



BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK

Mammut Sports Group AG

PUBLICATION DATE: JULY 2018

this report covers the evaluation period 01-01-2017 to 31-12-2017

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. The online [Brand Performance Check Guide](#) provides more information about the indicators.

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK OVERVIEW

Mammut Sports Group AG

Evaluation Period: 01-01-2017 to 31-12-2017

MEMBER COMPANY INFORMATION	
Headquarters:	Seon, Switzerland
Member since:	25-09-2008
Product types:	Outdoor, Sportswear, Bags & Accessories
Production in countries where FWF is active:	Bangladesh, China, India, Macedonia, Republic of, Myanmar, Romania, Viet Nam
Production in other countries:	Cambodia, Germany, Honduras, Latvia, Lithuania, Philippines, Portugal, Switzerland, Taiwan
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	95%
Benchmarking score	69
Category	Good

Summary:

Mammut has met most of FWF's performance requirements. The brand monitored 95% of its suppliers, which meets the required monitoring threshold after three years of FWF membership. With a score of 69 points, Mammut is placed in the 'Good' category.

After having been awarded 'Leader' status in the last years, Mammut is now placed in the 'Good' category. In 2017, Mammut continued its strategy to transfer production from China to Vietnam. The brand made use of 66 production locations, which meant a record number of suppliers for the brand. Mammut has long term relationships with its main suppliers who usually have several production locations in various countries. The shift in production locations by those suppliers meant that Mammut had to build new relationships with those new factories, monitor them and follow up on labour standard violations. Mammut has a strategy in place to reduce the total number of suppliers.

Mammut has particularly good systems in place to monitor suppliers, evaluate their performance and assess country risks. Still, the growth in the number of suppliers poses challenges in monitoring suppliers and actively following up on audit results.

In Myanmar, Mammut actively followed up on a complaint concerning a child worker. The child worker was stopped from working, the family was compensated for the income and education will be arranged until the child turns 16. FWF is monitoring the remediation and has also verified that certificates of fitness were arranged for all the young workers. The child worker expressed satisfaction with this solution. The factory was also provided with a training to set up an age verification system.

In 2017, Mammut also made progress on living wages. The brand conducted a research on price calculations by factories. The research will be published in 2018 with the help of FWF.

Despite the fact that Mammut's purchasing department has to approve the placement of production at new suppliers by the Japanese subsidiary, there is still a difference between the human rights due diligence performed by Mammut and its subsidiary. FWF recommends Mammut to bring the subsidiary in line with its human rights due diligence, for example by visiting all new suppliers before placing orders. Furthermore, the brand is required to ensure that factories sign the FWF Code of Labour Practices before first orders are placed and evidence of a posted Worker Information Sheet can be provided.

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.	47%	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.	2	4	0

Comment: Mammut sources from 16 countries, at 37 suppliers and 66 production locations, amounting to a total production of approximately 3.5 million items a year. The brand is moving its production from China to Vietnam. In this transitional period, it is building up leverage at the new production locations and the brand aims to consolidate its supplier base.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to leverage into consideration when moving its production to Vietnamese production locations. The brand should consider the risk of human rights violations at suppliers, the influence it has to bring change and the impact it can have at a factory level. Furthermore, FWF recommends Mammut to consolidate its supplier base where possible, and increase leverage at main supplier(s) to effectively request improvements of working conditions. It is advised to describe the process of consolidation in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.1b Percentage of production volume from production locations where member company buys less than 2% of its total FOB.	25%	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.	0	4	0

Comment: In 2017, Mammut aimed to reduce its tail end. Despite its efforts, the number of suppliers grew to 66. Mammut believes that 2017 was a record year when it comes to the number of suppliers and it would soon drop in 2018.

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

It is advised to describe the process of consolidation in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.2 Percentage of production volume from production locations where a business relationship has existed for at least five years.	53%	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: With several suppliers, Mammut has been working for a long period of time. The brand values long term relationships. These suppliers often have several production locations. Mammut is moving production to new production locations, although it stays with the same suppliers. Although Mammut knows the suppliers very well, the brand will have to assess the status of working conditions at the new production locations and will have to build up new relationships with factory management.

Also, its Japanese subsidiary started new relationships with Chinese subcontractors to ensure sufficient production capacity was reserved for Mammut.

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

It is advised to describe policies regarding maintaining long term business relationships in a sourcing strategy that is agreed upon with top management/sourcing staff.

