



Brand Performance Check

Greiff Mode GmbH & Co.

This report covers the evaluation period 01-05-2021 to 30-04-2022

About the Brand Performance Check

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Brand Performance Check Overview

Greiff Mode GmbH & Co.

Evaluation Period: 01-05-2021 to 30-04-2022

Member company information	
Headquarters:	Bamberg , Germany
Member since:	2015-03-15
Product types:	Workwear
Production in countries where Fair Wear is active:	China, North Macedonia, Romania, Viet Nam
Production in other countries:	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany, Morocco, Pakistan, Portugal, Ukraine
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	87%
Benchmarking score	74
Category	Good

Summary:

GREIFF has shown progress and met most of Fair Wears' performance requirements. With a benchmarking score of 74, GREIFF is placed in the Good category. Although the monitoring threshold does not determine the category this year, GREIFF has monitored 87% of its production volume.

Corona Addendum:

After a challenging year during the pandemic, GREIFF had a successful business year in 2021/2022 and achieved about 80% of the revenue of the pre-pandemic level. Nevertheless, challenges arose in GREIFF's supply chain, such as a high increase in transport costs, global inflation, delivery problems for fabrics and trimmings and capacity shortage.

The war in Ukraine also impacted the brand as two strategic partners of the brand are based in Ukraine. Since the beginning of the war, GREIFF has supported its long-term business partners and continues to place orders. The brand is in daily contact with both suppliers.

In 2021/2022, GREIFF joined the living wage lab of the Partnership of Sustainable Textiles and set the base for the living wage project in collaboration with another member at a strategic supplier in Pakistan. In addition, GREIFF could demonstrate that for five other suppliers, CMT prices increased between four to eleven per cent to reflect wage increases and the effects of inflation.

As part of its membership in the Partnership for Sustainable Textiles, GREIFF does a risk analysis for all countries it sources from. The brand analysed its deeper supply chain down until Tier 4, an internal collaboration of CSR, Purchasing and Product Development.

In 2021/2022, COVID-19 had no significant influence on GREIFF's production. The brand stayed in daily contact with its suppliers and was aware of isolated COVID-19 cases, which had minor effects on the production flow. The COVID-19 Health and Safety programmes remained in place. Even though travelling remained restricted, the brand could visit most of its production partners.

It is to highlight that GREIFF actively supported its supplier in Bosnia in finding a new key customer when the brand's leverage dropped from 100% to 30% leverage, due to the reduced demand for clothes for the restaurant and hotel business. Since 2021, the brand has been the supplier's primary customer, and there hasn't been any negative impact on the supplier due to reduced orders of GREIFF.

GREIFF has strong systems to enable proper human rights due diligence through frequent visits and thorough risk analysis. The brand must focus on the biggest challenge of living wages in the upcoming year.

Performance Category Overview

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

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

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

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

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

1. Purchasing Practices

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.1a Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys at least 10% of production capacity.	89%	Member companies with less than 10% of a production location's production capacity generally have limited influence on production location managers to make changes.	Supplier information provided by member company.	4	4	0

Comment: GREIFF has a stable supply chain with its main suppliers in Marokko, Ukraine and Bosnia. GREIFF aims to work with small to medium suppliers where it can have significant leverage. At most of its suppliers, GREIFF has considerable leverage, allowing them to influence working conditions. Due to the reduced demand for clothes for the restaurant and hotel business during the global pandemic, GREIFF decreased its leverage significantly at its supplier in Bosnia (from 100% to 30% leverage). The brand took its responsibility as the only customer at this supplier very seriously. At an early stage, the brand supported the supplier by finding an additional customer to fill the capacity gap. In 2022, the market improved, and GREIFF had to increase capacity at other partners to produce the orders as the new customer established 70% of the capacity in Bosnia.

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.	2%	Fair Wear provides incentives to clothing brands to consolidate their supplier base, especially at the tail end, as much as possible, and rewards those members who have a small tail end. Shortening the tail end reduces social compliance risks and enhances the impact of efficient use of capital and remediation efforts.	Production location information as provided to Fair Wear.	3	4	0

Comment: In 2021/2022, GREIFF bought 2 % of its production volume at production locations where it bought less than 2 % of its total FOB. Two suppliers produce small quantities of specific accessories, like ties and belts for the brand, to offer its customers a complete product range. Another supplier is based in Vietnam and delivers low-priced suits for the brand, and the fourth supplier just started working with the brand and has, therefore, only a small production volume in the first year of business.

