

WELCOME!

Greetings,

We thank you for your interest in the Social and Labor Convergence Project.

What does the SLCP want to achieve?

This pioneering project seeks to create a converged assessment framework that supports stakeholders' efforts to improve working conditions in the global apparel and footwear supply chain.

This project will help the industry to:

- Reduce audit fatigue: avoid duplications and reduce the number of social & labor audits by replacing current proprietary assessment tools
- Increase the opportunity for greater comparability of social & labor data
- Redeploy resources towards improvement actions
- Build mutual trust and respect, measure and understand working conditions and improve those conditions over time

To promote adoption and create scale, the converged assessment framework will be open source and publicly available.

We are actively seeking your opinion on the project and we thank you in advance for taking the time to complete the survey and provide feedback on the three elements of the S&L converged assessment framework-prototype2:

1. Data Collection & Verification Tool (excel)
2. The Verification Protocol (PDF)
3. The Verifier Guidance (PDF)

Your involvement is important to ensuring the project is as inclusive as possible; your feedback will be reviewed and analyzed to help inform the next iteration of the converged assessment framework.

There are 41 questions total, all of which are optional to answer except your organizational information. We encourage you to answer all questions; however, if your time is limited, we welcome you to focus on the areas you are most interested in giving thoughtful feedback on. You will also be able to save your survey results if you are unable to complete the entire survey in one session, and return and complete it at a later stage.

Answers to the survey will be treated confidentially. They will be compiled and the feedback we will share will not attribute any comments or inputs to specific contributors.

We appreciate your time and contributions to this process. Please keep in mind that the survey will now close on December 13, 2017 (extended from original closing date of Dec. 4).

Thank you.

SOCIAL & LABOR CONVERGENCE Public Consultation Survey - SLCP Converged Assessment Framework/ Proto2

ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION

* 1. Please note that this information will be confidential. We are only asking these questions should we need to follow-up with you to better understand your feedback:

Name (First and Last)

Name of Organization You Represent:

Email Address:

* 2. Is your organization a signatory of the SLCP?

- Yes
- No

* 3. Type of organization you belong to (select the one that best applies):

- Brand/Retailer
- Manufacturer/Supplier
- Agent
- Trade union
- Civil society organization
- Auditing firm/Service provider
- Standard holder
- Other (please specify)
- Academic
- (Inter) Government
- Business/Trade association
- Multi-stakeholder initiative
- Investors
- Consultants

* 4. Which country is your organization headquartered in?

* 5. Which country are you located in?

* 6. In case we need to contact you to gather further feedback, do you authorize us to reach you by email?

Yes

No

SOCIAL & LABOR
CONVERGENCE

Public Consultation Survey - SLCP Converged Assessment Framework/ Proto2

THE SLCP ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK AS A WHOLE (all three elements: tool, protocol, verifier guidance)

The following sections of the survey cover three areas in line with the elements of the S&L Converged Assessment Framework-Proto2:

1. The Data Collection & Verification Tool
2. The Verification Protocol
3. The Verifier Guidance

SLCP OBJECTIVES

To create a converged assessment framework that supports stakeholders' efforts to improve working conditions in the global apparel and footwear supply chain.

This project will help the industry to:

- *Reduce audit fatigue: avoid duplications and reduce the number of social & labor audits, by replacing current proprietary assessment tools,*
- *Increase the opportunity for greater comparability of social & labor data*
- *Redeploy resources towards improvement actions*
- *Build mutual trust and respect, measure and understand working conditions, and improve those conditions over time.*

7. Please rate how well the S&L Converged Assessment Framework (proto2) supports the objectives of the Social and Labor Convergence Project (SLCP) from a scale of 1-5 (5 being “Very well”; 1 being “Not so well”)

Not so well Very well

A horizontal bar containing five star icons, representing a 5-point rating scale.