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: In 2017, Mammut started sourcing from 11 new production locations. Not all production locations had returned the FWF questionnaire before first orders were placed.

Requirement: Mammut needs to ensure that new suppliers sign and return the questionnaire before first orders are placed.

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

Comment: New suppliers that are selected by Mammut are assessed according to a scoring system. During a visit by senior staff, Mammut explains its position with regards to labour standards and FWF. Information like FWF's country studies, other stakeholder information and FWF's Health and Safety checklist is taken into account. It also collected several existing audit reports.

The Japanese subsidiary is now required to place production orders of all its suppliers through Mammut's headquarters. Still, processes have not yet been entirely aligned. In several cases where the Japanese subsidiary started working with a new factory, the factory was not visited and the FWF health and safety check was not filled out. No (external) audit reports were received prior to placing orders.

Requirement: Mammut needs to ensure that its human rights due diligence approach is integrated throughout the entire company. The selection of new suppliers should be done in the same manner by Mammut and its Japanese subsidiary.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to ensure that the Japanese subsidiary cannot select and place production at new production locations before Mammut HQ has completed the human rights due diligence process. Furthermore, FWF recommends Mammut to develop a strategy towards the selection of new production locations.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.5 Production location compliance with Code of Labour Practices is evaluated in a systematic manner.	Yes	A systemic approach is required to integrate social compliance into normal business processes, and supports good decisionmaking.	Documentation of systemic approach: rating systems, checklists, databases, etc.	1	2	0

Comment: Mammut keeps track of audit reports through a Master list. The Head of Vendor follows up on audit results during visits and emails. Reported progress is updated in the CAPs. Purchasers are informed of the CAP status and also assist in follow up.

Mammut has a supplier evaluation system in which it scores human rights issues per supplier and its overall performance. It has set up a traffic light system where issues are marked as red (critical), orange (major) or yellow (minor issue). Supplier performance is evaluated annually.

Mammut does not yet have a performance based system in place that rewards suppliers when they make good progress on social issues.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to share and discuss the outcome of the supplier evaluation with all its suppliers. Furthermore, FWF recommends Mammut to consider how it can stimulate progress on social issues, for example by offering price increases, bonuses or financial support to resolve issues.

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: Mammut has two seasonal types of products (summer/winter) and a range of Never Out of Stock-items. Lead times are between 3 - 8 months, depending on the type of product.

Mammut agrees on a production capacity plan with its suppliers at the beginning of the year indicating order dates and order amounts. To facilitate balanced production planning, Mammut shares detailed forecast information with suppliers, which are updated monthly and include an estimate about the delivery of fabric. All suppliers need to agree on order dates. Mammut is able to shift a part of its Never Out of Stock-production to the low-season.

Mammut estimates the standard minute per style, but does not agree with the factory on the total number of minutes that can be used for production. The brand does not know the total production capacity of each factory. With some critical products Mammut reserves specific working lines in the factory.

In addition, Mammut has reserved substantial margin time in its delivery cycles to ensure that order delays can be handled. In case of delay, Mammut either accepts the delay or considers splitting orders or air freight.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to learn more about the standard minute per style and how the production of its products impacts the total production capacity of the factory. Furthermore, FWF recommends Mammut to discuss with the factories how to deal with planning of production during peak season to prevent excessive overtime.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.7 Degree to which member company mitigates root causes of excessive overtime.	Intermediate efforts	Some production delays are outside of the control of member companies; however there are a number of steps that can be taken to address production delays without resorting to excessive overtime.	Evidence of how member responds to excessive overtime and strategies that help reduce the risk of excessive overtime, such as: root cause analysis, reports, correspondence with factories, etc.	3	6	0

Comment: In 2017, 5 out of 7 FWF-audits showed that excessive overtime took place at the factories. One factory has a record of FWF-complaints about excessive overtime. Mammüt has often addressed the issue with factory management, including a comprehensive root cause analysis. Despite the efforts of Mammüt, the factory has not shown significant improvements when it comes to labour conditions, especially when it comes to working hours. Therefore, Mammüt informed factory management that it will stop production by gradually decreasing orders over the period of a year.

At several other factories, Mammüt raised the issue and is discussing it with management. At one factory, management claimed that excessive overtime was already reduced, although this was not yet verified by Mammüt. Most FWF-audits were conducted in the last quarter of 2017, limiting Mammüt's ability to perform a root cause analysis at these suppliers in 2017. Therefore, follow up of these audit reports will be assessed during the next Brand Performance Check.