Recommendation: Fair Wear encourages GREIFF to review regularly whether production locations where it buys less than 2% of their FOB are of strategic relevance and if the specific accessories are still needed.

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.	71%	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: GREIFF values long-term relationships with its suppliers. They are generally rarely replaced. In its financial 2021/2022, GREIFF bought 71 % of its total production volume from locations where a business relationship has existed for at least five 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.	Yes	The CoLP is the foundation of all work between production locations and brands, and the first step in developing a commitment to improvements.	Signed CoLPs are on file.	2	2	0

Comment: In its financial year 2021/2022, one new production location in Pakistan was added to GREIFF's supply chain. The brand already works with this supplier for more than five years, the vertical supplier produces materials for the brand, but there had not been a direct business relationship before 2022.

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

Comment: In the past financial year, GREIFF added one new supplier from Pakistan. The brand has worked with this supplier since 2016, before GREIFF sourced materials from this vertical supplier. Since 2022 the supplier is also producing for the brand. Since the beginning of the partnership, GREIFF has worked closely with the supplier and conducted thorough human rights due diligence. The collaboration started with a public-private partnership (PPP) project between GREIFF and the German government, supported and guided by the German consultancy Hess Natur Stiftung. As part of this project, the independent third party regularly visited the supplier and conducted various training sessions. GREIFF received monthly reports of the results. The final goal for the supplier was to receive the Oeko-tex STEP certificate, a sustainability certificate focusing on social and environmental indicators.

In general, when selecting new suppliers, GREIFF tries to stay in countries where they are already active and have done a risk analysis as part of their due diligence approach. Additional visits to all new suppliers are conducted before placing bulk orders, labour standards are discussed, and special attention is given to ensuring at least legal minimum wages (LMW) are paid to all workers. Any existing audit report is requested, and the quality is verified. Experience is that the quality of the report differs a lot and that most of them need to contain more information to follow up on findings thoroughly. GREIFF conducts a Health and Safety Check with the Fair Wear Health and Safety checklist. GREIFF also checks the factory wage level at new suppliers to ensure that at least the legal minimum wage is paid. The collective outcome of these checks provides GREIFF with enough information to make sourcing decisions.

As part of its membership in the Partnership for Sustainable Textiles (Textilbündnis, Germany) GREIFF does a risk analysis for all countries it sources from. Being a member of the Textilbündnis, GREIFF also has access to the online tool called T-Rexs where all risks of all production countries are well defined and always kept updated. The brand analysed its deeper supply chain down until Tier 4. All information is entered collaboratively between CSR, Purchasing and Product Development. T-Rexs is used as an additional source of information.

In 2022 the brand revised its sustainability guidelines and internal sourcing policy to strengthen its human rights due diligence further.

In 2021/2022, COVID-19 had no significant influence on GREIFFs production. The brand stayed in daily contact with its suppliers and was aware of isolated COVID-19 cases, which had relatively minor effects on the production flow due to staff shortages. The COVID-19 Health and Safety programmes remained in place in 2021/2022. Travelling remained restricted. Nevertheless, the brand could visit most of its production partners.

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: GREIFF has an integrated evaluation system for each production location to collect information and ensure smooth communication. This evaluation includes supplier prices, product quality, delivery timelines, supplier service and social compliance.

GREIFF organises supplier evaluations several times per year with relevant staff to discuss current issues at production locations and evaluate supplier progress concerning CAP follow-up. Service evaluation is based on ease of working relations, trust, openness and responsiveness. Quality is checked in-house, and suppliers are evaluated on performance, including deliveries and delays. Additionally, GREIFF evaluates compliance with the Code of Labour Practices, checking whether the questionnaires are filled in and the Worker Information Sheets posted. GREIFF visits the factories and discusses labour standards. GREIFF systematically collects audits and discusses and monitors CAP follow-up. Supplier evaluation is a tool to support the ongoing partnership. As all suppliers specialise in certain products, the brand cannot link the evaluation results with a reward system in the form of, e.g. increased orders.

GREIFF has not cancelled any of its planned orders and managed in 2021/22 to business at 80% of the level before the pandemic.

The brand has a responsible exit strategy if it needs to end a business relationship with one of its partners. The brand stopped ordering one product from a Vietnamese partner, which accounted for 1,4% FOB and 3% leverage in the last business year. As this was a tail-end supplier and the product was discontinued, the brand did not need an exit strategy.

