



# **Brand Performance Check**

## **Tricorp BV**

**Publication date : March 2020**

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2019 to 31-12-2019

## About the Brand Performance Check

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

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

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

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

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

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

# Brand Performance Check Overview

## Tricorp BV

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2019 to 31-12-2019

Member company information	
Headquarters:	Rijen , The Netherlands
Member since:	2007-06-01
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where FWF is active:	Bangladesh, China, India, North Macedonia, Turkey, Viet Nam
Production in other countries:	Cambodia, Pakistan, 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
Scoring overview	
% of own production under monitoring	84%
Benchmarking score	50
Category	Good

## Summary:

Tricorp has shown progress and met most of Fair Wear's performance requirements. Tricorp's monitoring threshold of 84% exceeds monitoring requirements (80%). With a benchmarking score of 50, Tricorp is awarded the 'Good' category. Tricorp has a relatively small supply chain, which it has made progress in consolidating. As most production locations have been its partner for a long time, are regularly visited and are locations from which Tricorp buys a significant portion of its production, the brand is in a good position to improve working conditions.

During its last financial year, Tricorp established a new monitoring system and focused on auditing and remediation. Tricorp has not yet started with open-costing with suppliers. Fair Wear recommends Tricorp to start working on systematically demonstrating the link between its buying price and wage levels and set target wages above the legal minimum wage with some key production locations.

While its production planning system enables reasonable working hours at the factory level, excessive overtime remains a challenge in Tricorp's supply chain. Fair Wear requires Tricorp to take steps to prevent excessive overtime.

Tricorp has started training workers and management on the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and complaints helpline. One supplier has participated in advanced training through Fair Wear's Workplace Education Programme. Fair Wear encourages Tricorp to gradually train a larger portion of its supply chain.

Overall, Tricorp has taken several steps to move from 'Suspended' status to 'Good' status. Examples of steps taken include restructuring the internal processes of monitoring and remediation to the newly created CSR position, hiring a CSR manager, creating several new policies, aligning the buyers and quality managers with CSR and focusing on auditing and monitoring the supply chain. This has resulted in a borderline 'Good' score of 50 points.

In the current performance check report, several indicators have an insufficient score. For the insufficient scores on indicator 2.7 (Bangladesh) and 3.2, the Fair Wear policy for repeated non-compliance is applicable. This means that scoring insufficiently on these indicators in the next performance check will automatically lead to placement in the 'Needs Improvement' category, regarding those scores.

## Performance Category Overview

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

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

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

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

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

# 1. Purchasing Practices

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity.	62%	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.	3	4	0

Comment: 62% of the 2019 production volume came from locations where Tricorp buys at least 10% of the factory's production capacity.

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.	7%	FWF provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts.	Production location information as provided to FWF.	3	4	0

Comment: Tricorp has a limited number of production locations (amounting to 7%) producing less than 2% of its total FOB.

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.	72%	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.	3	4	0

Comment: Tricorp has long term business relationships. The majority of its supply chain, 72% of 2019 purchasing volume comes from production locations where the member has worked with for over 5 years.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.3 All (new) production locations are required to sign and return the questionnaire with the Code of Labour Practices before first bulk orders are placed.	No	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between production locations and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	0	2	0

Comment: Tricorp did not add new production locations during the last financial year. Two questionnaires of production locations of existing productions are missing, one for a production location in Poland and one for a production location in Bangladesh.

Requirement: Tricorp needs to ensure that all production locations sign and return the questionnaire, including existing production locations.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.4 Member company conducts human rights due diligence at all (new) production locations before placing orders.	Intermediate	Due diligence helps to identify, prevent and mitigate potential human rights problems at suppliers.	Documentation may include pre-audits, existing audits, other types of risk assessments.	2	4	0

Comment: Tricorp has developed a procedure for assessment of new production locations, which includes elements for human rights due diligence policy such as the requirement of sharing existing social audits, willingness to improve on human rights, including moving towards payment of living wage. Tricorp has developed a due diligence procedure for buyers in this financial year and started to implement it.

The brand has done a desk-study risk analysis on the country level and is aware of country-specific risks. These are compared with audit results and when clarification was needed, Tricorp requested further proof. One supplier shared only the pages of reports that showed positive results and Tricorp has proactively discussed this with this supplier and received access to full documentation.

