
Auditee :	Meizhou Spoton Sports Equipment Technology Co., Ltd, Branch of High-Tech District
Audit Date From :	25/04/2019
Audit Date To :	26/04/2019
Expiry Date of the Audit :	Please refer to the producer profile in the amfori BSCI platform
Auditing Company :	BureauVeritas
Auditor's Name(s) :	Jo Chen(Lead)
Auditing Branch (if applicable) :	



This is an extract of the on line Audit Report. The complete report is available in the amfori BSCI Platform.
Access www.bsplatform.org, for entitled users only.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise circulated without the amfori consent.

This is an extract of the amfori BSCI Audit Report, which is available in the amfori BSCI Platform. © amfori, 2018 - The English version is the legally binding One.



Rating	A combination of ratings per Performance Area where:	Consequence																																							
A Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum 7 Performance Areas rated A No Performance Areas rated C, D or E <p>These are three examples:</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td></tr> </table>	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	The auditee has the level of maturity to maintain its improvement process without the need for a follow-up audit.
A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A																													
A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B																													
A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B																													
B Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum 3 Performance Areas rated C No Performance Areas rated D or E <p>These are three examples:</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>C</td></tr> <tr><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td></tr> </table>	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	The auditee has the level of maturity to maintain its improvement process without the need for a follow-up audit.
A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B																													
A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C																													
B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	C	C																													
C Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum 2 Performance Areas rated D No Performance Areas rated E <p>These are three examples:</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>D</td></tr> <tr><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>D</td></tr> </table>	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	C	C	C	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	D	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	D	D	The auditee needs follow up to support its progress. Following the completion of the audit, the auditee develops a Remediation Plan within 60 days.
A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	C	C	C																													
A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	C	C	C	D																													
C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	D	D																													
D Insufficient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum 6 Performance Areas rated E <p>These are three examples:</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>D</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>D</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td></tr> </table>	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	D	D	A	A	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	E	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	The auditee needs follow up to support its progress. Following the completion of the audit, the auditee develops a Remediation Plan within 60 days.
A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	D	D																													
A	A	A	B	B	B	C	C	C	D	D	D	E																													
D	D	D	D	D	D	D	E	E	E	E	E	E																													
E Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum 7 Performance Areas rated E <p>These are three examples:</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td><td>E</td></tr> </table>	A	A	A	A	A	A	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	A	A	B	B	C	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	amfori BSCI Participants shall closely oversee the auditee's progress as the producer may represent a higher risk than other business partners.
A	A	A	A	A	A	E	E	E	E	E	E	E																													
A	A	B	B	C	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	E																													
E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E																													
Zero Tolerance	A Zero Tolerance Issue was identified (see amfori BSCI System Manual Part V – Annex 5: amfori BSCI Zero Tolerance Protocol)	Immediate actions are required. The amfori BSCI Zero Tolerance Protocol is to be followed.																																							

Main Auditee Information



Name of producer :	Meizhou Spoton Sports Equipment Technology Co., Ltd, Branch of High-Tech District		
DBID number :	378772		
Audit ID :	149608		
Address :	Liangneng Road, High-tech Industry Park, Shejiang Town, Mei County, Meizhou		
Province :	Guangdong	Country :	China
Management Representative :	Mr. Dai Kaijian/Manager		
Contact person:	Ling Zhu	Sector :	Non-Food
Industry Type :	Sports equipment and sportwear	Product group :	sports equipment
Product Type :	Helmet		



Audit Range :	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Audit	
Audit Scope :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Main Auditee	<input type="checkbox"/> Main Auditee & Farms	
Audit Environment :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industrial	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural	<input type="checkbox"/> Small Producer
Audit Announcement :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully-Announced	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully-Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/> Semi-Announced
Random Unannounced Check (RUC) :	No		
Audit extent (if applicable) :	none		
Audit interferences or contingencies (if applicable) :	none		
Overall rating :	C		
Need of follow-up :	Yes	If YES, by : 26/04/2020	

Rating per Performance Area (PA)												
PA 1	PA 2	PA 3	PA 4	PA 5	PA 6	PA 7	PA 8	PA 9	PA 10	PA 11	PA 12	PA 13
D	A	A	A	C	D	B	A	A	A	A	B	A

Executive summary of audit report

Meizhou Spoton Sports Equipment Technology Co., Ltd, Branch of High-Tech District (the name in Chinese was '梅州市思铂顿体育器材科技有限公司高新区分公司', Business License No. was 91441400MA51BJJA1F) was established in February 07, 2018 and located on Liangneng Road, High-tech Industry Park, Shejiang Town, Mei County, Meizhou (the Chinese address was '广东省梅州市梅县区畲江镇高新技术产业园区量能路'). The factory specialized in the manufacture of Helmet. The main produce processes included foam forming, sucking, sewing, mould processing, spray painting, watermark, assembly and packing. According to factory management, peak season was not obvious.