Recommendation: As it is not always possible to reward suppliers with more volumes, Greiff Mode GmbH & Co. could look into other incentives that reward suppliers' commitment towards the CoLP. An example would be to offer training for skill building/capacity development.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.6 The member company's production planning systems support reasonable working hours.	Strong, integrated systems in place.	Member company production planning systems can have a significant impact on the levels of excessive overtime at production locations.	Documentation of robust planning systems.	4	4	0

Comment: GREIFF has two types of products: Never Out of Stock items (NOS, 80%) and specific products that are being ordered by customers (20%). The catalogues of the NOS items have a validity of two years; therefore, it does not have a high or low season. GREIFF provides its suppliers with a 12-months forecast of its production planning for the NOS products (always in December for the coming year). This planning is based on input from the production locations about their available hours per month per location per production stage. The actual order placement can differ by about 20 per cent. Last-minute changes are rare.

The lead time for suppliers from Europe and Africa is ten weeks. GREIFF buys the fabric and sends it to the factories. For Pakistan and Vietnam, the lead time is between 16 to 26 weeks. These production locations supply ready-made garments.

GREIFF has a large stock and can respond to clients' demands. This enables GREIFF to accept some degree of a delay from the suppliers that supply the NOS items. For these items, the production status is reconfirmed daily. Delays of fabric are monitored and handled by GREIFF. It does not influence the lead time for its suppliers.

GREIFF calculates the standard minutes per style and has started to relate it to the production capacity of several of its most important suppliers.

The planning was not impacted by COVID-19. But after reducing capacities during the pandemic, GREIFF struggles with increasing capacities to fill its stock again. Also, in future, the brand needs a large stock to respond quickly to its client's demands.

Recommendation: The brand should closely monitor capacity developments in the next year to ensure orders to replenish its reduced warehouse stock will not lead to excessive overtime at some of its suppliers.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	No production problems /delays have been documented.	Some production delays are outside of the control of member companies; however there are a number of steps that can be taken to address production delays without resorting to excessive overtime.	Evidence of how member responds to excessive overtime and strategies that help reduce the risk of excessive overtime, such as: root cause analysis, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	N/A	6	0

Comment: GREIFF has a general insight in which production countries overtime is an issue. In the financial year 2021/2022, three audits were conducted (One supplier in Ukraine and two suppliers in Pakistan). Excessive overtime was not reported in any of the three reports.

GREIFF accepts delays in delivery because it has some flexibility in its planning. Until now, due to its high stock levels, GREIFF can delay some of its recurring NOS orders, which usually can be moved to less busy months. Moreover, GREIFF prioritizes customer orders over its NOS orders. In case of urgency, part delivery via airfreight at company expenses is possible.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.8 Member company can demonstrate the link between its buying prices and wage levels in production locations.	Intermediate	Understanding the labour component of buying prices is an essential first step for member companies towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages – and towards the implementation of living wages.	Interviews with production staff, documents related to member's pricing policy and system, buying contracts.	2	4	0

Comment: GREIFF conducts wage checks yearly at all CMT suppliers: the lowest, average, and highest wages paid to workers are collected. Wage ladders and country studies are used as background information. GREIFF negotiates recurring basic model prices after legal minimum wages have been met. In case needed, cost reduction is achieved through the quality of the fabric used or in the layout and cutting of the product.

As a standard practice, to know the minutes needed to produce a single item, GREIFF uses the requirements of the association GermanFashion Modeverband e.V., which sets standard production minutes for different production steps. Knowing the minutes per production step allows GREIFF to know the production minute per style. The Technical manager is well aware of the standard production minutes needed and is responsible for the price negotiations.

GREIFF calculates the price breakdown per style and is aware of the percentage of the labour cost in general. Aside from knowing the production minutes per style, GREIFF needs to demonstrate a clear understanding of the labour cost components of its buying prices. Labour costs are not fixed.

For the suppliers in Bosnia, North Macedonia, Marocco, Romania and Ukraine, GREIFF showed an increased labour price. In general, GREIFF is aware of when and how much increase in salary the suppliers are paying their workers. The increased wages are checked through audits.

The brand regularly monitors inflation, price and currency fluctuations in the respective production countries. Prices are regularly adjusted and negotiated to take those impacts into account. In addition, GREIFF pays small-quantity surcharges in case orders are smaller than planned, which occurred in the previous business year due to the effects of the pandemic.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends to extend to update the annual wage checks, e.g. by including the number of workers receiving the lowest, average and highest wages. The overview should only include workers on the production floor. The overview should also include actual living wage benchmarks to calculate the living wage gap.