Recommendation: FWF encourages Mammüt to continue its in-depth approach at one of its suppliers and apply a similar approach to all its factories where excessive overtime takes place. The brand could start discussions with other large customers to mitigate the root causes of excessive overtime.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.8 Member company's pricing policy allows for payment of at least the legal minimum wages in production countries.	Style-level policy	The first step towards ensuring the payment of minimum wages - and towards implementation of living wages - is to know the labour costs of garments.	Formal systems to calculate labour costs on per-product or country/city level.	4	4	0

Comment: Mammut follows a partnership approach when negotiating prices. When developing a new style, Mammut involves its suppliers in the process and agrees on a target price based on feedback from suppliers as well as past experience. Part of the process is the discussion of a costing sheet (fabric, CMT and trims).

The starting price can be higher or lower than the target price. Mammut and the supplier then work towards the target price. The price remains fixed for this specific style and is not renegotiated with every order. Mammut is not yet aware of the costs per labour minute. Mammut asks about wage levels but does not relate the wage levels to the standard minute per style and the direct labour costs. In 2017, Mammut did a research to learn more about factory costs, especially direct labour costs.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to continue its research about pricing and implement the findings in its pricing policy. It should ensure that transparency in costing and productivity will be increased. Relating the costs per labour minute to its pricing policy would be an advanced next step.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
1.9 Member company actively responds if suppliers fail to pay legal minimum wages.	Yes	If a supplier fails to pay minimum wage, FWF member companies are expected to hold management of the supplier accountable for respecting local labour law.	Complaint reports, CAPs, additional emails, FWF audit reports or other documents that show minimum wage issue is reported/resolved.	1	2	-2

Comment: At two suppliers, a FWF-audit found that several workers were not paid the legal minimum wage. At one factory, Mammut reached out to factory management, which claimed that it stopped to hire temporary workers. The temporary workers were earning a wage below the legal minimum wage. Mammut did not verify whether the factory actually stopped hiring temporary workers.

Another audit was conducted in December 2017. Therefore, Mammut could not provide follow up in 2017. Its performance will be assessed during the next Brand Performance Check.

Recommendation: FWF strongly recommends Mammut to always verify whether legal minimum wage issues have actually been resolved in case factory management claims so. Mammut could hire a local consultant or plan a monitoring visit of one of FWF's auditors to check whether the issue has actually been resolved.

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 root causes of wages lower than living wages with suppliers and takes steps towards the implementation of living wages.	Production location level approach	Sustained progress towards living wages requires adjustments to member companies' policies.	Documentation of policy assessments and/or concrete progress towards living wages.	4	8	0

Comment: Mammut is an active participant of the FWF Living Wage Incubator, a platform to assist member brands in designing projects to work towards living wages with their suppliers. Mammut has done research in which it learned more about price calculations by factories and how factories calculate overhead, direct and indirect labour costs. The brand is discussing with FWF to bring out a publication about its findings.

Although living wages are part of the discussion with suppliers, the brand has not yet taken active steps to start increasing wages at suppliers.

Recommendation: FWF encourages Mammut to actively share its lessons learned with other garment brands. Furthermore, FWF recommends to select a number of factories with which it can actively work towards raising wages. The selection procedure could take into account the leverage Mammut has at suppliers, long-term relationships, presence of other FWF members and an active worker committee or trade union.

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

PURCHASING PRACTICES

Possible Points: 44

Earned Points: 24

Additional comments on Purchasing Practices:

Mammut has approximately 600 products in its apparel collection, divided into five different target groups: Alpine Climbing, Rock Climbing, Freeride/Snow, Backpacking/Hiking and Alpine Performance.

In 2017, Mammut was in the process of designing a strategy on all CSR-related topics: animal welfare, clean production, reduced footprint and ethical production. The WECARE strategy was launched in 2018. The brand has set targets for all 4 areas.

2. MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
% of own production under standard monitoring (excluding low-risk countries)	80%	
% of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled	12%	FWF low risk policy should be implemented. 0 = policy is not implemented correctly. N/A = no production in low risk countries.
Meets monitoring requirements for tail-end production locations.	No	FWF members must meet tail-end monitoring requirements. Implementation will be assessed during next Brand Performance check.
Total of own production under monitoring	95%	Minimums: 1 year: 40%; 2 years 60%; 3 years+: 80-100% Measured as a percentage of turnover.