If rated 2 stars or lower, please explain why and how this could be improved:

SOCIAL & LABOR CONVERGENCE Public Consultation Survey - SLCP Converged Assessment Framework/ Proto2

SECTION 1: THE DATA COLLECTION & VERIFICATION TOOL (element 1)

The Social & Labor Convergence Project (SLCP) aims to bring together unique perspectives to create an efficient, scalable and sustainable solution for social audits. The SLCP seeks to develop a simple, unified and effective industry-wide assessment framework, which

- **Is descriptive – standard agnostic and judgment free**
- **Collects relevant and essential social & labor data**
- **Assesses objectively social & labor conditions**

CONTENT/QUESTIONS - THE DATA COLLECTION AND VERIFICATION TOOL (PROTO2)

8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the content/questions in the Data Collection and Verification Tool - Prototype 2 (Excel file) from a scale of 1-5 (5 being “Very Satisfied”; 1 being “Very Dissatisfied”)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

A horizontal bar containing five star icons, representing a 5-point rating scale.

If rated 2 stars or lower, explain why and how this could be improved:

9. Were there any questions missed that we should consider for each of the following sections? (check all that apply)

Note: For sections selected, please describe the question(s) you would want to see and its intent with respect to improvement of the social and labour conditions or compliance purposes. See comment box below.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Facility Profile | <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Involvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recruitment and Hiring | <input type="checkbox"/> Health and Safety |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Working Hours | <input type="checkbox"/> Termination |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wages and Benefits | <input type="checkbox"/> Management Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employee Treatment | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable/None Missing |

For sections selected, which question? Please describe:

10. Were there any questions that were unclear or could benefit from further clarification for each of the following sections/areas? (check those that apply)

- Facility Profile
- Recruitment and Hiring
- Working Hours
- Wages and Benefits
- Employee Treatment
- Employee Involvement
- Health and Safety
- Termination
- Management Systems
- "More Info" Boxes
- Not Applicable

For sections selected, which questions? Please describe:

11. Were there any questions that were redundant/inappropriate for each of the following sections/areas?
(check all that apply)

- Facility Profile
- Recruitment and Hiring
- Working Hours
- Wages and Benefits
- Employee Treatment
- Employee Involvement
- Health and Safety
- Termination
- Management Systems
- "More Info" Boxes
- Not Applicable

For sections selected, which question? Please describe:

12. SLCP proto2, 1. Data collection & verification tool. Section (tab) Employee Involvement (worker engagement)

Several elements on worker engagement have been included in the tool. These cover among others Freedom of Association (separate questions on Unions and Worker Committees), Grievance Mechanism and pro-active worker engagement (through worker surveys, town hall meetings, team meeting etc.). Please find these under the tab Employee Involvement.

Survey Question:

Do you feel the element of worker engagement is sufficiently addressed in the tool questions (see tab "Employee Involvement")?

- Yes, worker engagement is sufficiently addressed
- No, worker engagement is not sufficiently addressed. Please explain:

13. SLCP proto2, 1. Data collection & verification tool. Verification tabs: Summary Report

The tool includes an Accuracy Index: A % of questions that were accurate based on those answered.

The purpose of the index is to demonstrate to both facility and users the deviation between the data collected by the facility and the verified data. It is not to “rate” the facility but simply to understand how much information the verifier had to alter.

Survey Question:

Do you agree that the accuracy index is a useful tool to have?

Yes, it is useful

No, it is not useful

Any comments regarding your answer selection?

14. Any Other Comments related to content/questions? (You may skip this question or answer those that apply)

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Instructions | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Facility Profile | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Recruitment and Hiring | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Working Hours | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Wages and Benefits | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Employee Treatment | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Employee Involvement | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Health and Safety | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Termination | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| Management Systems | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |
| "More Info" Boxes | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px;"></div> |

15. How helpful or unhelpful do you find the “More Info” guidance boxes provided in the tool?

| Not helpful | Neither helpful nor unhelpful | Somewhat helpful | Very helpful |
|---|---|--|---|
|  |  |  |  |

Please provide feedback on your response and, if applicable, where we can improve:

16. Which questions in the data collection & verification tool (element 1 under SLCP converged assessment framework proto2) specifically require (better) guidance/'more info'? (check those that apply)

- Facility Profile
- Recruitment and Hiring
- Working Hours
- Wages and Benefits
- Employee Treatment
- Employee Involvement
- Health and Safety
- Termination
- Management Systems
- "More Info" Boxes
- Not Applicable

For sections selected, which question(s)? Please provide section, question number, and describe how this could be improved:

17. Any general comments or feedback specific to the content/questions used in the Data Collection and Verification Tool - Proto 2 (element 1 of the SLCP converged assessment framework)?