In addition, GREIFF should ring-fence how much of their pricing contributes to payment of wages.

GREIFF is encouraged to provide buyers (or other employees involved in price negotiations with suppliers) training on cost breakdown, for example, using the FairPrice app.

GREIFF could provide suppliers who don't use open costing training on product costing and how to quote prices, including (direct and indirect) labour costs. FairPrice product owners can conduct such training in all Fair Wear production countries.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.9 Member company actively responds if production locations fail to pay legal minimum wages and/or fail to provide wage data to verify minimum wage is paid.	No problems reported/no audits	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage or minimum wage payments cannot be verified, Fair Wear member companies are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law. Payment below minimum wage must be remediated urgently.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, Fair Wear Audit Reports or additional monitoring visits by a Fair Wear auditor, or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	N/A	0	-2

Comment: In the last financial year, no legal minimum wage issues were reported. The CSR manager again requested the annual wage overview for each supplier, reporting on the lowest-paid, average, and highest wage per supplier. Also, a comparison to the applicable legal minimum wage per country did not show any non-compliances.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.10 Evidence of late payments to suppliers by member company.	No	Late payments to suppliers can have a negative impact on production locations and their ability to pay workers on time. Most garment workers have minimal savings, and even a brief delay in payments can cause serious problems.	Based on a complaint or audit report; review of production location and member company financial documents.	0	0	-1

Comment: There is no evidence of late payments to suppliers by GREIFF and the brand did not change its payment terms during COVID-19.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.11 Degree to which member company assesses and responds to root causes for wages that are lower than living wages in production locations.	Intermediate	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: Internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc	4	6	0

Comment: GREIFF annually gathers wage reports from suppliers, which are cross-checked with the wage ladder tool and in the audit reports. Additionally, Fair Wear's country studies and information from the Clean Clothes Campaign to get the wage estimates, country profiles that include wages estimates with the wage on average, and lowest wages of workers.

In 2021/2022 GREIFF started participating in the Partnership for Sustainable Textile's Living Wage Lab. The aim is to learn more about wages and social benefits, and living wages at their suppliers. With one of its Tier 1 suppliers, GREIFF wants to develop and implement a living wage strategy and find jointly scalable solutions for its wider supplier chain. The Living Wage Lab is planned for two years. The brand plans to extend the project to other Tier 1 suppliers during this period. In 2021/ 2022, the brand participated in bi-monthly working group meetings to better understand how wages can be increased and how this can be financed. Initially, GREIFF planned to start the project at one of its strategic suppliers in Ukraine, but the brand had to find an alternative supplier due to the war. GREIFF decided to initiate the project in collaboration with another Fair Wear member with its Pakistani supplier. 2021/ 2022 can be seen as setting the base for the project in the framework of the Living Wage Lab. Definition of a target wage and other concrete actions are planned for 2022 / 2023.

Recommendation: GREIFF should take concrete actions in 2022 / 2023 on implementing living wages at its supplier in Pakistan. A target wage needs to be set in close collaboration with the supplier. Fair Wear emphasizes the need to involve workers and their representatives at every step and ensure that all living wage efforts positively contribute to a healthy social dialogue.

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

Comment: GREIFF has no own production facilities.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
1.13 Member company determines and finances wage increases.	Intermediate	Assessing the root causes for wages lower than living wages will determine what strategies/interventions are needed for increasing wages, which will result in a systemic approach.	Evidence of how payment below living wage was addressed, such as: internal policy and strategy documents, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: As mentioned under 1.11, the brand joined the Living Wage Lab of the Partnership for Sustainable Textiles in 2021/2022. The brand did not develop a strategy to finance wage increases yet. However, the brand could demonstrate that for five suppliers, CMT prices increased between 4-11% in order to reflect actual wage increases and the effects of inflation on those suppliers.

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

Recommendation: In determining what is needed and how wages should be increased, it is recommended to involve worker representation.

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.	14%	Fair Wear member companies are challenged to adopt approaches that absorb the extra costs of increasing wages.	Member company's own documentation, evidence of target wage implementation, such as wage reports, factory documentation, communication with factories, etc.	2	6	0

Comment: The external audit report conducted at one of the Ukrainian suppliers stated that wages could be considered a living wage for an average worker. The living wage benchmark for the region where the supplier is based was set at 13.803 UAH. Reviewing the audit results showed that the above statement included wages, a monthly bonus and non-monetary benefits (transportation). 366 workers out of a total of 384 workers were paid a living wage (according to the above benchmark) at this supplier.

