on timelines by which the supplier should update Equip on the status again. Equip also does this for audits which do not automatically include an Excel CAP, then this is created by the brand based on the audit report. The CSR coordinator uses a digital planning software with reminders to remember to check in with the suppliers in time. For external audits, which do not include a CAP, the brand creates a CAP and then follows the same process. The brand has regular Zoom meetings with its most important suppliers, during which CAP progress is discussed, although these meetings also go beyond such practical discussions and are considered an important relationship-building tool. Equip keeps all CAP files and pieces of evidence of follow-up in an organised compliance folder on the server.

In 2021, two Fair Wear audits in Indonesia and China were conducted. Equip could demonstrate follow-up on most issues in both CAPs. The brand could also show it tries to work on more complex findings, for example in Indonesia the brand is working with the factory on non-discrimination of workers with a disability and the type of contract workers are on. The factory is very willing to work on improvements and has made many changes in the past years. However, the brand also realises the more complex topics can be culturally sensitive and prefers to discuss complex findings when visiting the factories. The CEO of Equip is briefed to discuss outstanding complex CAP findings whenever he travels to the factories (see chapter 5). Equip also organised a Worker Education Programme training in Indonesia, in response to findings related to freedom of association. As China still cannot be visited, the brand was supported by its local colleagues for follow-up of this CAP. Equip could demonstrate active follow-up on this CAP as well, but considers it more difficult to work on complex topics because of the travel restrictions.

The impact of COVID-19 was regularly discussed during the monthly meetings between Equip and factory management, as well as assessed during the visits of the local Quality Control Teams.

Recommendation: The feedback and supportive evidence that is sent by suppliers can be complex and difficult to interpret when unfamiliar with the local laws and expertise. Equip can use Fair Wear's local team to verify the supportive evidence in case that is desirable, also when progress on a certain finding is at a halt because of complex local contexts.

It is advised to include worker representation in the remediation process. Either to engage workers in identifying and implementing improvements or to verify realised 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.	not applicable	Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, brands could often not visit their suppliers from March - December 2020. For consistency purposes, we therefore decided to score all our member brands N/A on visiting suppliers over the year 2020.	Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	N/A	4	0

Comment: As travel was restricted due to the Covid-19 pandemic, this indicator is not applicable in this year's performance check. However, as Equip has local teams in Vietnam and China, 46% of its suppliers have been visited regularly.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.6 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	Yes, quality assessed and corrective actions implemented	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.	3	3	0

Comment: Equip requests BSCI audit reports for all its strategic suppliers and almost all others as well. The brand checks whether the report matches Fair Wear's standards and specifically check whether worker interviews have been conducted. Equip creates a CAP if this is not available from the report and could demonstrate the CAPs are followed up on during the performance check.

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 Fair Wear membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. Fair Wear requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by Fair Wear.	Policy documents, inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories, reports of meetings with suppliers, reports of additional activities and/or attendance lists as mentioned in policy documents.	3	6	-2
Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh	Intermediate			3	6	-2
Compliance with FWF Myanmar policy	Intermediate			3	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: BANGLADESH

All factories in Bangladesh are covered under the International Accord. Equip monitored the progress made on the CAPs, the sites achieved 100% completion and the other 99%. Equip is not a member of the Bangladesh Accord but is considering joining the International Accord. It is Equip's strategy to consolidate its supplier base in Bangladesh, to be able to have more impact at suppliers it continues to work with. Equip is also aware of the gender-related risks in Bangladesh. The new due diligence policy includes the topic of gender and gender-based violence. Equip requests factories whether they have anti-harassment committees, and this information gets fed into the score cards when selecting new suppliers.

MYANMAR

Equip published all Myanmar factories in the Fair Wear database as per Fair Wear's requirements. Equip shared information in its Social Report on the audits and follow up on the audits. At the beginning of 2021, the military coup in Myanmar changed the situation there in terms of human rights risks. Equip has been following the developments in Myanmar closely and is in the process of exiting two of its Myanmar suppliers. This makes follow-up on CAPs more difficult. As the factories are foreign-owned, Myanmar considers it unlikely that the owner, which is based in Taiwan, is connected to the military. The factories are not based in the special economic zones which are controlled by the military. Equip still is trying to support the workers in the factories by maintaining production at one factory. The brand has the impression this kind of stability is appreciated by the workers, as the work provides them with income and safety. Equip has been collaborating actively with other Fair Wear members to exchange experiences and inform each other about the situation at factory level. All Myanmar factories have signed the Fair Wear questionnaire and commit to improving labour standards. Equip assessed and published publicly that all Myanmar factories are not military-related.