The factory occupied two 4-storey production buildings (B and C), one 3-storey office building and one 3-storey dormitory building (canteen was located on the 1st floor). The total land area was about 22,000 square meters. The 3rd floor of dormitory building and another 4-storey production building A were rent to Zhong Han Daily Products Co., Ltd which specialized in the manufacture of shoes sole. Per factory tour, management interview and employees' interview, it was noted that there this companies' products were different with auditee, had independent management and employees. Therefore, this company areas was not included in audit scope.

There were a total of 97 employees (68 productive employees and 29 non-productive employees) with 44 male and 53 female. The youngest employee noted during this audit was 18 years old.

The factory adopted finger-print system to record working hours of employees. Per management, all production employees and office conducted 1 shift: 8:00 to 17:30 with break off from 12:00 to 13:30. Security guard conducted 2 shifts: 07:00 to 15:00; 14:00 to 22:00. Canteen staff conduct 1 shift: 06:30 to 09:00, 10:00 to 13:00 and 16:30 to 19:00. Wages were paid before 30th day of the following month in cash and wage slips were issued. Per payroll review and interviews with management, all employees were paid by hourly rate.

During the audit, employees' time records wage record were sampled as follows for working hour and wage testing: 11 samples selected from March 2019 as current paid month, 11 samples selected from February 2019 and 11 samples selected from January 2019. Accordance with sampled employees' time records, the maximum overtime hours were 2 hours per day, and 80 hours per month. The maximum weekly working hours were 58 hours. The maximum working day was consecutive 6 days. Employees could refuse to work for overtime freely, without penalty.

According to the sampled payroll records, it was noted that all employees were paid at least CNY 8.10 per hour, which met the local minimum wage CNY 8.10 per hour since July 2018. Overtime hours worked on weekday and weekends were paid with 150% and 200% of employees' normal wage respectively, which was compliance with legal requirement. No overtime hours worked on holiday.

According to the social insurance payment receipt provided by factory management, it was noted that only 37 out of 97 (38.14%) employees were provided with pension, unemployment, maternity, medical and accident insurance in April 2019. No other commercial accident insurance provided. Therefore, accident insurance didn't cover all employees.

Further, 11 employees were selected for private interviews from different workshops. No negative comment was issued during employee interviews. Interviewed employees were satisfied with the working environment, compensation, working hour and management team in the factory.

A closing meeting was held with the factory representatives and all of the findings were discussed. Mr. Dai Kaijian / Manager, Mr. Hu Jianyin / Worker Representative and Mr. Hu Hui / Worker Representative attended the open meeting and the closing meeting. And Mr. Dai Kaijian / Manager signed the onsite CAP and agreed to take corrective actions.

Remarks:
1. There was no agency or contracted worker used, no collective bargaining agreement was signed and no government waiver was obtained, either. Thus, no photo attached for the relevant documents.

2. This audit was a partial scope follow up audit where another audit body had carried out the previous audit. Bureau Veritas does not accept any liability for any issues missed in the previous audit. This audit is focusing on issues that audit had been raised.

3. The 3rd floor of dormitory building and another 4-storey production building A were rent to Zhong Han Daily Products Co., Ltd which specialized in the manufacture of shoes sole. Per factory tour, management interview and employees' interview, it was noted that there this companies' products were different with auditee, had independent management and employees. Therefore, this company areas was not included in audit scope.

4. The auto spray painting line on the 4th floor in building C was under decoration; a half of 3rd floor of building C were empty and not used. 2 out of 4 assembly lines on the 3rd floor of building B were not in production. Management mentioned that because of lacking order.

5. Per management interview, it was noted that PA7.6, PA7.7 and PA7.17 would be corrected within June 2019.

6. The insurance system for employees was under the auditee's parent company, Meizhou Spoton Sports Equipment Technology Co., Ltd. And auditor had randomly check the name list, employees in the insurance system was worked in auditee.

