



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Tricorp BV

PUBLICATION DATE: JULY 2016

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2015 to 31-12-2015

ABOUT THE BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

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

FWF's Brand Performance Check is a tool to evaluate and report on the activities of FWF's affiliate members. The Checks examine how affiliate management systems support FWF's Code of Labour Practices. They evaluate the parts of affiliate 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 factories, and most factories work for many different brands. This means that in most cases FWF affiliates have influence, but not direct control, over working conditions. As a result, the Brand Performance Checks focus primarily on verifying the efforts of affiliates. Outcomes at the factory level are assessed via audits and complaint reports, however the complexity of the supply chains means that even the best efforts of FWF affiliates cannot guarantee results.

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

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 affiliate 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.

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Tricorp BV

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2015 to 31-12-2015

| AFFILIATE INFORMATION | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Headquarters: | Rijen, Netherlands |
| Member since: | 01-06-2007 |
| Product types: | Workwear |
| Production in countries where FWF is active: | Bangladesh, China, India, Turkey |
| Production in other countries: | Cambodia, Poland |
| 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 |
| All suppliers have been notified of FWF membership? | Yes |
| SCORING OVERVIEW | |
| % of own production under monitoring | 90% |
| Benchmarking score | 50 |
| Category | Good |

Summary:

In 2015, Tricorp meets most of FWFs management system requirements. For the Brand Performance Check, Tricorp has achieved a score of 50. This score together with a monitoring percentage of 90% results in Tricorp being placed in the Good category.

In comparison to last year, Tricorp has made a good effort and booked progress when it comes to monitoring and remediation. Also they have taken further steps to mitigate risks related to Building and Fire Safety in Bangladesh.

Tricorp still has significant potential to improve in 2016. This is especially related to knowing exactly where all production takes place, especially when working with an agent and conducting sufficient social compliance due diligence when starting production at new production locations, creating a systematic approach to follow-up on remediation.

PERFORMANCE CATEGORY OVERVIEW

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

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

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

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

1. PURCHASING PRACTICES

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS | RESULT | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR | DOCUMENTATION | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|---|--------|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1.1 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where affiliate buys at least 10% of production capacity | 56% | Affiliates with less than 10% of a factories' production capacity generally have limited influence on factory managers to make changes. | Supplier information provided by affiliate. | 3 | 4 | 0 |

Recommendation: FWF recommends Tricorp to consolidate its supplier base where possible, and increase leverage at main supplier(s) to effectively request improvements of working conditions.

Comment: According to the supplier register, Tricorp sources about 56% of its production volume from factories where it buys at least 10% of production capacity.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1.2 Percentage of production volume from suppliers where a business relationship has existed for at least five years | 55% | Stable business relationships support most aspects of the Code of Labour Practices, and give factories a reason to invest in improving working conditions. | Supplier information provided by affiliate. | 3 | 4 | 0 |
|--|-----|--|---|---|---|---|

Comment: Tricorp works to have a long-term relationship with its suppliers. A business relationship has existed for at least five years with suppliers responsible for 55 % of the production volume.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1.3 All new suppliers are required to sign and return the Code of Labour Practices before first orders are placed. | Yes | The CoLP is the foundation of all work between factories and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements. | Signed CoLPs are on file. | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|--|-----|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|

Comment: Before Tricorp places an order they send the supplier the FWF questionnaire. In 2015, Tricorp asked its larger suppliers to renew their questionnaire and share a picture of the CoLP.

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.4 Company conducts human rights due diligence at all new suppliers before placing orders. | Yes | Due diligence helps to identify, prevent and mitigate potential human rights problems at new suppliers. | Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments. | 4 | 4 | 0 |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|

Comment: Tricorp works to have a long-term relationships with suppliers and therefore only adds a few suppliers per year. When selecting new suppliers transparency is most important. Through requiring transparency from suppliers Tricorp gets insight in labour conditions at the factory.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1.5 Supplier compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner. | Yes | A systemic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decisionmaking. | Documentation of systemic approach: rating systems, checklists, databases, etc. | 1 | 2 | 0 |
|--|-----|--|---|---|---|---|

Recommendation: Members are encouraged 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.

Comment: In 2015, Tricorp asked its larger suppliers to share a picture of the CoLP, all pictures are kept on file. In addition, when suppliers are visited compliance with the CoLP is discussed, both by CSR and non-CSR staff.

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

Recommendation: A good production planning system needs to be established based on the production capacity of the factory for regular working hours. Tricorp could be more proactive in bundling orders to allow suppliers to spread workload more evenly.