Recommendation: Even though GREIFF decided not to proceed with the Living Wage Lab in Ukraine, it should support the supplier in increasing wages so that the 18 workers below the Living Wage benchmark receive a living wage.

Purchasing Practices

Possible Points: 46

Earned Points: 32

2. Monitoring and Remediation

Basic measurements	Result	Comments
% of production volume where an audit took place.	75%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	12%	To be counted towards the monitoring threshold, FWF low-risk policy should be implemented. See indicator 2.9. (N/A = no production in low risk countries.)
Member meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	Yes	
Requirement(s) for next performance check		
Total monitoring threshold:	87%	Measured as percentage of production volume (Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100%)

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

Comment: The CSR manager works closely with the product manager, who supports sustainability in technical production. Additionally, colleagues from purchasing are closely involved. Together they are responsible for problems identified by the monitoring system. When necessary, the CEO is also involved.

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

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

Comment: In the financial year 2021/2022, the brand conducted one audit at its supplier based in Ukraine. The CAP was shared during the exit meeting by the auditor. The brand started to follow up on the findings after CAP and audit were talked about with the external auditor and asked the factory to suggest a remediation timeline based on the findings.

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	Fair Wear considers efforts to resolve CAPs to be one of the most important things that member companies can do towards improving working conditions.	CAP-related documentation including status of findings, documentation of remediation and follow up actions taken by member. Reports of quality assessments. Evidence of understanding relevant issues.	4	8	-2

Comment: GREIFF conducts the majority of its audits through Sumations. GREIFF discusses progress during visits and uses the timelines to set deadlines and regular reminders to suppliers for updates. During visits, the technical manager verifies the remediation progress and discusses outstanding points from the CAP.

In 2021/2022, GREIFF conducted one audit in its production facilities in Ukraine in August 2021. CAP issues of this audit have been verified during the check, taking into consideration the challenging situation of follow-up since the outbreak of the war in Ukraine in February 2022. GREIFF could show the factories' feedback per CAP finding however there has not been further dialogue between the factory and GREIFF in cases where remediation was unclear for the brand. Complex findings such as Freedom of Association (FoA) were addressed but not followed up on in detail. For example: On the FoA finding 'workers do not know about the worker's council', the supplier gave feedback that 'all employees are part of the labour council'. GREIFF did not ask for further clarification of the statement given. Other findings, such as on fire safety or juvenile workers, were marked as completed, but proof in the form of documentation or photos was missing. Due to the war in Ukraine, there is a high risk to the Health and Safety of the workers. Therefore, it is of high importance to crosscheck evacuation routes are marked, and instructions are clear.

Recommendation: If feedback on a CAP finding provided by the supplier is unclear, the brand should clarify all points before an issue is closed. Regarding the finding on Freedom of Association at the Ukrainian supplier, especially during the war, it is of utmost importance that workers know their representatives to raise grievances and feel supported.

Fair Wear recommends GREIFF to only close issues when verification can be provided by showing proof (pictures, documentation) or by on-site visits of GREIFF, by including worker representation, or by an independent third party. Also, in the specific situation of the war in Ukraine with a very high risk of, e.g. air raids, it is important to verify that fire evacuation plans, including routes and signs, are in place.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.5 Percentage of production volume from production locations that have been visited by the member company in the previous financial year.	not applicable	Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, brands could often not visit their suppliers from March - December 2020. For consistency purposes, we therefore decided to score all our member brands N/A on visiting suppliers over the year 2020.	Member companies should document all production location visits with at least the date and name of the visitor.	N/A	4	0

Comment: As travel was restricted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this indicator is not applicable in 2021. Nevertheless, the brand was able to visit 71% of its production locations.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.6 Existing audit reports from other sources are collected.	Yes and quality assessed	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.	2	3	0

Comment: In 2021/2022, GREIFF collected two audit reports for its two production locations in Pakistan.

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

Comment: In 2021/2022, GREIFF did not source from Bangladesh, Turkey and Myanmar, and it did not use abrasive blasting.

For country assessments, GREIFF uses country studies, country profiles from the Clean Clothes Campaign, and additional risk assessments based on agent information. Experience and in-country visits by the technical manager to multiple suppliers are essential for the brand to understand ongoing industry issues. As mentioned under indicator 1.4., GREIFF does a risk analysis for all countries it sources from (Tier 1 - 4) and uses the online tool called T-Rexs, where all risks of all production countries are well defined and always kept updated.