7. Audit Company: Bureau Veritas Consumer Products Service

Audit Company APSCA Number: 11600002

Lead Auditor Name: Jo Chen

APSCA Auditor Registered Number: 21701268



Auditee's background information			
Auditee's name :	Meizhou Spoton Sports Equipment Technology Co., Ltd, Branch of High-Tech District	Legal status :	Limited company
Local Name :	梅州市思铂顿体育器材科技有限公司高新区分公司(91441400MA51BJJA1F)	Year in which the auditee was founded :	2018
Address :	Liangneng Road, High-tech Industry Park, Shejiang Town, Mei County,	Contact person (please select) :	Ling Zhu
Province :	Guangdong	Contact's Email :	julia@spotonhelmet.com
City :	Meizhou	Auditee's official language(s) for written communications :	Chinese
Region :	North East Asia	Other relevant languages for the auditee :	None
Country :	China	Website of auditee (if applicable) :	www.helmetspoton.com
GPS coordinates :	N:24°02'1" E: 115°59'5"	Total turnover (in Euros) :	4000000.00
Sector :	Non-Food	Of which exports % :	80.00
Industry :	Sports equipment and sportwear	Of which domestic market % :	20.00
If other, please specify :		Production volume :	50000 pcs per month
Product Group :	sports equipment	Production cost calculation :	Yes
If other, please specify :		Lost time injury calculation cost :	No
Product Type :	Helmet		

Auditee's employment structure at the time of the audit			
Total number of workers :	97	Total number of workers in the production unit to be monitored (if applicable) :	0
	MALE WORKERS	FEMALE WORKERS	
Permanent workers	44	53	
Temporary workers	0	0	
In management positions	14	15	
Apprentices	0	0	
On probation	0	0	
With disabilities	0	0	
Migrants (national citizens)	18	22	
Migrants (foreign citizens)	0	0	
Workers on the permanent payroll	44	53	
Production based workers	0	0	
With shifts at night	2	0	
Unionised	0	0	
Pregnant	-	0	
On maternity leave	-	0	