Comment: Tricorp mostly sells from stock and do not have a seasonal collection therefore they are able to provide their supplier with a stable flow of orders. When placing an order Tricorp asks the supplier what its proposed delivery date is. This allows suppliers to ensure reasonable working hours. Based on supplier requests Tricorp may decide to place various orders at once with different delivery dates to make sure suppliers can ensure reasonable working hours.

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

Recommendation: Tricorp could take a more proactive approach in researching root causes of excessive overtime in their supply chain and discussing the topic with its suppliers to see how they can further contribute to reducing overtime.

Comment: Since Tricorp allows suppliers to set the delivery date of the order they feel they do not contribute to excessive overtime. However, audit reports have identified excessive overtime at Tricorp suppliers, which has not yet been addressed in the CAP follow-up.

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

Recommendation: At a minimum, members are recommended to investigate wage levels in production countries, among others by making use of FWFs Wage Ladder and country studies. As an advanced step, increased transparency in costing and productivity gives insight in the labour costs per product. This forms the basis for ensuring enough is paid to cover at least minimum wage and for making steps towards living wages.

Comment: Tricorp values quality over price. In addition, the number of styles Tricorp offers is limited and has been stable over the past years. This makes that Tricorp has a good insight in what the price of its product can be. Whenever suppliers state a price that is generally accepted and in case of a large excess suppliers are asked to provide an explanation. In the past years this explanation was often an increase of the legal minimum wage.

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|--|---|----|---|----|
| 1.9 Affiliate actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages. | No | If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage, FWF affiliates are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law. | Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, FWF audit reports or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved. | -2 | 2 | -2 |
|---|----|--|---|----|---|----|

Requirement: If a supplier fails to pay minimum wages, FWF members are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law and require a time bound action plan to ensure adequate payment.

Comment: During one of the audits it turned out workers at one of Tricorp's suppliers were not earning the legal minimum wage. During the brand performance check Tricorp was unable to show that they actively responded to this finding.

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|--|--|---|---|----|
| 1.10 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by affiliate. | No | Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on factories and their ability to pay workers on time. Most garment workers have minimal savings, and even a brief delay in payments can cause serious problems. | Based on a complaint or audit report; review of factory and affiliate financial documents. | 0 | 0 | -1 |
|---|----|--|--|---|---|----|

Comment: With most suppliers Tricorp offers 30 % advance payment and 70 % upon delivery.

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1.11 Degree to which affiliate assesses root causes of wages lower than living wages with suppliers and takes steps towards the implementation of living wages. | No efforts shown. | Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to affiliates' policies. | Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages. | 0 | 8 | 0 |
|---|-------------------|---|--|---|---|---|

Requirement: FWF expects Tricorp to use the wage ladder and information provided in the audit reports to discuss living wage with its suppliers and improve wages at its suppliers the coming years.

Comment: Tricorp has not actively addressed living wages with their suppliers in 2015.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.12 Affiliate sources from an FWF factory member. | Yes | When possible, FWF encourages affiliates to source from FWF factory members. On account of the small number of factories this is a 'bonus' indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an affiliate's score. | Supplier information provided by affiliate. | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|

Comment: Tricorp sources from a FWF factory member.

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.13 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the affiliate. | 2% | Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an affiliate's score. | Supplier information provided by affiliate. | 1 | 2 | 0 |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|

Comment: Tricorp owns 20 % of shares of one of its suppliers. It sources 2 % of production volume at this supplier.

PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 43

Earned Points: 20

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

| BASIC MEASUREMENTS | RESULT | COMMENTS |
|---|--------|--|
| % of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries) | 69% | |
| % of own production in low risk production countries where FWF's Low Risk policy has been implemented | 3% | FWF low risk policy should be implemented. 0 = policy is not implemented correctly. N/A = no production in low risk countries. |
| Total of own production under monitoring | 90% | Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 90% Measured as a percentage of turnover. |

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

Comment: A specific person, the sourcing manager, is designated to follow up on problems identified by the monitoring system.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| 2.2 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans | Intermediate | FWF considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that affiliates can do towards improving working conditions. | Documentation of remediation and followup actions taken by affiliate. | 4 | 8 | -2 |
|---|--------------|---|---|---|---|----|

Recommendation: FWF recommends that to facilitate remediation, Tricorp could consider:

- Hire a local consultant to assist factory in developing an action plan and to assist factory management in investigating root causes related to overtime and wages and addressing health and safety issues.
- Organise supplier seminars.
- Provide factory training.
- Share knowledge/material.
- Provide financial support to the supplier for implementing improvements.