OTHER RISKS

Equip is very much aware of the risks related to forced labour in China and recognises this problem is now moving beyond the cotton industry and beyond the region of Xinjiang through labour transfer schemes. Equip has a prohibition on Xinjiang cotton which is being checked by the local team. Equip considers factories where audits have found 'migrant labourers' to have a higher risk of forced labour and asks its local team to check this. Equip has an anti-slavery statement and its supplier manual also states no forced labour is accepted. To date, the brand has not found any forced labour at its suppliers.

During COVID-19, the highest risk in Equip's supply chain was the closure of the factories in Vietnam and loss of wages for the workers. Equip stayed in contact with the supplier about this during the lockdown and is in the process of following up on this (see 1.9). For all countries, Equip maintained an overview of risks and measures in the countries and followed up with factories based on these risks.

Recommendation: As of 2022, Equip should follow Fair Wear's heightened human rights due diligence when assessing and following up on risks in Myanmar.

We ask Equip Outdoor Technologies UK Limited to make a clear statement to its suppliers that, as a brand, it does not want to be involved with any forced labour in its supply chains, including subcontractors. We advise Equip Outdoor Technologies UK Limited to add the risk of forced labour to its risk assessments.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.8 Member company cooperates with other FWF member companies in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers.	Active cooperation	Cooperation between customers increases leverage and chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the chances of a factory having to conduct multiple Corrective Action Plans about the same issue with multiple customers.	Shared CAPs, evidence of cooperation with other customers.	2	2	-1

Comment: The CSR team had regular contact with other members sourcing from the same production locations, to work together on CAPs, complaints and other risks such as the situation in Vietnam and in Myanmar.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.9 Percentage of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	100%	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws. Fair Wear has defined minimum monitoring requirements for production locations in low-risk countries.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of Fair Wear membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	2	2	0

Member undertakes additional activities to monitor suppliers.: No (o)

Comment: Equip has met the monitoring requirements for its factory in the UK. Equip gave a presentation about Fair Wear membership, the Worker Information Sheets are posted and the CoLP questionnaire is signed. As part of the brand's anti-modern slavery work, Equip conducts human rights due diligence on all its on-site contractors in the UK (cleaning, agency staff, and security personnel).

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).	Yes	Fair Wear encourages its members to monitor 100% of its production locations and rewards those members who conduct full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Production location information as provided to Fair Wear and recent Audit Reports.	2	2	0

Comment: Equip conducts full audit with Amfori/BSCI at all its suppliers regularly, including the suppliers in the tail end. Following the audit, Equip creates a CAP and during the performance check, the brand could demonstrate it followed up on these CAPs as well.

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	Fair Wear believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of Fair Wear or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	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	Fair Wear believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods.	External production data in Fair Wear's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by Fair Wear or FLA members.	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	Fair Wear believes it is important for member companies to know if the licensee is committed to the implementation of the same labour standards and has a monitoring system in place.	Questionnaires are on file. Contracts with licensees.	N/A	1	0

Monitoring and Remediation

Possible Points: 26

Earned Points: 22

3. Complaints Handling

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
Number of worker complaints received since last check.	1	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.	3	

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.1 A specific employee has been designated to address worker complaints.	Yes	Followup is a serious part of Fair Wear membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	1	1	-1

Comment: Equip's CSR manager and coordinator together are responsible for dealing with complaints.

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

Comment: All production locations are aware of the Fair Wear CoLP and the complaints hotline, Equip provided the photographic evidence that the suppliers have posted the Worker Information Sheets in a place accessible for workers.

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/training not possible	After informing workers and management of the Fair Wear CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural worker-management dialogue.	Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	6	0

Comment: Following the previous check's recommendation, Equip raised awareness about the Fair Wear CoLP through a WEP Communications training at its Indonesian supplier. This training includes the contents of the WEP Basic and therefore counts for both indicators 3.3 and 4.4. A WEP Basic training was done at Equip's main Chinese supplier. Two of Equip's suppliers in Myanmar, responsible for 3% FOB, received a WEP Communications training in 2019, which still counts for this indicator. In total, this means 61% of Equip's FOB comes from factories where a WEP training programme took place.