As general risks for its production countries, the brand identified the declining worker population as a significant risk in Eastern Europe. It identified forced labour as a high risk in China. Freedom of Association is at risk in China, Vietnam and Morocco. Living wages were identified as a risk for all Tier 1 suppliers. For the two suppliers in Ukraine, the war is the main risk for the workers.

To remediate and prevent the risk of forced labour in its supply chain in China, GREIFF has checked its entire supply chain in China based on the Partnership of Sustainable Textiles checklist. To work on FoA in Morocco, the brand has followed up on audit findings using training in the factory, and a new audit was conducted in 2022/23. In Pakistan, GREIFF is sourcing with another Fair Wear member at a factory. The brands collaborate to mitigate the risks and recently started a project on living wages at their supplier. In Ukraine, the brand is in very close contact with its two suppliers, continues to place orders, and accepts delivery delays, which did not occur in 2021/22.

To remediate the risks related to COVID-19, the brand remained in close contact and ensured COVID-19 Health and Safety programmes remained in place in 2021/2022.

Recommendation: Knowing the country-specific risks facilitates the starting point for discussing this with suppliers. Member companies can agree on additional commitments that are required to mitigate risks. GREIFF can provide additional measures for support and integrate that into the monitoring system.

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

Comment: GREIFF had no active CAP at shared suppliers in the latest business year. Nevertheless, the brand collaborated actively with two other Fair Wear Foundation members in 2021/2022, at one production site in Pakistan.

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

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

Comment: GREIFF sources from three production sites located in so called low-risk countries. Monitoring requirements for these three production sites in low-risk countries are fulfilled.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits at tail-end production locations (when the minimum required monitoring threshold is met).	Yes	Fair Wear encourages its members to monitor 100% of its production locations and rewards those members who conduct full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Production location information as provided to Fair Wear and recent Audit Reports.	2	2	0

Comment: Four production sites fall under the tail-end production locations. Two of these are based in low-risk countries. At one Pakistani supplier, the brand collected an existing audit report, at the Chinese and Vietnamese suppliers, no additional monitoring was done.

Recommendation: If an external audit report is used, the brand should always be actively involved or at least updated about the CAP follow-up.

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.	Yes	Fair Wear believes it is important for affiliates that have a retail/wholesale arm to at least know if the brands they resell are members of Fair Wear or a similar organisation, and in which countries those brands produce goods.	Questionnaires are on file.	1	2	0

Comment: GREIFF has an outlet in Bamberg where 60 external brands are sold. The questionnaires are sent to all external brands. For 67 % of the total external brand volume, the brand has received the signed questionnaires back.

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).	10%	Fair Wear believes members who resell products should be rewarded for choosing to sell external brands who also take their supply chain responsibilities seriously and are open about in which countries they produce goods.	External production data in Fair Wear's information management system. Documentation of sales volumes of products made by Fair Wear or FLA members.	1	3	0

Comment: From all external brands, three brands are member of the Fair Labour Association and two are member of Fair Wear. In total this adds up to 10 % of the total external sales volume.

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

Monitoring and Remediation

Possible Points: 31

Earned Points: 21

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 Fair Wear membership, and cannot be successfully managed on an ad-hoc basis.	Manuals, emails, etc., demonstrating who the designated staff person is.	1	1	-1

Comment: The CSR manager is involved in complaint handling, where needed the CEO gives support.

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 Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and complaints hotline is a first step in alerting workers to their rights. The Worker Information Sheet is a tool to do this and should be visibly posted at all production locations.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from production location visits, etc.	-2	2	-2

Comment: GREIFF has ensured that the Fair Wear CoLP and complaints helpline are posted in ten of thirteen factories. The brand was unaware the Worker Information Sheet (WIS) is also needed at the two German suppliers. The new Pakistani supplier still needs to post the WIS as GREIFF accidentally sent the wrong language to the supplier. In general, the posting of the Worker Information Sheet is checked during all visits and audits at the production locations.