Comment: CAPs are followed up, using the FWF CAP template. CAP follow-up is shared with FWF on a regular basis, showing moderate efforts to address most CAPs, primarily focusing on factory-level issues, such as health and safety improvements.

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3 Percentage of production volume from suppliers that have been visited by the affiliate in the past financial year | 50% | Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by affiliate staff or local representatives. They reinforce to factory managers that affiliates are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices. | Affiliates should document all factory visits with at least the date and name of the visitor. | 3 | 4 | 0 |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|

Recommendation: Regular visits provide the opportunities to discuss problems and corrective actions in the time period between formal audits.

Comment: Tricorp visited several of its suppliers in 2015. From 2016 onwards Tricorp plans to visit all its suppliers annually.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|--|---|---|---|
| 2.4 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected. | Yes | Existing reports form a basis for understanding the issues and strengths of a supplier, and reduces duplicative work. | Audit reports are on file; evidence of followup on prior CAPs. Reports of quality assessments. | 1 | 3 | 0 |
|--|-----|---|--|---|---|---|

Recommendation: Existing reports form a basis for understanding the issues and strengths of a supplier, and reduces double work. Existing audits can be counted towards the monitoring threshold if the quality of the report is assessed using the FWF audit quality tool and corrective actions are implemented.

Comment: Some suppliers are BSCI audited. Tricorp receives these audit reports and uses this to ensure suppliers have some knowledge about social compliance.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|--|---|---|----|
| 2.5 Audit Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) findings are shared with factory. 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: Tricorp shares the CAP and audit report with its suppliers, either directly or through its agent. The audit results are also discussed during visits.

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

Requirement: Tricorp's monitoring system should identify and address high risk issues that are specific to the Tricorp's sourcing practices. FWF provides policies and country-specific requirements to members. Priorities in remediation efforts are guided by these policies.

Comment: In its due diligence approach Tricorp does not specifically address the high-risk issues specific to its supply chain, such as sub-contracting, living wages and excessive overtime.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6a High risk issues specific to Bangladesh are identified and addressed by the monitoring system and remediation activities. | Intermediate Capacity | Affiliates sourcing in Bangladesh should take additional action to address both building and fire safety and the prevention of violence against women. | Building, electrical and fire safety inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories (Accord signatories and/or FWF affiliates), etc. | 1 | 3 | 0 |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|

Recommendation: Tricorp could consider taking more explicit steps to deal with harassment at the work floor in Bangladesh, for example by stimulating production locations to take part in the WEP programme and facilitate the establishment of Anti Harassment Committees.

Comment: Tricorp is aware of the issues related to building safety in Bangladesh. In 2015, Tricorp followed-up on the Accord Building and Fire Safety reports. With one supplier where building safety violations were discovered Tricorp discussed remediation and pre-financed the construction work.

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| 2.6b High risk issues specific to Myanmar are identified and addressed by the monitoring system and remediation activities. | Insufficient Capacity | Myanmar is still in the process of establishing the legal and civil society infrastructure needed to ensure compliance with labour rights. Extra care must be taken when doing business in Myanmar. | Shared CAPs, Wage Ladders per factory. | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|---|

Comment: In 2015, one of Tricorp's suppliers in China relocated part of the production to Myanmar once. After Tricorp found out they discussed with the supplier that they would rather not have production in Myanmar.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|--|---|---|----|
| 2.7 Affiliate cooperates with other customers in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers | Information sharing | Cooperation between customers increases leverage and chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the changes of a factory having to conduct multiple Corrective Action Plans about the same issue with multiple customers. | Shared CAPs, evidence of cooperation with other customers. | 1 | 2 | -1 |
|---|---------------------|---|--|---|---|----|

Comment: In 2015, Tricorp shared a factory with a new FWF member. That member was still sorting out their system and did not cooperate in the follow up on corrective actions. Therefore, Tricorp only shared information regarding the shared supplier.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.8 Monitoring requirements are fulfilled for production in low-risk countries | Yes | Low risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with basic standards. | Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires. | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|

Requirement: Monitoring requirements need to be fulfilled for production in low-risk countries in order for it to be counted towards the monitoring threshold. All production sites in low-risk countries must:

- Be visited annually by affiliate representatives;
- Be informed of FWF membership and return the completed CoLP questionnaire before production orders are placed;
- Be aware of specific risks identified by FWF;
- Have the FWF Worker Information Sheet posted in local languages.