OBJECTIVES - THE DATA COLLECTION AND VERIFICATION TOOL (PROTO2)

18. How well does the Data Collection & Verification Tool - Proto2 (element 1 under SLCP Converged Assessment Framework proto2) meet each of the following objectives?

Well Not so well

Is a simple, unified and effective industry-wide assessment tool

If “Not so well”, please describe how this could be improved:

Is descriptive – standard agnostic and judgement free

If “Not so well”, please describe how this could be improved:

Collects relevant and essential social & labor data

If “Not so well”, please describe how this could be improved:

Assesses objectively social & labor conditions

If “Not so well”, please describe how this could be improved:

Will help eliminate audit fatigue

If “Not so well”, please describe how this could be improved:

Increases the opportunity for greater comparability of social & labor data

If “Not so well”, please describe how this could be improved:

If other, please describe

If “Not so well”, please describe how this could be improved:

19. Is there a missing element from the Data Collection and Verification Tool-Proto2 that would help drive buy-in?

- No
- Yes - Please explain the missing element and describe its value with respect to improvement of the social and labour conditions or compliance purposes:

20. Any general comments or feedback specific to objectives of the Data Collection & Verification Tool-Proto2 (element 1)?

21. How satisfied or unsatisfied are you with the Data Collection & Verification Tool (element 1 under of the converged assessment framework)?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Please explain your selection and describe your recommendations and/or priority for improvement in the next iteration of the data collection & verification tool:

22. Are there any last comments or feedback you would like to share with the SLCP Public Consultation team for consideration ahead of the next version of the Data Collection & Verification Tool (Proto2)?

SECTION TWO: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL (element 2)

This verification protocol aims to specify procedures and process requirements regarding the verification (stage 2 in the SLCP assessment process). The objective of the SLCP verification process is to verify and ensure the integrity and accuracy of the data collected through the tool and reported by facilities (stage 1 in the SLCP assessment process)

CONTENT - VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

23. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the content of the verification protocol:

| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |

If rated 2 thumbs or lower, explain why and how this could be improved:

24. Is anything missing that we should consider for each of the following sections? If yes, please describe the intent of the content you would want to see added with respect to improvement of the social and labour conditions or strict compliance purposes

| | Yes | No |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Request for verification | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | <input type="text"/> | |
| Pre-verification communication and submission | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | <input type="text"/> | |
| Offsite review | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | <input type="text"/> | |
| On site verification | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | <input type="text"/> | |
| Reporting | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | <input type="text"/> | |

25. Were there any points that were unclear or could benefit from further clarification for each of the following sections/areas?

| | Yes | No |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Request for verification | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Pre-verification communication and submission | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Offsite review | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| On site verification | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Reporting | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If yes , please describe | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |

26. Any other comments related to content?

The data collection can be either done by self-assessment (SA) by facility (only) or a joint assessment (JA) (facility + external assistance). On each occasion, even if the external party is a SLCP approved verifier, the data must be verified by an(other) SLCP approved Verifier.

Rationale: The SLCP assessment is a lengthy tool. Signatories understand that it may take a while for facilities to become comfortable with the tool and seek assistance in completion (Joint Assessment) As such means are provided for good quality information as they learn how to complete the assessment tool. in order to avoid conflict of interest and create a clear separation between the initial assessment and the verification, these can not be combined.

Survey Question:

Do you support the separation between Joint Assessment and Verification?