The results of a risk-analysis were the reason for Tricorp not to start sourcing from Myanmar. A future step for Tricorp is to assess what local stakeholders consider as major human rights risks in a region.

The director of operations has the decision-making power in selecting a new supplier, the CSR manager has an advisory role to the director of operations.

Next step for Tricorp is to share the risk analysis with (local) stakeholders to include their perspective on labour rights risks.

Recommendation: A risk-analysis as part of the decision-making process of selecting new production locations is an important step to mitigate risk and prevent potential problems. FWF recommends Tricorp to clearly define preventive actions for identified risks and connect them to sourcing decisions in such a way that CSR can have a veto not to start sourcing from a country or production location. This also includes strategies to tackle structural risks such as low wage levels in the country, limited freedom of association and restricted civil society that are beyond the brand's individual sphere of influence.

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: Tricorp regularly does supplier evaluations. During the period of the assessment period, the evaluation of supplier performance on labour conditions at the production location is not integrated with the general buyers and quality evaluation. The results of both evaluations are compared during a buyers meeting. A production decision to terminate the relationship with one supplier based on (lack of) factory performance in remediation in combination with quality and delivery issues, has been made. There were no positive rewards of well-performing production locations during the assessment period.

Recommendation: FWF encourages Tricorp to develop an evaluation/grading system for suppliers where compliance with labour standards is a criterion for future order placement which integrates the CSR evaluation with the general buyers and quality evaluation.

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, training 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.	General or ad-hoc system.	Member company production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at production locations.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	2	4	0

Comment: Tricorp is not working with seasons, given its clientele ordering workwear consistently. Specification for products is well known to suppliers and production can take place throughout the year, allowing suppliers to even out production peaks for seasonal products. Orders are placed six months in advance, including transport. No design changes to the order are made afterward. Forecasting and actual order volumes rarely differ. Tricorp keeps large volumes of items on stock in Europe allowing them to accommodate delays from the supplier's site.

Specials are developed in close collaboration with the supplier well in advance. A final forecast is shared after confirmation with the client. Actual order volumes usually vary by max. 5%.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Tricorp to investigate labour minutes needed per style to allow for more precise planning and integrating production capacity knowledge of suppliers in planning.

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

Comment: The majority of FWF and BSCI audits documented excessive overtime findings or suppliers not being transparent about working hours. In the 2019 Fair Wear audit in China documents could not be verified as working hour are not recorded and in the 2019 Turkish audits there are findings of excessive overtime. In the 11 external audits in Bangladesh, China, Pakistan, and Cambodia conducted in 2019, excessive overtime was identified in the 8 Chinese audits. In many of the audited factories, Tricorp is one of the main clients. Tricorp could demonstrate that they had discussed these findings. Tricorp could not demonstrate that it had conducted root cause analyses.

Requirement: Tricorp should investigate to what extent its current buying practices have an effect on the working hours at the supplier level. A root cause analysis of excessive overtime should be done to investigate which steps can be most effective to reduce excessive overtime.

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.	Insufficient	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.	0	4	0

Comment: At the time of the assessment, Tricorp cannot demonstrate the link between its buying price and wages in production locations. In an audit of a Chinese and a Turkish production location, both done end of 2019, the factory management has indicated that the prices Tricorp is paying are not supporting living wages.

Requirement: Tricorp 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. For the production locations where Tricorp buys exclusively at a supplier, the member should be able to demonstrate the link between its pricing and the wage levels at the supplier.

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, FWF member companies are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law. Payment below minimum wage must be remediated urgently.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, FWF Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a FWF auditor, or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	0	0	-2

Comment: In an audit at a Chinese supplier the working hours were not recorded and annual leave not paid. During the performance check, Tricorp showed that this was discussed with the supplier.

It was noted during an audit at a Turkish supplier that social securities and entitled leave are not paid as legally required. The brand responded actively.

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

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.	Insufficient	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: Internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc	0	6	0

Comment: At the time of the assessment, Tricorp has no overview of wages levels at the factories and the gap between payment and living wage. Root causes are not discussed.

Requirement: Tricorp must assess the root causes of wages that are lower than living wages, taking into account its leverage and effect of its own pricing policy. Tricorp is expected to take an active role in discussing living wages with its suppliers. The FWF wage ladder can be used as a tool to implement living wages, to document, monitor, negotiate and evaluate the improvements at its suppliers.