Requirement: GREIFF must ensure that the Worker Information Sheet, including contact information of the local complaints handler of Fair Wear, is posted in the German factories and the Pakistani supplier, in a location that is accessible to all workers. GREIFF 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.	All production in low-risk countries/training not possible	After informing workers and management of the Fair Wear CoLP and the complaints hotline, additional awareness raising and training is needed to ensure sustainable improvements and structural worker-management dialogue.	Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in the WEP basic module. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	6	0

Comment: Because of travel restrictions in 2021 that limited the possibility of conducting training, this indicator is not applicable in 2021.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends Greiff to actively raise awareness about the Fair Wear Code of Labour Practices and Fair Wear complaint helpline among a larger portion of its suppliers. GREIFF should ensure good quality systematic training of workers and management on these topics. To this end, GREIFF can either use Fair Wear's WEP Basic module, (WEP Basic modules are for example available in Romania and North Macedonia) or implement training related to the Fair Wear CoLP and complaint helpline through third-party training providers or brand staff. Non-Fair Wear training must follow the standards outlined in Fair Wear's guidance and checklist 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

Comment: Even though, via the Fair Wear complaint mechanism, no complaint was recorded, it is important to mention that in March 2022, GREIFF received a complaint from the national coordinator of the Dutch Clean Clothes Campaign (CCC) regarding one of GREIFF's production partners in Pakistan. The complaint included claims around living wages, particularly concerning severance pay and calculating vacation bonuses. During the financial year, GREIFF, in collaboration with two other Fair Wear members, met with CCC to discuss the complaint. The complaint was also filed at the Pakistani court, which is why the brands (together with the supplier) decided to wait for the final court decision. During the legal process, the Trade Union filed a complaint with Fair Wear in 2022/ 2023, which is why this complaint will be officially reviewed in the next Brand Performance Check.

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

Comment: The brand did not receive an official complaint via the Fair Wear complaints line but via the Clean Clothes Campaign. From the beginning, GREIFF collaborated closely with two other Fair Wear brands and a non-Fair Wear member, producing at this factory.

Complaints Handling

Possible Points: 5

Earned Points: 1

4. Training and Capacity Building

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

Comment: GREIFF uses its internal intranet workplace to inform all staff of activities, including Fair Wear membership (Brand Performance check, Social Report). The CSR manager works closely with the sales and marketing department and has given training on this topic.

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

Comment: Staff in direct contact with suppliers is informed about Fair Wear requirements through regular meetings and the internal intranet workplace. Moreover, they have direct access to the CSR folder of the CSR manager, where all information about Fair Wear membership is stored.

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

Comment: GREIFF is in direct contact with all its production locations. No matter whether an agent is involved or not. The company works with agents for its production locations in North Macedonia and Marocco.

GREIFF's agents also have to sign the company's sustainability policy with additional agents' related sourcing policies and requirements. The agents are also actively involved in CAP follow-up and complaints handling.

Performance indicators	Result	Relevance of Indicator	Documentation	Score	Max	Min
4.4 Factory participation in training programmes that support transformative processes related to human rights.	All production in low-risk countries/training not possible	Complex human rights issues such as freedom of association or gender-based violence require more in-depth trainings that support factory-level transformative processes. Fair Wear has developed several modules, however, other (member-led) programmes may also count.	Training reports, Fair Wear's data on factories enrolled in training programmes. For alternative training activities: curriculum, training content, participation and outcomes.	N/A	6	0

Comment: Because of travel restrictions in 2021 that limited the possibility of conducting training, this indicator is not applicable in 2021.

Recommendation: Fair Wear recommends GREIFF to implement training programs 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 and structural change to improve working conditions. To this end, GREIFF can implement advanced training through external training providers or brand staff. Non-Fair Wear training must follow the standards outlined in Fair Wear's guidance and checklist 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.	No training programmes have been conducted or member produces solely in low-risk countries	After factory-level training programmes, complementary activities such as remediation and changes on brand level will achieve a lasting impact.	Documentation of discussions with factory management and worker representatives, minutes of regular worker-management dialogue meetings or anti-harassment committees.	N/A	2	0

Training and Capacity Building

Possible Points: 5

Earned Points: 5

5. Information Management

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

Comment: Since 2018, GREIFF has a specific written agreement with all suppliers against subcontracting. The agreement is encompassed in its sustainability policy. All suppliers and agents are informed about the policy. Moreover, a significant part of the brands' collection is NOS products which remain the same for two years or more and are produced by the same factories.

With the introduction of the myGREIFF-Code (see also 6.2), GREIFF is aware of all production partners used for its NOS products. This contributes to diminishing the risk of unauthorized subcontracting.

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

Comment: The CSR and other relevant staff at GREIFF use the office intranet, calls, and regular meetings to share information about working conditions at production locations.

Information Management

Possible Points: 7

Earned Points: 7

6. Transparency

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

Comment: GREIFF communicates about Fair Wear through its website and social media. The brand has also spoken about the Fair Wear membership at events and lectures on CSR.