Comment: Tricorp produces a small part of its collection in Poland. In 2015, Tricorp did not visit this location to check on compliance with the CoLP. However, production takes place via another FWF member, who did visit the relevant factory to monitor compliance.

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|---|-----|---|---|
| 2.9 External brands resold by the affiliate who have completed and returned the external brand questionnaire. (% of external sales volume) | 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 | 3 | 0 |
| 2.10 External brands resold by affiliates that are members of another credible initiative. (% of external sales volume) | No external brands resold | FWF believes affiliates who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to stock external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously. | 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 |

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 35

Earned Points: 16

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: Tricorp has designated a specific person, the sourcing manager, to address complaints when they occur.

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3.2 System exists to check that the Worker Information Sheet is posted in factories | Yes | The Worker Information Sheet is a key first step in alerting workers to their rights. | Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from factory visits, etc. | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|---|-----|---|--|---|---|---|

Comment: In 2015, Tricorp asked its larger suppliers to share a picture of the CoLP, all pictures are kept on file.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|---|---|----|
| 3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited factories where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline. | 33% | The FWF complaints procedure is a crucial element of verification. If factory-based complaint systems do not exist or do not work, the FWF worker helpline allows workers to ask questions about their rights and file complaints. Factory participation in the Workplace Education Programme also count towards this indicator. | Percentage of audited factories where at least 50% of interviewed workers indicate awareness of the FWF complaints mechanism + percentage of factories in WEP programme. | 2 | 4 | -2 |
|--|-----|--|--|---|---|----|

Recommendation: Tricorp can stimulate its suppliers to participate in WEP trainings, to raise awareness about the existence and the functioning of FWF's worker hotline. In addition to sending the worker information sheet, affiliates can use the worker information cards available for download on FWF's website.

Comment: Workers at a third of the factories audited in 2015 were aware of FWF and the worker helpline.

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|-----|---|----|
| 3.4 All complaints received from factory workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure | No complaints received | Providing access to remedy when problems arise is a key element of responsible supply chain management. Affiliate involvement is often essential to resolving issues. | Documentation that affiliate has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process. | N/A | 6 | -2 |
|--|------------------------|---|---|-----|---|----|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-----|---|----|
| 3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers | No complaints or cooperation not possible / necessary. | Because most factories supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the FWF affiliate can be critical in resolving a complaint at a supplier. | Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc. | N/A | 2 | -2 |
|--|--|--|--|-----|---|----|

COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 5

4. TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

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

Comment: All staff at Tricorp has been made aware of FWF membership requirements through internal newsletters and through training as part of the Tricorp campus, which every staff member has attended.

| | | | | | | |
|--|----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 4.2 Ongoing training in support of FWF requirements is provided to staff in direct contact with suppliers. | No | Sourcing, purchasing and CSR staff at a minimum should possess the knowledge necessary to implement FWF requirements and advocate for change within their organisations. | FWF Seminars or equivalent trainings provided; presentations, curricula, etc. | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|--|----|--|---|---|---|---|

Recommendation: A training session on labour standards can be held for purchasing staff. FWF can support or facilitate in providing trainings. In addition, it is recommended to actively take part in training opportunities FWF offers such as: FWF seminars, the FWF annual conference and webinars.

Comment: At the moment the purchasing manager is responsible for everything regarding FWF. She monitors all communication between other staff and suppliers. Other staff in direct contact with suppliers do not receive additional support on FWF requirements.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|----|
| 4.3 All sourcing contractors/agents are informed about FWF's Code of Labour Practices. | Yes | Agents have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is the responsibility of affiliate to ensure agents actively support the implementation of the CoLP. | Correspondence with agents, trainings for agents, FWF audit findings. | 1 | 2 | -2 |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|----|

Comment: In the cases where Tricorp works with agents, they are aware of FWF's Code of Labour Practices but not play an active role in supporting CoLP implementation.

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|---|---|---|
| 4.4 Factory participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume) | 40% | Lack of knowledge and skills on best practices related to labour standards is a common issue in factories. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards sustainable improvements. | Documentation of relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education Programme. | 4 | 6 | 0 |
|---|-----|--|--|---|---|---|

Comment: Tricorp enrolled about 40% of its factories located in countries where WEP is offered in WEP training sessions in 2015.