Where Tricorp buys exclusively at a supplier, the member is held more accountable for implementing adequate steps. The member is expected to take an active role in discussing living wages with its suppliers and should take steps to work towards living wages.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.12 Percentage of production volume from factories owned by the member company (bonus indicator).	None	Owning a supplier increases the accountability and reduces the risk of unexpected CoLP violations. Given these advantages, this is a bonus indicator. Extra points are possible, but the indicator will not negatively affect an member company's score.	Supplier information provided by member company.	N/A	2	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.13 Member company determines and finances wage increases	None	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach.	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	0	4	0

Comment: Tricorp determines and/or finances no wage increases.

Requirement: Tricorp should analyse what is needed to increase wages and develop a strategy to finance the costs of wage increases.

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	0%	FWF member companies are challenged to adopt approaches that absorb the extra costs of increasing wages.	Member company's own documentation, evidence of target wage implementation, such as wage reports, factory documentation, communication with factories, etc.	0	3	0

Comment: Tricorp is not aware of paying a share of a living wage. A finding of an audit in China and one in Turkey is that factory management states that the prices Tricorp is paying are not supporting a living wage for the workers.

Requirement: Tricorp is expected to begin setting a target wage for its production locations.

---

## **Purchasing Practices**

**Possible Points: 47**

**Earned Points: 15**

---

## 2. Monitoring and Remediation

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	84%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled	0%	To be counted towards the monitoring threshold, FWF low-risk policy should be implemented. See indicator 2.9. (N/A = no production in low risk countries.)
Meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	Yes	
Requirement(s) for next performance check		
Total of own production under monitoring	84%	Measured as percentage of production volume (Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100%)

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

Comment: The CSR manager is responsible to follow up on problems identified by the monitoring system.

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

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

Comment: Tricorp ensures that audit reports and CAPs are shared with and discussed with factory management in a timely manner, either in person, through Skype or via email. Although Tricorp discusses progress, the brand is not agreeing on deadlines for remediation with the production location.

Requirement: Tricorp should specify a reasonable timeframe for resolving the corrective action plan. In case a worker representation is applicable the CAP should be shared with worker representative as well as involved in setting the timeframe for realising improvements.

Recommendation: Before an audit takes place, Tricorp is recommended to check with the supplier whether worker representatives are active. In this way, they can be involved from the start of an audit and be invited for the audit opening and exit meeting.

Including workers when following up on audit reports gives them the opportunity to be informed of issues in the factory and have a voice in the prioritization of issues

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.4 Degree of progress towards resolution of existing Corrective Action Plans and remediation of identified problems.	Basic	FWF considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that member companies can do towards improving working conditions.	CAP-related documentation including status of findings, documentation of remediation and follow up actions taken by member. Reports of quality assessments. Evidence of understanding relevant issues.	4	8	-2

Comment: Corrective action plans are set up between Tricorp and suppliers when issues are found at the production location. Tricorp is proactive in the follow-up and could prove for a random sample of Fair Wear and BSCI audits that suppliers are repeatedly reminded to follow up and improve.

At one supplier in Bangladesh, Tricorp has 95% leverage. The brand has supported this supplier in several ways to improve building safety, including a loan for fire doors.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Tricorp actively contribute or facilitate the improvement process instead of only reminding the factory to follow-up for other factories as well. Furthermore, it is advised to only close issues when verification can be provided by showing proof (pictures, documentation) or by on-site visits of Tricorp, by including worker representation, or an independent third party.

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.	89%	Formal audits should be augmented by annual visits by member company staff or local representatives. They reinforce to production location managers that member companies are serious about implementing the Code of Labour Practices.	Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	4	4	0

Comment: Tricorp visits 89% of its suppliers in which labour conditions are discussed and photos are taken of the posted Worker Information Sheets.