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

Comment: The Head of Vendor is responsible for following up on issues identified by the monitoring system. This happens in close cooperation with other purchasers and technical staff.

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: In 2017, seven FWF-audits were conducted. Mammut shares audit reports with the factories as soon as Mammut receives the report from FWF. It ensures that timelines are set up. In two cases, an active worker representation or trade union was present. Mammut did not yet send the report to the worker representatives and involved them in follow up.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to include worker representatives when following up on audit reports. 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.	Intermediate	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.	6	8	-2

Comment: Mammut has set up a traffic light system to track social issues at suppliers. The brand marks those issues as red, orange or yellow. One of the challenges Mammut faced in following up at suppliers, is that due to a growing number of suppliers, Mammut needed to focus its efforts to follow up. Therefore, It mainly focuses on resolving the red-marked issues. Mammut is especially strong in keeping track of the progress towards resolution of existing CAPs.

In 2017, Mammut actively followed up on several complaints, such as a child labour case at a Myanmarese factory (see 3.4), which was adequately resolved. Furthermore, Mammut focused on discussing the CAPs with suppliers that were audited in 2017. Despite the fact that Mammut keeps track of the progress made, issues were sometimes closed by factory management without proper verification by Mammut or an independent third party.

Recommendation: FWF strongly recommends to ensure that the size of the supply chain and the available resources of Mammut to actively follow up are matching. Possible solutions could be to decrease the number of suppliers or increase the amount of resources needed for active follow up. Furthermore, FWF recommends Mammut to only close issues when verification can be provided by showing proof (pictures, documentation) or by on-site visits of Mammut 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.	94%	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: Mammut regularly visits most of its suppliers by CSR-staff or technical staff to discuss labour standards.

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: Mammüt regularly collects existing audit reports of other organisations, like BSCI, Sumations, Elevate or other FWF brands who have their own audit system. The brand completes the Audit Quality Assessment tool and follows up on the CAP with the factories.

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.	4	6	0
Compliance with FWF enhanced monitoring programme Bangladesh	Intermediate			3	6	-2
Compliance with FWF Myanmar policy	Advanced			6	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: Mammut sources 12% of its production from two Bangladeshi production locations. Both production locations have been audited by the Bangladesh Accord and the Bangladesh Alliance on fire, building and electrical safety issues. Both production locations had completed all the CAPs, but audits by the Accord of December 2017 showed new issues had emerged. Where in one factory these were only minor issues, the other factory had significant issues on fire safety. The brand is not a signatory to the Bangladesh Accord. The factories have not yet participated in the WEP-training on Prevention of Violence against Women.

In Myanmar, Mammut actively followed up on the child labour complaint (see 3.4). Mammut also shared the lessons learned and its Myanmar experience during a conference organized by SOMO, the European Outdoor Group and FWF.

The Burmese factories (2% of production) have been audited and were one of the first factories in Myanmar to be trained by FWF. Mammut complies with the FWF Enhanced Monitoring Programme on Myanmar. In its social report, the brand publishes per labour standard what issues have been found in the factories and how Mammut is addressing this, including wage ladders. Mammut has not yet taken measures to actively promote social dialogue in the factory despite the fact that one of the factories has an active trade union.

Mammut keeps track of specific risks in its supply chain by analyzing the outcomes of audit reports and creating an overview of most common issues. Furthermore, the Corporate Responsibility department assesses each new country individually in relation to specific human rights risks.

Recommendation: FWF strongly recommends Mammut to sign the Bangladesh Accord on Fire and Building Safety. The brand should also motivate its Bangladeshi suppliers to participate in the WEP-training on the Prevention of Violence against Women. Furthermore, FWF recommends Mammut to enhance social dialogue in its Burmese factories by engaging with the trade union, checking minutes of meetings between management and the trade union, including them in following up on audit results and assess training needs.

FWF also recommends Mammut to link the analyses of audit reports with human rights reports of production countries. The brand should set up a system to continuously monitor risks based on human rights reports, adaptations of laws, etc.