Finding Report



Audit Type : Follow-up Audit	
Performance Area 1 : Social Management System and Cascade Effect	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: D	Deadline date:31/03/2020
GOOD PRACTICES: Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:	
<p>The overall observation showed that the auditee partially respect the requirement of this performance area. Per document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the main auditee had established social compliance management policies, procedures, manuals and organization structure to implement BSCI code of conduct. However, gaps were identified in implementation. 整体观察表明, 受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈, 审核发现工厂建立了社会责任管理方针、程序、手册及组织架构来执行BSCI行为规范。但在实际执行中仍存在一些差距。</p> <p>1.1 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish amfori BSCI management system at all. And many issues of each performance area were identified during the audit. Not Closed: It was noted that the auditee had set up management system to compliance with the BSCI Code of Conduct. But some policies were improperly implemented and did not monitor the management system accurately. And some non-compliance was detected on Performance area 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10,12,13. All performance areas worked well would lead the BSCI management system was more effective. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI PA1.1 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未建立amfori BSCI管理系统。审核中每个部分都发现了不符合项。未改善: 审核发现被审核方建立了社会责任管理体系以符合BSCI行为准则, 部分制度没有执行到位, 并且对其社会责任体系执行情况监管不到位。在执行领域1.2,5,6,7,10,12,13 发现不符合项。各个执行领域的运行良好会有利于整个BSCI系统的有效运行。工厂管理层表示会尽快改善。请参看BSCI PA1.1</p> <p>1.2 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not appoint a senior manager to ensure amfori BSCI management implementation. And the senior manager of the factory did not know about the Code of amfori BSCI. Closed: Factory had appointed a senior manager to ensure amfori BSCI management implementation. And per management interview, the senior manager of the factory knew about the Code of amfori BSCI. 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未指定一名高层管理负责amfori BSCI管理实施。而且工厂的高层管理人员不了解amfori BSCI的行为准则。已改善: 工厂已指定一名高层管理人员负责amfori BSCI管理实施。而且通过访谈, 工厂的高层管理人员对amfori BSCI的行为准则有一定了解。</p> <p>1.3 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not define any monitoring requirement on social performance in supplier management procedure. And the factory did not conduct monitoring for suppliers in their social performance. Closed: Factory had defined monitoring requirement on social performance in supplier management procedure. And the factory had conducted monitoring (assessment) for suppliers in their social performance. 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未在供应商管理程序里定义社会责任方面的要求。且工厂未对供应商进行社会责任方面的监控。已改善: 工厂已经供应商管理程序里定义社会责任方面的要求。且工厂有对供应商进行社会责任方面的监控(如: 评估)。</p> <p>1.4 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not set up an effective workforce planning, which lead to workers' overtime hours were not in line with the legal requirement. Not closed: It was noted that the facility didn't hire enough employees or properly organized to meet the produce requirement. Based on the sampled employees' time records, the maximum overtime hours were 2 hours per day and 80 hours per month. The maximum working hour per week was 58 hours. Employees could have at least one day leave in consecutive 6 working days. Employees could refuse to work for overtime freely, without penalty. Excessive overtime working hours will result in heavy workload; employees may not have enough rest and increase the risk of health safety issue. The factory management stated that the factory was optimizing the production and they would try their best to control employees' overtime working hours in the future. Please refer to BSCI PA1.4. 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵守该准则, 原因是工厂未建立有效的人力资源控制计划, 使得工人的加班时间未满足法规要求。未改善: 审核发现工厂没有请足够的工人或更好地组织生产来满足生产的需求。抽样发现员工存在月加班时间超出法定要求的情况, 最大达80小时/每月。工厂的最大日加班是2小时, 最大周工作时间是58小时, 最大连续工作天是6天。员工可以自由选择加班, 不会受到任何的处罚。繁重的工作会引起超时时地加班工作, 而过长的工作时间会对员工的健康造成一定的损害。工厂管理层正在优化生产的过程, 将在日后尽可能地控制员工的加班时间。请参看BSCI PA1.4条</p>	
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: E	Deadline date:31/03/2019
Good practices None.	
Areas of improvement	
<p>Consolidated finding: The factory did not establish complete policy or procedure on social accountability. No senior manager was appointed as the amfori BSCI representative. No policy established with respect to the selection, management and monitoring of its suppliers' social accountability. Gaps had been identified in implementation as follows: (There are no social policy, written declaration of subsupplier, subsupplier monitoring records provided by the auditee, which makes the social policy, written declaration of subsupplier, subsupplier monitoring documents not applicable.) 综合概况: 工厂未建立完善的社会责任政策和程序。工厂未指定高层管理作为amfori BSCI负责人。工厂未建立包括社会责任要求的供应商的筛选、管理和监控政策。工厂在系统执行方面和amfori BSCI要求有以下差距: (工厂未提供社会责任政策、供应商签署的协议、供应商监控记录, 所以社会责任政策、供应商签署的协议、供应商监控资料未提供。)</p> <p>1.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish amfori BSCI management system at all. And many issues of each performance area were identified during the audit. 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未建立amfori BSCI管理系统。审核中每个部分都发现了不符合项。</p> <p>1.2 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not appoint a senior manager to ensure amfori BSCI management implementation. And the senior manager of the factory did not know about the Code of amfori BSCI. 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未指定一名高层管理负责amfori BSCI管理实施。而且工厂的高层管理人员不了解amfori BSCI的行为准则。</p> <p>1.3 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not define any monitoring requirement on social performance in supplier management procedure. And the factory did not conduct monitoring for suppliers in their social performance.</p>	

DBID : 378772 and Audit Id : 149608

Audit Date : 25/04/2019

Audit Type: **主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未在供应商管理程序里定义社会责任方面的要求。且工厂未对供应商进行社会责任方面的监控。**

- 1.4 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not set up an effective workforce planning, which lead to workers' overtime hours were not in line with the legal requirement.**
被审核方(生产商)未遵守该准则, 原因是工厂未建立有效的人力资源控制计划, 使得工人的加班时间未满足法规要求。