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: Since 2019, Tricorp is member of BSCI in addition to a member of Fair Wear. In addition to the BSCI audit summary (the downloadable PDF that can be shared with others) Tricorp is actively using the online information system of BSCI which contains more detailed information than the download. Tricorp gave a detailed and documented explanation of how access to the BSCI database facilitates the implementation of corrective action plans.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.7 Compliance with FWF risk policies.	Average score depending on the number of applicable policies and results	Aside from regular monitoring and remediation requirements under FWF membership, countries, specific areas within countries or specific product groups may pose specific risks that require additional steps to address and remediate those risks. FWF requires member companies to be aware of those risks and implement policy requirements as prescribed by FWF.	Policy documents, inspection reports, evidence of cooperation with other customers sourcing at the same factories, reports of meetings with suppliers, reports of additional activities and/or attendance lists as mentioned in policy documents.	1	6	-2
Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh	Insufficient			-2	6	-2
Compliance with FWF Myanmar policy	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF guidance on abrasive blasting	Policies are not relevant to the company's supply chain			N/A	6	-2
Compliance with FWF guidance on risks related to Turkish garment factories employing Syrian refugees	Intermediate			3	6	-2
Other risks specific to the member's supply chain are addressed by its monitoring system	Intermediate			3	6	-2

#### Comment: Bangladesh

Tricorp is sourcing from four production locations in Bangladesh. The brand is not a member of the Bangladesh Accord. One of the factories, where Tricorp has 95% leverage, there is no coverage of Accord audits. Tricorp has received safety reports from this factory that at the moment do not give sufficient and up to date information for Tricorp to assess the safety situation at this factory. There is no CAP available. Nevertheless, the brand has supported this factory to improve the safety of the building, for example by giving a loan for fire safety doors. Tricorp is in discussion with the Accord to become a member, however, Tricorp did not yet take the step to apply for membership.

#### Turkey

Tricorp has three Turkish suppliers, for one supplier a subcontractor is known. The brand has developed a policy for Syrian refugees, following and integrating the Fair Wear guidelines in its communication with the Turkish production locations. Findings related to Syrian refugees in audits are addressed. The most recent Worker Information Sheet (WIS) of Fair Wear Global Services is posted in these three factories.

#### Other risks

Tricorp is informed about other country-specific risks and has conducted a desk study on non-Fair Wear countries Pakistan and Cambodia using different human rights resources for this study. In the conversations with suppliers about CAP follow-up, the CSR manager is focusing on.

The brand is less informed about risks related to specific types of products, such as leather.

Requirement: Tricorp should assure to comply with the requirements of the Fair Wear enhanced monitoring programme on Bangladesh, either by:

1) becoming a signatory of the Accord which ensures an Accord inspection of the factory to gain insight into the safety situation and participate in active follow up of remediation.

Or; 2): make a time-bound plan to phase out the supplier in accordance with Fair Wear's responsible exit strategy. This is especially important where member production is a significant part of total factory production.

Recommendation: Tricorp could schedule a WEP module on Syrian refugee workers at a Turkish supplier that employs Syrian refugee workers or that is located in an area where many Syrian refugee workers are working. WEP module on Syrian refugee workers is developed for management and for Turkish and Syrian workers.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.8 Member company cooperates with other FWF member companies in resolving corrective actions at shared suppliers.	No CAPs active, no shared production locations or refusal of other company to cooperate	Cooperation between customers increases leverage and chances of successful outcomes. Cooperation also reduces the chances of a factory having to conduct multiple Corrective Action Plans about the same issue with multiple customers.	Shared CAPs, evidence of cooperation with other customers.	N/A	2	-1

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.9 Percentage of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	0-49%	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws. FWF has defined minimum monitoring requirements for production locations in low-risk countries.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	1	3	0

Comment: The brand has one production location in a low-risk country. Questionnaire is not returned and no evidence of Worker Information Sheet is posted. Tricorp did not visit this supplier recently.

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:

- Ensure up to date information on the labour conditions in the location either by a regular visit and/or a report by a third party;
- 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.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits at tail-end production locations (when the minimum required monitoring threshold is met).	No	FWF encourages its members to monitor 100% of its production locations and rewards those members who conduct full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Production location information as provided to FWF and recent Audit Reports.	N/A	2	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.11 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from external brands resold by the member company.	No external brands resold	FWF believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of FWF or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	N/A	2	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.12 External brands resold by member companies that are members of another credible initiative (% of external sales volume).	No external brands resold	FWF believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods.	External production data in FWF's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by FWF or FLA members.	N/A	3	0

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.13 Questionnaire is sent and information is collected from licensees.	No licensees	FWF believes it is important for member companies to know if the licensee is committed to the implementation of the same labour standards and has a monitoring system in place.	Questionnaires are on file. Contracts with licensees.	N/A	1	0