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: Mammut shares several factories with other FWF-members. Mammut actively cooperates with those members to resolve issues.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.9 Percentage of production volume where monitoring requirements for low-risk countries are fulfilled.	50-100%	Low-risk countries are determined by the presence and proper functioning of institutions which can guarantee compliance with national and international standards and laws.	Documentation of visits, notification of suppliers of FWF membership; posting of worker information sheets, completed questionnaires.	1	2	0

Comment: Mammut has production at 11 production locations in Latvia, Lithuania, Germany, Portugal and Switzerland. The brand ensured that it received a signed FWF questionnaire and the FWF Code of Labour Practices was posted.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
2.10 Extra bonus indicator: in case FWF member company conducts full audits above the minimum required monitoring threshold.	Not applicable	FWF encourages all of its members to audit/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	3	0

Comment: Mammut does not meet the tail end requirements. Therefore, the indicator is rated n/a.

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

Comment: Mammut does not sell garments from other brands.

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.	Yes, and member has information of production locations	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.	1	1	0

Comment: Mammut has two licencees, who are both a FWF-member. One member filled out the FWF questionnaire and informed Mammut of the production locations. Although the other member was not sent the FWF questionnaire, Mammut was informed about the production location and was also sent a recent audit report.

MONITORING AND REMEDIATION

Possible Points: 30

Earned Points: 25

3. COMPLAINTS HANDLING

BASIC MEASUREMENTS	RESULT	COMMENTS
Number of worker complaints received since last check	3	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	1	
Number of worker complaints resolved since last check	2	

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 Head of Vendor is responsible for addressing worker complaints.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.2 System is in place to check that the Worker Information Sheet is posted in factories.	No	The Worker Information Sheet is a key first step in alerting workers to their rights.	Photos by company staff, audit reports, checklists from production location visits, etc.	0	2	0

Comment: Mammut regularly checks with suppliers whether the supplier posted the Worker Information Sheet by visiting the supplier or by asking for a picture. In several cases, Mammut asked for a picture which was not provided and therefore could also not be shown during the Brand Performance Check.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.3 Percentage of FWF-audited production locations where at least half of workers are aware of the FWF worker helpline.	44%	The FWF complaints procedure is a crucial element of verification. If production location based complaint systems do not exist or do not work, the FWF worker helpline allows workers to ask questions about their rights and file complaints. Production location participation in the Workplace Education Programme also count towards this indicator.	Percentage of audited production locations where at least 50% of interviewed workers indicate awareness of the FWF complaints mechanism + percentage of production locations in WEP programme.	2	4	0

Comment: In the last three years, Mammut invested in audits and trainings. In total, 30 factories were audited and 11 factories were trained to increase the awareness of management and workers on the FWF worker helpline.

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

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
3.4 All complaints received from production location workers are addressed in accordance with the FWF Complaints Procedure	Yes + Preventive steps taken	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.	6	6	-2

Comment: In 2017, Mammut received 3 complaints at two factories. At a Chinese factory where multiple FWF-members source from, workers complained about excessive overtime and pregnant women who were required to operate heavy machinery and who could not meet their production targets, which was deducted from their social security contributions. Also, management would pressure workers and local vendors not to share any information.

A verification audit showed that working hours were controlled to be within 60 hours/week and workers say they do not work more than 6 days consecutively. Workers stated that compared with 2016, their working hours have been reduced. The off-site interviews found that the observed overtime hours were consistent with the attendance records provided by the factory. FWF auditors have not found any sign of workers being coached this time. No non-compliance issues regarding sick leave or the treatment of pregnant workers were found. The factory also participated in the WEP-basic training. The complaint was therefore closed.

In December 2016, FWF received an advanced notice of a report on labour conditions and social issues in the export-oriented garment industry in Myanmar. Shortly thereafter the report was also shared by SOMO with all the FWF member brands that are sourcing in Myanmar. This draft research report included findings about alleged child labour at a factory supplying several FWF member brands. FWF decided to treat this case as a complaints procedure on 4 January 2017. FWF staff conducted an interview with ALR (the organisation that conducted the worker interviews for the SOMO research) and conducted 30 off-site worker interviews before visiting the factory unannounced. During this investigation, one child worker aged 15 years and 5 days was identified. The worker has been working in the factory sewing department since 23 April 2015, and was 13 at the time of recruitment. 12 young workers, age between 16.3 to 17.8 years old, were identified as working in the factory.

The factory management team, with which the preliminary findings were shared, took the situation very seriously and was very concerned about the findings. Stakeholders reported that the use of fake and borrowed ID cards is widespread in Myanmar. This was also the case here as the worker confirmed that she applied with a fake (i.e. borrowed) ID Card. FWF concludes that there was no intentional child labour at the factory.