Remarks from Auditee

<p>Performance Area 2 : Workers Involvement and Protection</p>	
<p>1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A</p>	<p>Deadline date:31/03/2020</p>
<p>GOOD PRACTICES: Nil</p>	
<p>AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:</p> <p>The overall observation showed that the partially respected the requirement of this performance area. Per document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the main auditee had established communication structure and procedures to genuinely involve workers and their representatives. Meeting records showed that management exchanges information on workplace-related issues with workers and their representatives regularly. According to interviewees, provided procedures and records, workers' representatives were elected by workers without any interference from factory management. Workers' representatives were allowed to carry out their duties within working hours without losing pay or other negative repercussions. Grievance mechanism procedure had been established. Workers can lodge grievances through such a mechanism. However, based on satisfactory evidence, gaps were identified in implementation.</p> <p>整体观察表明,受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,审核发现工厂建立了沟通渠道和程序来切实确保员工及员工代表的参与。会议记录显示管理人员与员工代表定期就工作场所相关事项进行一次沟通。根据员工访谈,管理程序文件及记录显示,员工代表由员工自由选举而不受管理层干涉。员工代表可以在工作时间内行使其职责而不会被克扣工资或者受到任何负面影响。工厂建立了申诉机制,员工可以通过该机制表达诉求。但在实际执行中仍存在一些差距。</p> <p>2.1 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was not any kind of meeting or communication way between management and workers arranged by the factory to let workers know the workplace issues. And according to interview with workers, workers did not know the basic safety risk in the workshop. Closed: Factory had establish health and sasfety committee, and employees would participate in regular meeting. 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵守该准则,原因是工厂未安排任何形式的管理层和员工之间会议或沟通方式来让员工了解工作场所的问题。根据员工访谈,员工不了解工作场所的健康安全隐患。已改善: 工厂有建立安全委员会,且有员工参与定期会议。</p> <p>2.2 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because no long-term goals/vision was established to protect workers according to amfori BSCI Code of Conduct. Not Closed: It was noted that the auditee has not yet defined long-term goals in cooperation with workers and workers representatives based on BSCI code. Per management interview, they were not aware of that workers and workers representatives need to be involved. The facility management represented that they would defined long-term goals in cooperation with workers and workers representatives as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI PA 2.2 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵守该准则,原因是工厂未根据amfori BSCI行为准则定义长期目标来保护员工。未改善: 审核方发现工厂没有与工人及工人代表一起商定关于BSCI准则长期目标。工厂管理层访谈发现工厂不知道需要与工人及工人代表一起参与。工厂表示将会与员工代表方商定长期目标。请参看BSCI PA2.2</p> <p>2.4 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't provide effective training regarding amfori BSCI management system to all employees, and through interview with the workers, they were not clear amfori BSCI requirements. Closed: Factory had provided effective training regarding amfori BSCI management system to employees, and through interview with the workers, they konw about the amfori BSCI requirements. 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂没有提供有效的关于amfori BSCI管理体系的培训给工人,而且通过员工访谈,他们不清楚amfori BSCI的要求。已改善: 工厂有提供amfori BSCI管理体系培训给员工,通过访谈,员工对amfori BSCI有一定了解。</p> <p>2.5 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish grievance mechanism for individuals or communities. Closed: Factory had established grievance mechanism for individuals and communities. 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未建立了个人和社区的申诉机制。已改善: 工厂已经建立了个人和社区的申诉机制。</p>	
<p>Remarks from Auditee:</p>	
<p>Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: E</p>	<p>Deadline date:31/03/2019</p>
<p>Good practices None.</p>	
<p>Areas of improvement</p> <p>Consolidated finding: Training policy is established by the factory, which cover the training needs of all workers in rights, responsibilities, and health. Training plan and records were provided during the audit, such as the training about factory rules was conducted on 27 Jul. 2018. Amfori BSCI code and factory policy/rules were posted at the factory. Gaps had been identified in implementation as follows: (There are no grievance mechanism provided by the auditee, which makes thegrievance documents not applicable.) 综合概况: 工厂建立了培训政策,包括员工需要了解的权利与义务,和健康安全。审核过程中工厂提供了培训计划及培训记录,例如厂规的培训在2018年7月27日举行。Amfori BSCI 行为准则、公司政策、厂纪厂规被张贴在工厂。工厂在系统执行方面和amfori BSCI要求有差距:(工厂未提供申诉机制,所以申诉相关资料未提供。)</p> <p>2.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was not any kind of meeting or communication way between management and workers arranged by the factory to let workers know the workplace issues. And according to interview with workers, workers did not know the basic safety risk in the workshop. 被审核方(生产商)未遵守该准则,原因是工厂未安排任何形式的管理层和员工之间会议或沟通方式来让员工了解工作场所的问题。根据员工访谈,员工不了解工作场所的健康安全隐患。</p> <p>2.2 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because no long-term goals/vision was established to protect workers according to amfori BSCI Code of Conduct. 被审核方(生产商)未遵守该准则,原因是工厂未根据amfori BSCI行为准则定义长期目标来保护员工。</p> <p>2.4 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't provide effective training regarding amfori BSCI management system to all employees, and through interview with the workers, they were not clear amfori BSCI requirements. 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂没有提供有效的关于amfori BSCI管理体系的培训给工人,而且通过员工访谈,他们不清楚amfori BSCI的要求。</p> <p>2.5 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish grievance mechanism for individuals or communities. 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未建立了个人和社区的申诉机制。</p>	