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 Fair Wear's work and shares best practices with the industry.	Member company publishes one or more of the following on their website: Brand Performance Check, Audit Reports, Supplier List.	2	2	0

Comment: GREIFF is transparent about its supply chain through MyGREIFF-Code. The myGREIFF-Code can be found on the label of its NOS garments. Using the myGREIFF code, the customer can see all production process steps on the country level. In addition, GREIFF publishes its brand performance check report.

GREIFF has signed the Fair Wear transparency policy and publicly discloses 90% of its suppliers on the Fair Wear website and the Open Supply Hub (former Open Apparel Registry). In addition, both the latest Brand Performance Check Report and Social Report are published on GREIFF's website.

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

Comment: GREIFF has submitted its social report and published it on its 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 Fair Wear policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Evaluation of the Fair Wear membership is conducted in close collaboration between the CSR manager and top management. The CEO is actively involved in the Fair Wear membership and supports needed actions.

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.	83%	In each Brand Performance Check report, Fair Wear may include requirements for changes to management practices. Progress on achieving these requirements is an important part of Fair Wear membership and its process approach.	Member company should show documentation related to the specific requirements made in the previous Brand Performance Check.	4	4	-2

Comment: In the previous Brand Performance Check, GREIFF had six requirements. The brand had received requirements on the indicators related to living wage implementation (1.8, 1.11, 1.13 and 1.14) as well as on legal minimum wages (1.9) and Transparency (6.2)

The first requirement was that during COVID-19, the member is expected to thoroughly check with its suppliers whether they foresee any issues with paying wages. The brand made sufficient progress as no legal minimum wage issues were reported in 2021/2022, and the CSR manager requested an annual wage overview for each supplier. (1.9)

Secondly, GREIFF must demonstrate the link between its buying prices and wage levels in production locations (1.8). GREIFF must clearly understand the labour cost components of its buying prices. The brand did not progress sufficiently on this indicator in 2021/2022.

Thirdly, GREIFF was required to conduct a root cause analysis for wages lower than living wages in the production locations, determine and finance wage increases, and pay its share of the target wage at suppliers. In 2021/2022, the brand made an essential step in joining the Partnership of Sustainable Textiles living wage lab and set the base for the living wage project in collaboration with another Fir Wear member at a strategic supplier in Pakistan (1.11). The brand still needs to develop a strategy to finance wage increases. However, the brand could demonstrate that for five suppliers, CMT prices increased between 4-11% to reflect actual wage increases and the effects of inflation on those suppliers. (1.13). A target wage still needed to be defined. However, the external audit report conducted at one of the Ukrainian suppliers stated that wages could be considered a living wage for an average worker, which is progress to last year. (1.14).

Lastly, the brand was required to disclose production locations to other member brands in FairForce and on the Fair Wear website. GREIFF made sufficient progress. It has signed the Fair Wear transparency policy and publicly discloses 90% of its suppliers on the Fair Wear website and the Open Supply Hub (former Open Apparel Registry) (6.2).

Evaluation

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 6

Recommendations to Fair Wear

GREIFF recommends Fair Wear to develop an awareness-raising poster on gender-based violence similar to the Worker Information Sheet.

The brand would encourage Fair Wear to reestablish the German stakeholder event as the brands benefit significantly from other members' learnings and best practises.

GREIFF recommends that Fair Wear reconsider indicator 2.12, which focuses on external brands sold by members who are also part of an organisation such as Fair Wear or Fair Labour Association.

In addition, GREIFF would benefit from more support regarding external communication, next to the Third Party flyer provided by Fair Wear.

The brand noticed that the history of its Social Reports (older than 2020/2021) was missing on the Fair Wear website and asked to add those again.

Scoring Overview

Category	Earned	Possible
Purchasing Practices	32	46
Monitoring and Remediation	21	31
Complaints Handling	1	5
Training and Capacity Building	5	5
Information Management	7	7
Transparency	6	6
Evaluation	6	6
Totals:	78	106

Benchmarking Score (earned points divided by possible points)

74

Performance Benchmarking Category

Good

Brand Performance Check details

Date of Brand Performance Check:

05-12-2022

Conducted by:

Julia Krämer

Interviews with:

Daniel Clocuh - Head of Purchasing and Product Management

Jens Möller - Managing Director

Nicole Wagner - CSR Manager

Robert Pröll - Technical Manager