---

## Monitoring and Remediation

**Possible Points: 28**

**Earned Points: 17**

---

### 3. Complaints Handling

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

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

Comment: The CSR manager is designated to address worker 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.	No	Informing both management and workers about the FWF Code of Labour Practices and complaints hotline is a first step in alerting workers to their rights. The Worker Information Sheet is a tool to do this and should be visibly posted at all production locations.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from production location visits, etc.	-2	2	-2

Comment: In 2019, Tricorp has contacted all production locations about posting the most up to date Worker Information Sheet (WIS). Most suppliers have sent photos of the WIS posted, some have not yet. For Turkey, the brand shared proof that the most recent version of the WIS for Turkey with the new telephone numbers has been posted. Tricorp could show proof that the production locations that had not yet posted the WIS, were reminded.

Requirement: The member must ensure that the Worker Information Sheet, including contact information of the local complaints handler of FWF, is posted in factories in a location that is accessible to all workers. Member company should check by means of a visit whether the Worker Information Sheet is posted in the factories.

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.	5%	After informing workers and management of the FWF CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural worker-management dialogue.	Training reports, FWF's data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	4	6	0

Comment: One Chinese production locations has participated in FWF's Workplace Education Programme basic module in 2019 accounting for 5% of Tricorp's production volume in high-risk countries.

Recommendation: FWF recommends members to actively raise awareness about the FWF Code of Labour Practices and FWF complaint hotline among a larger portion of its suppliers. The member should ensure good quality systematic training of workers and management on these topics. To this end, members can either use FWF's Workplace Education Programme (WEP) basic module or implement training related to the FWF CoLP and complaint hotline through service providers or brand staff. FWF guidance on good quality training is available on the Member Hub.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.4 All complaints received from production location workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure	No complaints received	Providing access to remedy when problems arise is a key element of responsible supply chain management. Member company involvement is often essential to resolving issues.	Documentation that member company has completed all required steps in the complaints handling process.	N/A	6	-2

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
3.5 Cooperation with other customers in addressing worker complaints at shared suppliers	No complaints or cooperation not possible / necessary	Because most production locations supply several customers with products, involvement of other customers by the FWF member company can be critical in resolving a complaint at a supplier.	Documentation of joint efforts, e.g. emails, sharing of complaint data, etc.	N/A	2	0

---

## Complaints Handling

**Possible Points: 9**

**Earned Points: 3**

---

## 4. Training and Capacity Building

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

Comment: Tricorp ensures that all staff is aware of FWF membership. The CSR manager provides updates on employee meetings and the intranet. Tricorp informs new staff. During the annual Tricorp 'intern' days many colleagues show interest to join the CSR manager for a day.

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

Comment: Once every month the CSR manager joins the buyers' meeting to update buyers on CSR, including Fair Wear. In addition to this CSR individually discusses audits with the buyers as they participate in the CAP follow-up.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.3 All sourcing contractors/agents are informed about FWF's Code of Labour Practices.	Yes + actively support COLP	Agents have the potential to either support or disrupt CoLP implementation. It is the responsibility of member company to ensure agents actively support the implementation of the CoLP.	Correspondence with agents, trainings for agents, FWF audit findings.	2	2	0

Comment: Tricorp has several agents and all are open and active to participate in CAP follow-up. Tricorp receives regular updates from agents on how the production locations improve. There is not yet a due diligence procedure developed for agents.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Tricorp to apply consistency in its Fair Wear approach and develop a 'procedure - CAP follow up by suppliers' comparable to the several other Fair Wear related procedures during this financial year. With this procedure, Tricorp can actively train their sourcing contractors/agents on monitoring and remediating identified issues and enable them to support the implementation of the CoLP.

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.	10%	Complex human rights issues such as freedom of association or gender-based violence require more in-depth trainings that support factory-level transformative processes. FWF has developed several modules, however, other (member-led) programmes may also count.	Training reports, FWF's data on factories enrolled in training programmes. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	2	6	0

Comment: One production location in Bangladesh has participated in advanced training through FWF's Workplace Education Programme in the violence prevention module in 2017. This location account for 10% of the brand's production volume in high-risk countries.

Recommendation: FWF recommends members to implement training programmes that support factory-level transformation such as establishing functional internal grievance mechanisms, improving worker-management dialogue and communication skills or addressing gender-based violence. Training assessed under this indicator should go beyond raising awareness and focus on behavioural change and long-term structures to improve working conditions. To this end, members can make use of FWF's Workplace Education Programme communication or violence prevention module or implement advanced training through service providers or brand staff. FWF guidance on good quality training is available on the Member Hub.