Remarks from Auditee	
Performance Area 3 : The rights of Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A	Deadline date:
GOOD PRACTICES: Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT: <p>The overall observation showed that the auditee fully respected the requirement of this performance area. Per document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the auditee had set procedure to protect the right of workers to form and join organizations of their own choosing. Workers' representatives were allowed to carry out their duties within working hours without losing pay or other negative repercussions. Also representatives could hold negotiation with factory management regarding issues of health and safety, welfare and work condition though no collective bargain was ever held. According to interview with workers' representative, there was no discriminatory treatment from factory management. Also there was no any restriction of workers' representatives' interaction with workers according to employee manual and testimony of interviewees. The auditee could respect this principle the rights of Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining, and the employees could raise their concerns through, worker representatives, suggestion box or management directly.</p> <p>整体观察表明,受审核方满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,被审核方制定了相应的程序文件来确保员工可以自由成立或者参与各种组织。员工代表可以在工作时间行使其职责而不会被扣工资或者产生任何负面影响。员工代表可以代表员工与管理层就健康安全,员工福利及工作条件等方面进行集体谈判,虽然目前尚未举办过类似的谈判。根据员工手册及受访者口述,被审核方没有设置任何制止员工与员工代表接触的措施。被审核方尊重员工的自由结社的权利,并且员工可以通过员工代表、意见箱或者直接向管理层反映自己的意见或建议。</p> <p>3.1 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish procedure on freedom of association or collective bargaining. No trade union or worker representative election processes existed in the factory. Closed: Factory had established procedure on freedom of association or collective bargaining. And worker representative election had conducted. 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未建立自由结社或集体谈判权方面的程序。且工厂没有工会或工人代表选取的流程。已改善: 工厂已建立自由结社或集体谈判权方面的程序。且工厂已经进行了工人代表选举。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: B	Deadline date:31/03/2019
Good practices None.	
Areas of improvement <p>Consolidated finding: No worker representative in the factory. Confirmed by interview, the factory respected workers right to bargain collectively, no collective bargain was happened in factory. Gaps had been identified in implementation as follows: 综合概况:工厂没有工人代表。根据访谈确认,工厂尊重工人集体谈判权的权利,工厂尚未发生过集体谈判。工厂在系统执行方面和amfori BSCI要求有差距:</p> <p>3.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish procedure on freedom of association or collective bargaining. No trade union or worker representative election processes existed in the factory. 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未建立自由结社或集体谈判权方面的程序。且工厂没有工会或工人代表选取的流程。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee	

Audit Type : Follow-up Audit Performance Area 4 : No Discrimination	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A	Deadline date:
GOOD PRACTICES:	
Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:	
The overall observation showed that the auditee fully respected the requirement of this performance area. Per document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the auditee had set procedure to prevent any kind of discrimination and management were trained and promised to obey this principle. The auditee paid particular attention to avoid discrimination against vulnerable groups like migrant workers through employee manual and normal training. The auditee did not use health conditions for discrimination such as medical testing, virginity tests, use of contraception or equivalent. 整体观察表明, 受审核方满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈, 审核发现被审核方建立了禁止歧视的管理程序文件, 所有管理人员接受了相应培训并承诺遵守该原则。被审核方对弱势群体如外地工人给予了特别关注, 并通过员工手册, 日常培训来保障其权益。被审核方管理不以身体条件比如医学体检, 怀孕检查, 避孕节育等类似手段来设置歧视条款。	
4.1 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish procedure or policy on no discrimination. And management did not know clear about it. Closed: Factory had established procedure and policy on no discrimination. And management konw about the requirement. 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未建立关于反歧视方面的程序或政策。而且管理层不了解相关要求。已改善: 工厂已建立关于反歧视方面的程序或政策。而且通过访谈, 管理层对相关要求有一定了解。	
4.2 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was no formal grievance mechanism established in the factory. Closed: Grievance mechanism had been established in the factory. 上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未建立申诉机制。已改善: 工厂已建立申诉机制。	
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: E	Deadline date:31/03/2019
Good practices	
None.	
Areas of improvement	
Consolidated finding: The factory did not establish policy on anti-discrimination. No grievance system established for worker. Furthermore, the policy on discipline measures made by the factory was in line with legal and amfori BSCI requirement. Gaps had been identified in implementation as follows: 综合概况: 工厂未制定反歧视的政策。没有建立申诉机制。工厂的惩戒措施符合法规要求及amfori BSCI要求。工厂在系统执行方面和amfori BSCI要求有差距:	
4.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish procedure or policy on no discrimination. And management did not know clear about it. 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未建立关于反歧视方面的程序或政策。而且管理层不了解相关要求。	
4.2 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was no formal grievance mechanism established in the factory. 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未建立申诉机制。	
Remarks from Auditee	