However, as conducting training in 2021 was often impossible in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, Fair Wear has decided to make this indicator non-applicable for all members unless it is more beneficial to the members to make it count. The indicator is therefore n/a even though Equip has actively raised awareness about the CoLP at factories responsible for more than half of its FOB in 2021/2022.

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.	Yes	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.	3	6	-2

Comment: Equip received one new complaint in the financial year 2021/22 at a factory in China. The complaint was related to living wages, a worker's wages were unjustly cut after missing work. Equip followed up on this with the factory and the complaint was resolved, the worker received the due amount. Equip was in the lead during the follow-up, but cooperated with another Fair Wear member.

Recommendation: It is recommended to uncover the root causes of complaints and prevent them from recurring. When appropriate, the investigation includes incidents at other factories.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers.	Active cooperation	Because most production locations supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the Fair Wear member company can be critical in resolving a complaint at a supplier.	Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Equip shared evidence of active contact with other member brands on solving complaints.

Complaints Handling

Possible Points: 11

Earned Points: 8

4. Training and Capacity Building

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.1 All staff at member company are made aware of FWF membership.	Yes	Preventing and remediating problems often requires the involvement of many different departments; making all staff aware of Fair Wear membership requirements helps to support cross-departmental collaboration when needed.	Emails, trainings, presentation, newsletters, etc.	1	1	0

Comment: Equip is proud of its membership. The CSR team shares information about it with the whole team, including the employees at the factory in the UK and the local teams throughout the year. The CSR team developed infographics and some talking points for the sales team to use in their pitch. A new team member has been hired to make sure everyone internally as well as externally is well aware of Equip's sustainability work, including the Fair Wear membership.

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

Comment: The CSR team informed all teams of Equip, the UK based teams as well as the local teams. One important team to keep updated, which is not mentioned in Fair Wear documentation, is the development team. Equip considers this team crucial to be involved. The CSR team has monthly supplier meetings with members of the various teams to update each other on developments on the ground. When colleagues from other departments are visiting suppliers, they receive a briefing about outstanding CAP or other issues and a supplier visit checklist to document their impression of the conditions in the factory. Equip's CSR team also shares the invitation to Fair Wear webinars on various topics with members of other teams.

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, Fair Wear audit findings.	2	2	0

Comment: Equip works with intermediaries for two suppliers, who are also owners of other factories and therefore have to be informed of the Code of Labour Practices. The intermediaries are also involved in CAP follow-up in China and Bangladesh.

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/training not possible	Complex human rights issues such as freedom of association or gender-based violence require more in-depth trainings that support factory-level transformative processes. Fair Wear has developed several modules, however, other (member-led) programmes may also count.	Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in training programmes. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	6	0

Comment: Following the recommendation in the previous performance check, Equip's main supplier in Indonesia received a WEP Communications training in 2021/2022. Before Equip became a member, other members already had lined up WEP Communication Training at the same suppliers Equip sources from.

However, as conducting training was difficult in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, Fair Wear has decided to make this indicator non-applicable for all members unless it is more beneficial to the members to make it count. The indicator is therefore n/a even though Equip has actively raised awareness about the CoLP at factories responsible for 38% of its FOB.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.5 Degree to which member company follows up after a training programme.	Active follow-up	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.	2	2	0

Comment: Equip has been following up on each of the multiple sessions which encompass the WEP Communications training module. Throughout the year, as the module progressed, both brand and factory got a better understanding of the purpose of the training. Some concrete changes which were requested by the workers through this training, for example to change the location of the prayer room, have been followed up on immediately. The factory now plans to conduct a survey every six months to collect any issues the workers might have. A worker committee was elected before the training took place and it was ensured they attended the training.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Equip to discuss outcomes of dialogue sessions with its supplier and what steps management is planning to further strengthen dialogue between workers and management. This may include regular meetings between worker representatives and management to discuss improvements to working conditions or allowing worker representatives to conduct a worker survey on specific issues. Equip should also investigate how they can contribute to implementing the action plan workers and management have agreed on (e.g. by adjusting sourcing practices).

Training and Capacity Building

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 7

5. Information Management

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
5.1 Level of effort to identify all production locations.	Advanced	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.	6	6	-2

Comment: In the year 2020, Equip has prioritised identification of (unauthorised) subcontracting, which led to a detailed insight into the subcontractors of all suppliers. The local Quality Control teams, which were able to visit during production, actively checked capacity and explained what subcontracting means and why it is important to know. Equip engaged with all factories and cross-checked consistency throughout the BSCI database, Fair Wear database and Equip's information. All the information is maintained in a master overview of all the factories, which includes what processes each factory does and when they have last been visited. Equip's local team uses the visiting checklist to double-check whether no unauthorised subcontracting is taking place. Equip requests its suppliers to yearly fill out the Fair Wear questionnaire, which also includes questions about subcontracting.