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|---|---|---|---|
| 4.5 Factory participation in trainings (where WEP is not offered; by production volume) | 100% | In areas where the Workplace Education Programme is not yet offered, affiliates may arrange trainings on their own or work with other training-partners. Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator. | Curricula, other documentation of training content, participation and outcomes. | 4 | 4 | 0 |
|---|------|--|---|---|---|---|

Comment: Tricorp's factory located in Cambodia is an active participant of the ILO Better Factories Cambodia program. This is the only factory located in a country where WEP is not offered where production was placed in 2015.

TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 15

Earned Points: 10

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 affiliates to first know all of their production locations. | Supplier information provided by affiliate. Financial records of previous financial year. Documented efforts by affiliate to update supplier information from its monitoring activities. | 3 | 6 | -2 |

Requirement: After the end of each financial year, affiliates must confirm their list of suppliers and provide relevant financial data. A complete suppliers list means all suppliers are included.

Comment: Tricorp has taken steps to identify all production locations in 2015. However, a number of production locations were missing in the supplier register and only registered in the database during the Brand Performance Check process.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|---|---|---|----|
| 5.2 A system exists to allow purchasing, CSR and other relevant staff to share information with each other about working conditions at suppliers | Yes | CSR, purchasing and other staff who interact with suppliers need to be able to share information in order to establish a coherent and effective strategy for improvements. | Internal information system; status CAPs, reports of meetings of purchasing/CSR; systematic way of storing information. | 1 | 1 | -1 |
|--|-----|--|---|---|---|----|

Comment: All information regarding working conditions at suppliers is saved at on a location that is accessible to all relevant staff members.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 4

6. TRANSPARENCY

| PERFORMANCE INDICATORS | RESULT | RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR | DOCUMENTATION | SCORE | MAX | MIN |
|---|--------|---|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 6.1 Communication about FWF membership adheres to the FWF communications policy | No | FWF membership should be communicated in a clear and accurate manner. FWF guidelines are designed to prevent misleading claims. | Logo is placed on website; other communications in line with policy. Affiliates may lose points if there is evidence that they did not comply with the communications policy. | -2 | 1 | -2 |

Requirement: FWF membership should be communicated according to the FWF communications policy.

Comment: Tricorp communicates about FWF membership on its website and in the catalogue. In small catalogues for the specific brands only the FWF logo is included. This logo does not include the line 'Tricorp is a member of' or www.fairwear.nl. Additionally, the placement of the logo in the catalogue can be regarded as on garment communication.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6.2 Affiliate engages in advanced reporting activities | Yes | Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of FWF's work and shares best practices with the industry. | Affiliate publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List. | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|

Comment: The Brand Performance Check report is available on the Tricorp website.

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| 6.3 Social Report is submitted to FWF and is published on affiliate's website | Complete report submitted to FWF | The Social Report is an important tool for affiliates to transparently share their efforts with stakeholders. | Report adheres to FWF guidelines for Social Report content. | 1 | 2 | -2 |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|

Recommendation: FWF recommends Tricorp to also publish the social report on their website.

Comment: Tricorp submitted their social report to FWF.

TRANSPARENCY

Possible Points: 4

Earned Points: 0

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: FWF membership is evaluated several times a year by the people in direct contact with FWF (sourcing manager and operations manager) and the top management.

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|--|---|---|----|
| 7.2 Changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by affiliate | 38% | 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. | Affiliate should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check. | 2 | 4 | -2 |
|--|-----|---|--|---|---|----|

Comment: Tricorp addressed 3 out of 8 requirements from the previous Brand Performance Check, such as follow-up on the Accord Building and Fire Safety reports in Bangladesh and better insight in production times and Tricorp's influence on excessive overtime. Tricorp still needs to work on issues related to due diligence and monitoring in low-risk countries.

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 4

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

n/a

SCORING OVERVIEW

| CATEGORY | EARNED | POSSIBLE |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Purchasing Practices | 20 | 43 |
| Monitoring and Remediation | 16 | 35 |
| Complaints Handling | 5 | 7 |
| Training and Capacity Building | 10 | 15 |
| Information Management | 4 | 7 |
| Transparency | 0 | 4 |
| Evaluation | 4 | 6 |
| Totals: | 59 | 117 |

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

50

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

13-05-2016

Conducted by:

Anne van Lakerveld

Interviews with:

Geert Thijssen, Operations Manager

Jenny Roebroek, Buying/Sourcing

Hendrik Stiksma, General Director

Ruud Kuijpers, Management team member

Robbert Maas, Marketing & Communications

Audit Summary:

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