Audit Type : Follow-up Audit	
Performance Area 5 : Fair Remuneration	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: C	Deadline date:31/03/2020
GOOD PRACTICES: Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:	
<p>The overall observation showed that the auditee partially respected the requirement of this performance area. Per document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the local legal minimum wage standard was CNY 1410 per month since July 2018. All the employees were paid over minimum wage standard. Wages were paid by cash within 30 days in the following month according to legal requirement; all employees were paid by hourly rate. Pay-slips' were distributed to all workers when wages were paid which was also cross verified during worker's interview. The factory provided leave according to employees' application and legal requirement on paid basis. Maternity benefit was provided to female employee who was legally entitled to this welfare as per legal requirements. No illegal or unreasonable deduction had been identified through document review or reported by the interviewed workers. However, gap was identified during implementation.</p> <p>整体观察表明,受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,审核发现当地法定最低工资标准是1410元/月(2018年7月起)。所有员工工资都符合该标准。每月工资在下一个月30天内以现金的方式发放。所有员工都是以计时形式计算工资的。在工资发放时给员工发放了工资条(在员工访谈中对上述事实进行了交叉验证)。工厂按照法律要求并根据员工申请提供了带薪年假并给符合要求的女性员工提供了产假。通过员工访谈及记录查询没有发现任何形式的不合理扣款。然而,在执行中存在差距。</p>	
<p>5.1 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because incomplete wage records kept by the factory. The factory started production since 25 Jun 2018, and they only kept wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. Based on the provided wage records, the minimum wage was RMB1510 in Aug & Sep 2018. It was unable to verify whether minimum wage was ensured according to local law in other months. Closed: Factory maintained all wage records and provided for review. It was noted that employees at least paid CNY 1910 per month, which was more than the local legal minimum wage standard was CNY 1410 per month since July 2018.</p> <p>上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未保留完整的工资记录。工厂自2018年6月25日开始生产,但是只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。根据已提供的工资记录,2018年8月和9月工人的最低工资为1510元。但是不能判定在其他月份工人的最低工资是否符合法规要求。已改善:工厂保留了所有的工资记录,最低工资每月1910元,高于当地最低工资1410元每月。</p>	
<p>5.2 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory paid wage later than legal requirement. Till the audit day (7 Dec 2018), the factory did not pay wages of Oct 2018 to workers. Closed: No delay payment issue found during this audit.</p> <p>上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂迟发工资给工人。截至审核当天(2018年12月7日),工厂仍未发放2018年10月工资给工人。已改善:没有发现工厂有迟发工资情况出现。</p>	
<p>5.3 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory only provided wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. It was unable to verify whether the factory paid wages reflecting worker's skill or education in other months. (Based on the provided wage records, there were different skill allowance to different positions.) Closed: The factory paid wages reflecting worker's skill or education. (Based on the provided wage records, there were different skill allowance to different positions.)</p> <p>上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂只提供了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。不能准确评估在其他月份,工资是否反映了不同技能和教育水平。(根据已提供的工资记录,不同工做岗位有不同的技术津贴。已改善:工资反映了不同技能和教育水平。(根据已提供的工资记录,不同工做岗位有不同的技术津贴。)</p>	
<p>5.4 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not access decent standard of living before and during the audit. And the factory only provided wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. It was unable to verify the payment condition of other months. Not Closed: It was noted that factory did not calculate the BNW. BNW could make sure that employees were in decent living, which could be improve employees' work efficient. The factory management represented that they would analyze the actual situation and take corrective action. Please refer to BSCI PA 5.4</p> <p>上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未在审核前和审核过程中评估当地体面生活工资。而且工厂只提供了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。无法评估其它月份的工资状况。未改善:审核发现工厂没有对生活保障工资进行计算。基本生活保障工资可以确保员工更加体面地生活,可以有效地提高员工的工作效率。工厂管理层表示他们会分析实际产生的原因,然后会采取相应的改善措施。请参看BSCI PA5.4</p>	