FWF introduced suggested remediation, which meant that the child worker would need to stop working and that the family be compensated for income. Education should be arranged until the child turns 16, at which point the worker could be reinstated if desired. A medical certificate of fitness would need to be arranged for all workers under 18. With the support of the brands, the factory committed to the above remediation steps. FWF is monitoring the remediation and has also verified that certificates of fitness were arranged for all the young workers. The child worker expressed satisfaction with this solution. The factory was also provided with a training to set up an age verification system. Mammut cooperated extensively during the entire complaints process and in following up. Although the factory agrees to set up an age verification system, the brand has not yet verified whether the factory has successfully set up such a system.

Another complaint was filed by a worker of this factory who claimed to have been dismissed illegally. Although the complaint was admissible, verification by FWF showed that the complaint was not grounded as the worker had been fired in accordance with legal requirements.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to plan a monitoring visit or an audit by a FWF-team to check whether the factory has properly set up its age verification system.

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 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.	2	2	0

Comment: Mammut actively worked with other FWF members to resolve the complaint at the Chinese supplier.

COMPLAINTS HANDLING

Possible Points: 15

Earned Points: 11

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	-1

Comment: Staff of Mammut are well-informed about FWF membership. Mammut informs staff through:

- A quarterly employee newsletter
- Quarterly management information for staff
- An internal blog
- Special training for sales and distribution employees (seasonal)
- Special training for employees in the Purchasing and Material Management department (at least once a year)
- An internal Corporate Responsibility Network bringing together employees from different departments
- A special CSR evening for all staff

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: All staff in regular contact with suppliers are well aware of FWF membership requirements and briefed regularly. In addition, relevant staff of Mammut is actively participating in seminars, round tables and working groups concerning social compliance. All staff in direct contact with suppliers has received a training on social compliance.

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.	Member does not use agents/contractors	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.	N/A	2	0

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.4 Production location participation in Workplace Education Programme (where WEP is offered; by production volume)	29%	Lack of knowledge and skills on best practices related to labour standards is a common issue in production locations. Good quality training of workers and managers is a key step towards sustainable improvements.	Documentation of relevant trainings; participation in Workplace Education Programme.	4	6	0

Comment: In 2017, 4 trainings were given at Mammut suppliers. Mammut was one of the first brands to organize a WEP-basic training at its suppliers in Myanmar. In total, 11 trainings have been given in the last three years.

Recommendation: In order to ensure awareness and enhance understanding of the relevant labour standards, grievance mechanisms and the importance of a good mechanism for communication between employers and workers in the workplace, FWF developed the Workplace Education Programme. FWF currently offers the following training modules for the WEP: Basic, Gender Based Violence, Supervisor and the Factory Guide. More info on availability in countries can be found on the FWF website. Mammut should motivate its main supplier(s) to join WEP trainings.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
4.5 Production location participation in trainings (where WEP is not offered; by production volume)	0%	In areas where the Workplace Education Programme is not yet offered, member companies may arrange trainings on their own or work with other training-partners. Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator.	Curricula, other documentation of training content, participation and outcomes.	0	4	0

Comment: Mammut does not offer trainings to suppliers in other countries than where FWF is active.

Recommendation: All factory workers and management should be informed about FWF, labour standards and grievance mechanisms. In order to further communication between employers and workers in the workplace FWF recommends Member companies to ensure suppliers participate in trainings. Trainings must meet FWF quality standards to receive credit for this indicator: top management, supervisors and workers should be included in the trainings, separately. Workplace standards and dispute handling should be included in the training. At least 10-20% of the workforce must be trained, depending on the size of the factory. Worker participation should be balanced and representative.

FWF has developed the Factory Guide, an innovative and comprehensive e-learning tool to increase awareness of factory managers on FWF requirements and labour standards. This tool specifically provides FWF member companies the opportunity to increase awareness of managers in countries where FWF does not offer the WEP modules. FWF recommends member companies to ensure suppliers actively use the Factory Guide.

TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Possible Points: 13

Earned Points: 7

5. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
5.1 Level of effort to identify all production locations	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: Mammut has a system in place to identify all production locations. Through the FWF-questionnaire and FWF-audits it is aware of subcontractors at suppliers. The brand has an open dialogue with factories about the use of subcontractors and asks the suppliers whether the listed subcontractors are used for production of Mammut.