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: The CSR team has a shared drive with constantly updated information on monitoring and auditing, as well as regular meetings with different teams in place. Staff visiting production locations, are asked to fill out a checklist which feeds back to the CSR team. During the monthly supply chain meetings, members from each team come together and CSR topics are also discussed. When someone from higher management is visiting a factory, the CSR team drafts a briefing to inform them about all outstanding topics.

Information Management

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 7

6. Transparency

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

Comment: Equip communicates actively about the Fair Wear membership, including on-garment communication, press releases, communication at trade fairs, and in-store props with information about Fair Wear. Furthermore, Equip organised its first Sustainability Summit in Leusden, where Fair Wear was also invited to speak. Equip is happy to actively engage in Fair Wear's online campaigns, but cannot be involved if the main message relates to "fashion".

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

Comment: Equip publicly disclosed the factories in Myanmar, as well as a map of sourcing countries. Equip however has not yet disclosed a full list of suppliers.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends member Equip to disclose production locations to other member brands in Fair Force and on the Fair Wear website.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on member company's website.	Complete and accurate report submitted to FWF AND published on member's website.	The social report is an important tool for members to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders. Member companies should not make any claims in their social report that do not correspond with Fair Wear's communication policy.	Social report that is in line with Fair Wear's communication policy.	2	2	-1

Comment: Equip has published the social report on its website.

Transparency

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 5

7. Evaluation

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

Comment: Fair Wear membership is an important element for the strategic direction of Equip and is regularly discussed with top management.

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.	53%	In each Brand Performance Check report, Fair Wear may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of Fair Wear membership and its process approach.	Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	4	4	-2

Comment: Equip received five requirements in the previous brand performance check and has shown various levels of progress on most of these requirements, as well as on most recommendations.

1.8

- Equip needs to demonstrate an understanding of the link between buying prices and wage levels, to ensure their pricing allows for the payment of the legal minimum wage. --> intermediate progress made

- The member should engage in a dialogue with the supplier about the additional costs due to COVID-19, the effect on wages, etc. and take steps to incorporate these additional costs into their prices. --> basic progress made

1.11 Equip must assess the root causes of wages that are lower than living wages, taking into account its leverage and the effect of its own pricing policy. Equip is expected to take an active role in discussing living wages with its suppliers. The Fair Wear wage ladder can be used as a tool to implement living wages, to document, monitor, negotiate and evaluate the improvements at its suppliers. --> basic progress made

1.13 Equip should analyse what is needed to increase wages and develop a strategy to finance the costs of wage increases. --> basic progress made

2.4 Resolving and remediating non-compliances is one of the most important criteria member companies can do towards improving working conditions. Fair Wear expects Equip to examine and support remediation of any problem that they encounter. Coordinated efforts between different departments are required to ensure sustained responses to CAPs. --> sufficient progress made

Evaluation

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 6

Recommendations to Fair Wear

Equip would like Fair Wear to be more punctual when it comes to delivering audit and training reports, and to provide more consistency in reports from different countries. Equip would also like more clarity about when to expect things, such as the performance check report, webinars and training. Better management of the online webinars and more clarity about the content of both factory training and brand webinars. Furthermore, Equip feels Fair Wear should engage more with retailers, which are putting pressure on the brands to deliver, but are not held accountable for the effect on the supply chain of their demands. Equip would like it if Fair Wear would educate retailers about what Fair Wear is and what Fair Wear does. Equip would like to participate in social media campaigns, but not when the word fashion is included in the hashtag or the campaign, it would be great if some campaigns could not revolve around fashion. Finally, Equip would like it if Fair Wear could differentiate more between suppliers (which may own multiple production facilities) and factories (one production facility), because when a supplier starts a new facility, it now seems as if this is a completely new relationship while usually they have known the supplier for years.

Scoring Overview

Category	Earned	Possible
Purchasing Practices	37	52
Monitoring and Remediation	22	26
Complaints Handling	8	11
Training and Capacity Building	7	7
Information Management	7	7
Transparency	5	6
Evaluation	6	6
Totals:	92	115

Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

80

Performance Benchmarking Category

Leader

Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

28-06-2022

Conducted by:

Paula de Beer