- Yes, I agree that on each occasion, even if the external party is a SLCP approved verifier, the data must be verified by an(other) SLCP approved Verifier.
- No, if carried out by an SLCP approved Verifier, the data collection and verification can be combined

Comments:

28. SLCP Proto2, 2. Verification Protocol: 4, Eligibility of Verifiers, Page 3

Only SLCP approved Verifiers can produce a valid verified assessment report.

Approved verifiers:

- Verifiers can belong to a 2nd or 3rd party organization (2nd party organization is one with which a facility has a buying relationship).
- May belong to either brands, retailers, manufacturers, agents/licensees, NGOs, service providers (note that Verifier management process is under development).
- Have undergone the prerequisite training and approval process as determined by the appointed Verification Program Management Organization (VPM) and the SLCP.

Rationale: Signatories have emphasized that it is the quality of the individual verifier that matters not the organization to which the individual belongs. To aid with scale and to facilitate adoption, it is also beneficial to include Verifier from originations other than 3rd party bodies (service providers/audit firms).

Survey Question:

Do you agree that qualified verifiers belonging to 2nd party organizations should be allowed to carry out verification as long as they fulfill the criteria as stipulated by the project?

Yes, I agree

No, I do not agree

Comments:

29. SLCP proto2, 2. verification protocol, section 5.1 On-site Verification Planning, page 5

During the pilot, on-site verifications will be announced. Therefore, in planning, the verifier must consider local/national holidays as well as any specific dates that the facility will be unavailable for verification.

Rationale : The reason the visit will be announced is that this is a verification and not an audit. Announced verification supports the collaborative approach that this project is based on. It gives the industry an opportunity to reset the relationship between brands/retailers/agents and manufacturers by focusing on providing openness and data integrity. Moreover, it allows the facility to plan for having the responsible persons (such as HR-manager) to be on site for being available for interviews and having access to the required documents for review.

Survey question:

Do you support the proposal of announced visits for on-site verification?

- Yes, I support proposal of announced visits on-site verification visits
- No, I do not support the proposal of announced on-site verification visits
- I would prefer semi-announced visits with a 30-day window and block out days
- I would prefer semi-announced visits with a 10-day window

For any answer selected, please explain the rationale for supporting this option

30. SLCP proto2, 2. Verification Protocol, Section 5.3, Verification Length, Page 7

The table below provides an estimated minimum number of man-days to carry out on site verification work according to the size of the facility. Verifiers are to follow the guidelines indicated below on the minimum length requirements for the verification of the assessment data.

[SEE TABLE ON PAGE 7 OF VERIFICATION PROTOCOL]

Rationale: The tool is an in-depth assessment of social and labor issues in a facility. In order to carry out a thorough verification of such a lengthy tool and to ensure Verifiers are not rushing through the process.

Survey Question:

Do you agree with the proposed number of days on site?

- Yes, I agree the proposed number of days is sufficient
- No, it is too short
- No, it is too long

If selected "No, it's too short" or "too long", please explain rational for supporting this option.

Please also provide an alternative to the days on-site proposed and explain why.

Comments:

31. SLCP proto2, 2. Verification protocol. Section 5.3, Recommended Sample Size, Pages 10

Below, you will find the Recommended Sample Size table provided to Verifiers during the pilot process demonstrating the minimum number of interviews, sampling of personnel files and wage and working hour records to which a Verifier should refer. The sample was created after reviewing other samples from protocols widely used in the industry

[SEE TABLE ON PAGE 10 OF VERIFICATION PROTOCOL]

Survey Question:

Do you agree with the proposed sample size taking into account that this is a minimum number?

- Yes, I agree with the proposed sample size
- No, I do not agree with the proposed sample size. The sample sizes are not sufficient
- No, I do not agree with the proposed sample size. The sample sizes are too much

If you selected "No, sample size is not sufficient or too much," please explain the rationale for your proposed sample size:

32. SLCP proto2, 2. Verification protocol. Section 5.3, Worker Interviews, Pages 10-12 (worker engagement)

A critical part of verification is to incorporate employee experiences into an understanding of the validity of assessment data. The interviews are strictly confidential and subsequent reports will not identify the names of interviewees nor their individual responses. [...]