At the same time, it has a policy in place that does not allow for unannounced subcontracting. Despite the fact that contracts between Mammut and suppliers do not allow for subcontracting, Mammut sometimes only finds out at which (approved) production location production took place after the goods have been delivered. This is especially the case with its Japanese subsidiary and with factories that own multiple production sites. Regular on-site visits of quality control staff during production limit the risk of unauthorized subcontracting.

Recommendation: FWF recommends Mammut to take additional efforts to ensure that the brand is always informed beforehand about the placement of production at production locations. Furthermore, the brand could also agree with its main suppliers that only a selected number of production locations can be used for production.

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: Relevant staff has access to audit reports and CAPs. Purchasers and technicians that visit the supplier are regularly updated on CAP issues and follow up by the Head of Vendor. Staff members are actively involved in discussing follow up. Relevant feedback of purchasing staff is included in the CAP follow up system.

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: Mammut communicates about FWF on its website, in its supply chain newsletter, product flyers, workbooks, etc. As a FWF leader, Mammut uses the FWF logo on hangtags. All communication adheres to the FWF communication policy.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	RESULT	RELEVANCE OF INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	SCORE	MAX	MIN
6.2 Member company engages in advanced reporting activities	Production locations are 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: Mammut publishes the Brand Performance Check reports on its website. Furthermore, the brand published all its 2017 production locations in its social report. It is also transparent about most issues that are found at the suppliers. Mammut is considering to publish audit reports.

Recommendation: FWF would like to encourage Mammut to publish audit reports and give the broader public and other garment brands insight into the working conditions of its suppliers.

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 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: Mammüt published the social report 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 FWF policies are integrated into the structure of the company.	Meeting minutes, verbal reporting, Powerpoints, etc.	2	2	0

Comment: Mammut evaluates steps taken in context of FWF membership as part of regular internal discussions. Performance on monitoring and improving labour standards in the supply chain is measured and evaluated during quarterly meetings that involve the CSR coordinator and top management. A yearly evaluation of FWF membership is made during the process of writing the work plan and receiving FWFs performance check report. Mammut collects feedback from factories as part of ongoing discussions.

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.	50%	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.	4	4	-2

Comment: In the last Brand Performance Check report, Mammut was required to ensure that human rights due diligence for new suppliers of its Japanese subsidiary was aligned with Mammut HQ. Mammut made progress by ensuring that all new suppliers have to be approved by Mammut HQ. At the same time, the due diligence process for those suppliers was not yet the same as for suppliers that were selected by Mammut HQ.

Furthermore, FWF required Mammut to actively follow up on legal minimum wage findings at suppliers and verify whether factories took sufficient measures to guarantee the legal minimum wage. Mammut partially fulfilled this requirement and will still have to follow up in 2018.

EVALUATION

Possible Points: 6

Earned Points: 6

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FWF

Mammut recommends FWF to:

Not only provide guidance on priority issues but also on what verification should look like;

Provide contact details of the trade unionists or worker representatives;

Provide the questionnaire in other languages, especially when it comes to subcontractors who can only speak the local language;

Cooperate with initiatives like Higgs, the Social Labour Convergence Project and influence retailers such as REI;

Provide more clarity on living wages and what is expected from brands and what to aim for;

Use the Anker-method in the living wage benchmarks in audit reports and specify what is considered a best practice;

Ensure that audit reports contain traffic light system and critical, major, minor classification.

SCORING OVERVIEW

CATEGORY	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Purchasing Practices	24	44
Monitoring and Remediation	25	30
Complaints Handling	11	15
Training and Capacity Building	7	13
Information Management	4	7
Transparency	6	6
Evaluation	6	6
Totals:	83	121

BENCHMARKING SCORE (EARNED POINTS DIVIDED BY POSSIBLE POINTS)

69

PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING CATEGORY

Good

BRAND PERFORMANCE CHECK DETAILS

Date of Brand Performance Check:

31-05-2018

Conducted by:

Wilco van Bokhorst; Jesse Bloemendaal

Interviews with:

Oliver Pabst - CEO

Josef Lingg - COO

Adrian Huber - Head of Innovation and Corporate Responsibility

Adrian Margelist - Chief Creative Officer

Markus Jaeggi - Head of Purchasing

Frank Trommer - Purchasing Manager Apparel

Peter Hollenstein - Corporate Responsibility Manager

Michael Farnsworth - Head of Vendor Control