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: In the case of the Bangladeshi supplier, the established anti-harassment committee (AHC) was able to investigate and resolve complaints after the training, which is a best practice development. During the 2018 Fair Wear follow-up audit this AHC was found functional.

Recommendation: FWF recommends members to check whether their supplier conducts regular anti-harassment committee meetings, whether an external expert attends these meetings and whether complaints are reported to the committee.

---

## Training and Capacity Building

**Possible Points: 13**

**Earned Points: 9**

---

## 5. Information Management

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
5.1 Level of effort to identify all production locations	Intermediate	Any improvements to supply chains require member companies to first know all of their production locations.	Supplier information provided by member company. Financial records of previous financial year. Documented efforts by member company to update supplier information from its monitoring activities.	3	6	-2

Comment: Overall Tricorp has a solid understanding of where its products are made. Some audits mention subcontractors which are not included in the production location list of Tricorp. For these findings, Tricorp has no assurance that these production locations are not used for the brand. There are no written agreements with suppliers about subcontracting yet.

In 2019, Tricorp has prioritized the identification of subcontractors as one of the key priorities and has approached all suppliers to inform and update Tricorp on this topic.

Requirement: After the end of each financial year, members must confirm their list of production locations and provide relevant financial data. A complete list means ALL production locations are included of all production processes the member uses in the stages after fabric production. Tricorp should follow up on audit findings to investigate whether these subcontractor locations are used for Tricorp production.

Recommendation: Tricorp is advised to develop a systematic approach to complete the production location list. Part of the approach can be:

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

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
5.2 CSR and other relevant staff actively share information with each other about working conditions at production locations.	Yes	CSR, purchasing and other staff who interact with suppliers need to be able to share information in order to establish a coherent and effective strategy for improvements.	Internal information system; status CAPs, reports of meetings of purchasing/CSR; systematic way of storing information.	1	1	-1

Comment: The CSR manager works closely together with the production and quality control staff. They meet face to face regularly and information about working conditions at production sites is accessible to all.

---

## Information Management

**Possible Points: 7**

**Earned Points: 4**

---

## 6. Transparency

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

Comment: Tricorp overall complies with the Fair Wear communication policy. All Fair Wear communication was removed due to the 'suspended' status.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities	Supplier list is disclosed to the public.	Good reporting by members helps to ensure the transparency of FWF's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	2	2	0

Comment: All suppliers are mentioned in the social report. Furthermore, Tricorp is open to comply with the Fair Wear transparency policy and has returned the signed confidentiality agreement to Fair Wear as the first step to be transparent about production locations. Tricorp has not yet sent, received and uploaded the consent letters of the suppliers or asked consent to publish supplier data in another way.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Tricorp to publish the names of the supplier on its website.

Fair Wear recommends Tricorp to request consent to suppliers to be able to be transparent about their data and disclose the data of suppliers that have given consent to other member brands 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 FWF's communication policy.	Social report that is in line with FWF's communication policy.	2	2	-1

Comment: Tricorp has submitted a detailed social report to Fair Wear and published it on the corporate website.

## Transparency

**Possible Points: 6**

**Earned Points: 6**

## 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: CSR is working closely with the management team and last year's category of 'suspended' was discussed with management as well.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
7.2 Level of action/progress made on required changes from previous Brand Performance Check implemented by member company.	No requirements were included in previous Check	In each Brand Performance Check report, FWF may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of FWF membership and its process approach.	Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	N/A	4	-2

Comment: No performance check was conducted in 2019.

## Evaluation

**Possible Points: 2**

**Earned Points: 2**

## Recommendations to FWF

Tricorp values online webinars and learning sessions which is less time-consuming than seminars.

## Scoring Overview

Category	Earned	Possible
Purchasing Practices	15	47
Monitoring and Remediation	17	28
Complaints Handling	3	9
Training and Capacity Building	9	13
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	6	6
Evaluation	2	2
Totals:	56	112

### Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

50

### Performance Benchmarking Category

Good

## Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

20-02-2020

Conducted by:

Mariette van Amstel

Interviews with:

Jasper van Dongen - CSR manager

Maurice Leveke - Director of Operations

Ruud Kuijpers - Financial Director