SOCIAL & LABOR CONVERGENCE

MINUTES CC12 – 08 June 2020

Webinar 3:30 PM CEST - Janet's Zoom

Council members present:

1 Pierre Hupperts Independent Chair, SLCP Council

2 Eranthi Premaratne SAC

3 Ninh Trinh Target (joined later)

4 Steve Harris Expert

5 Nikhil Hirdaramani Group

6 Melina Tse Esquel Enterprises Limited

7 Darren Chastain Gap Inc. 8 Darrell Doren ELEVATE

9 Daniel Danielsen Expert

10 Abhishek Bansal Arvind Limited

11 Aleix Busquets Gonzalez C&A

Apologies

Tamar Hoek
 Anna Burger
 Expert

SLCP Secretariat

1 Janet Mensink

2 Holly Menezes

3 Sharon Hesp

4 Adam Castle

Susanne Gebauer

(joined at end)

Agenda item		Pre-reads	Ask to CC
Opening & welcome		N/A	N/A
A. Presentation			
1.	Objective and Scope		
	Tool Review		
2.	• ,	CC12 agenda & pre-read	Be updated
3.	Force) Approach Taken and		
J.	Progress Made		
4.	Achievements So Far		
5.	Planning Check		
B. Q&A		CC12 agenda and pre-read	Ask questions

Summary Key Decisions

- Secretariat to work on addressing concerns raised and developing mitigation measures and including evaluation criteria in pilot (e.g. on modularity/potential issues related to redistirbution of data points. Council to monitor the progress of the pilot
- Next Council meeting: overview of proto V1.4 changes (major and minor). Address questions and concerns raised in CC12, particularly granularity of data (key compliance 'essential' vs. informative) in V1.4.
- Agenda item for next Council meeting: whether a signatory vote on Tool 1.4 is required or whether this is at Council's discretion



Opening and Welcome

- Opening by SLCP Council chair Pierre Hupperts.
- Reminder on SLCP rules of engagement and anti-trust guidelines.
- Reminder why this additional meeting has been organised and suggestion to go more quickly through the slides the Council had seen in advance and to take more time on the content that will be more new to the Council
- Thanks to Janet & Susanne for preparing this additional meeting
- Two parts of this session: A. Presentation; B. Q&A/Discussion

A. Presentation

Context

1. Objective and Scope Tool Review

Reminder of scope, timeline and aims of the Tool Review

2. Executing Team (Task Force)

Reminder of how the Task Team is organized and who is in the Task Force:

- CAFTAC
- Additional technical advisorts
- Contributors

3. Approach Taken and Progress Made

Reminder of the process used to structure Tool Review:

- 9 brands with their data points for CoC compliance determination
- Key International Standards and national law data points/ social compliance determination (By ILO-BW)
- Excel compilation of information and "crude" mapping
- Finalization of "essentials" for review by Taskforce and Pilot

Aiming to finish in time to start the pilot on 1 July

Background: in current Tool (v1.3), there is potential for a total data points of 3009, with the majority of those being in Step 1. On average, a VRF had 1400 data points (and over 50% of all facilities completed Steps 1, 2 + 3).

Tool 1.4 will have:

- Step 1 (Essential) key compliance issues & key mgt issues
- Step 2 (Progressive) Step 1 plus more compliance & mgt issues
- Step 3 (Advanced) Steps 1 & 2 plus more compliance & mgt issues, above & beyond

The review will aim for:

- Rationalisation: on track to remove 499 data points (17%) and specifically in Step 1 690 data points will be removed (31%)
- Maintatining conditionalities: three times more conditional questions in
- Reorganizing data points among Steps: 299 data points (14%) will move from Step 1 to Step 2
- New definitions of Steps

Note: stats are based on Work in progress and subject to change.

Some examples of feedback on Guidance:



- Need guidance on COVID-19
- Suggestions for "more info" and Verifier Guidance
- SAC identified 2 conditionality errors

Guidance will also be updated for more alignment with legislation

80% of text changes will be to better align with ILS and NLL

Working on integrating automation to allow the Accredited Hosts to report non-compliance and the legal reference of the non-compliance (to ILS and NLL in the country "overlay")

Opportunities for worker engagement in the self/joint assessment:

- 20 data points in Step 1 flagged for worker engagement
- Will be supported by a "how to" guide

Concerns to be addressed:

- Possible non-alignement/ lack of clarity in v 1.4 structure
- Possible ambiguity for facilities on Step selection

Both of these will be addressed during the pilot

Susanne provided some examples of question changes in specific categories to provide more insight into the changes & the process behind them

4. Achievements So Far

- Majority of Tool Review is completed
- Rationalization and restructuring has happened
- Revamping of excel Tool structure template

5. Planning Check

Susanne updated Council on the detailed planning timeline of project deliverables. Work is very intensens and requires several feedback rounds, which take more time then expected.

Concerns:

- Delay in review rounds tool: will be mitigated by section by section review and later start of pilot
- Delay in guidance: pulling in additional resource

B. Q&A

Pierre final note on CC12 presentation and Q&A: Content rich session and discussion with the Council. Lot of detail shared with Council on Tool Review. Process is intense. Thanks to Secretariat for preparation of this call and clarity showing the progress against the five aims of the Tool Review (see pre-read and deck sent after call). Some questions and concerns have been raised by the Council. Particularly the new insights/newly raised questions should be recurring in next Council call.

Decisions

- Secretariat to work on addressing concerns raised and developing mitigation measures and including evaluation criteria in pilot (e.g. on modularity/potential issues related to redistirbution of data points. Council to monitor the progress of the pilot
- Next Council meeting: overview of proto V1.4 changes (major and minor). Address questions and concerns raised in CC12, particularly granularity of data (key compliance 'essential' vs. informative) in V1.4.
- Agenda item for next Council meeting: whether a signatory vote on Tool 1.4 is required or whether this is at Council's discretion