It is important to interview trade union and/or worker representatives, where they exist, to explore their view of working conditions, management attitude as well as any specific issues. It is recommended that the Verifier speak with a worker representative – elected or not (could be trade union rep or elected through internal system, or appointed by the facility) or equivalent at the start of /during the verification process. If the union is independent of the employer, this interview can be an important source of leads on other issues in the facility across the clusters.

Survey Question:

Do you support this proposal to include worker representatives and verify worker engagement approaches by the facility?

- Yes, I support the proposal
- No, I do not support the proposal - Please state how this can be improved:

OBJECTIVES - VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

33. How well does the verification protocol (element 2 of the SLCP converged assessment framework, proto2) meet each of the following objectives?

| | Well | Not so well |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Adequately ensures that integrity and accuracy of the data collected through the tool and reported by facilities (stage 1 in the SLCP assessment process) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved: | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Specifies procedures and process requirements regarding the verification | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved: | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Adequately ensures the qualification of the verifier | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved: | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Adequately ensures participation all internal stakeholders in the verification process | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved: | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Adequately ensures that the verified report will reflect the reality in the workplace | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved: | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |
| Adequately ensures that integrity and accuracy of the data collected through the tool and reported by facilities (stage 1 in the SLCP assessment process) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved: | | |
| <input type="text"/> | | |

34. How satisfied or unsatisfied are you with the current version of the verification protocol (element 2 of the SLCP converged assessment framework, proto2)?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Please explain your selection and describe your recommendations and/or priority for improvement in the next iteration of the data collection & verification tool:

35. Are there any last comments or feedback you would like to share with the SLCP team for consideration ahead of the next version of the verification protocol (element 2 of the SLCP converged assessment framework, proto2)?

SOCIAL & LABOR CONVERGENCE Public Consultation Survey - SLCP Converged Assessment Framework/ Proto2

SECTION THREE – VERIFIER GUIDANCE (element 3)

CONTENT - VERIFIER GUIDANCE

36. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the content in the verifier guidance:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
|  |  |  |  |  |

If rated 2 thumbs or lower, explain why and how this could be improved:

37. Please rate how useful the verifier guidance document is:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Useful | Somewhat Useful | No Opinion | Useful | Very Useful |
|  |  |  |  |  |

If rated 2 thumbs or lower, explain why and how this could be improved:

38. Please rate how clear the verifier guidance document is:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Clear | Somewhat Unclear | No Opinion | Clear | Very Clear |
|  |  |  |  |  |

If rated 2 thumbs or lower, explain why and how this could be improved:

OBJECTIVES - VERIFIER GUIDANCE

The Verifier Guidance (element 3 of the SLCP converged assessment, proto2) aims to provide instructions and guidance to verifiers to perform the verification and use the data collection & verification tool. Also it gives example questions to illustrate to verifiers how to respond to different kinds of questions, allowing them to extrapolate for the remainder.

39. How well does the verifier guidance meet the following objectives:

Well Not so well

Adequately provides instructions and guidance to verifiers to perform the verification

If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved

Adequately provides instructions and guidance to verifiers to use the data collection & verification tool

If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved

Adequately gives example questions to illustrate to verifiers how to respond to different kinds of questions, allowing them to extrapolate for the remainder

If "Not so well", please describe how this could be improved

CLOSING - VERIFIER GUIDANCE

40. How satisfied or unsatisfied are you with the current version of the verifier guidance (element 3 of the SLCP converged assessment framework, proto2)?

Very Dissatisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied Somewhat Satisfied Very Satisfied



Please explain your selection and describe your recommendations and/or priority for improvement in the next version of the guidance:

41. Are there any last comments or feedback you would like to share with the SLCP team for consideration ahead of the next version of the verifier guidance?

We thank you again for your continued support and participation in this project.
Your time and feedback in completing this survey is much appreciated.

-END OF SURVEY-