<p>5.5 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not provide adequate social insurance for employees as per legal requirement. Based on social insurance payment records of Oct 2018, the factory only provided retirement, injury, unemployment, childbearing, and medical insurance to 50 employees. There were totally 121 employees in the factory. (Confirmed by interview, many workers did not want to pay their individual part of the social insurance. They volunteered to give up it.) And the factory defined maternity leave was 128 days in the factory, which less than local law required. There was no employee applying maternity leave till the audit. Not Closed: According to the social insurance payment receipt provided by factory management, it was noted that only 37 out of 97 (38.14%) employees were provided with pension, unemployment, maternity, medical and accident insurance in April 2019. Per employees' private interview and management interview, it was noted that some employees were unwilling to purchase social insurance in the facility. Social insurance didn't cover all employees maybe cause the problem between the employer and the employee, which maybe reduce employees' worked efficiency. The facility management represented that they would enhance the social insurance training to employees and would try their best to improve the purchase rate in the future. Please refer to BSCI PA 5.5 and Article 73 of the Labor Law of the People's Republic of China.</p> <p>上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则,原因是工厂未按照法规要求提供足够社保给员工。根据2018年10月的社保缴费记录,工厂只为50名员工提供了养老、工伤、失业、生育和医疗保险。工厂总人数为121人。(根据访谈确认,一些工人不愿意支付社保的个人缴费部分。他们自愿放弃购买社保。)工厂规定的产假为128天,少于当地法规要求的产假天数。工厂暂无申请产假的员工。未改善:审核员发现工厂的社会保险覆盖不足。根据厂方提供的2019年4月社会保险缴费单据显示工厂为37/97名员工(38.14%)提供养老、失业、生育、医疗和工伤保险。没有为全体员工提供保险有可能会引起雇主与雇员之间的问题产生,这有可能会降低员工的工作效率。工厂管理层表示会加强社保的宣传,尽可能增加社保的购买比例。请参看BSCI PA 5.5及《中华人民共和国劳动法》第73条</p>	
<p>5.6 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory only provided wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. It was unable to verify the deduction condition of other months. Closed: No deduction condition extent prescribed by the law during this audit.</p> <p>上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则,原因是工厂只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。无法判定其它月份的工资扣除情况。已改善:此次审核没有发现违法扣款情况。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: E	Deadline date:31/03/2019
Good practices	

None Type : Follow-up Audit

Areas of improvement

Consolidated finding: The overall observation shows the auditee does not fulfil the requirement of performance area 5, because that not inadequate wage records kept by the factory for verifying. The factory established wages and benefit paying system, which included paid statutory holidays, sick leave, annual leave, marriage leave and maternity leave etc. Based on the wages from Aug 2018 to Sep 2018 provided by the factory, the minimum wage paid by the factory was RMB1510 per month, which higher than legal requirement. And in these two months, no other deduction except social insurance and tax were identified according to wages records of workers. Gaps had been identified in implementation:

综合概况: 整体观察显示被审核方不符合该绩效区域的要求, 工厂未保留充分的工资记录来验证。工厂制定了工资支付政策和福利政策, 福利政策包括给员工提供法定节假日, 病假, 婚假, 产假等假期。根据工厂提供的2018年8月至2018年9月的工资记录显示, 工厂给员工支付最低1510元每月的工资, 高于当地法规要求。在上述两个月份, 员工仅有社保和个税的扣款记录, 无其它的扣款。工厂在执行方面有不合 amfori BSCI 要求的地方, 如下:

- 5.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because incomplete wage records kept by the factory. The factory started production since 25 Jun 2018, and they only kept wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. Based on the provided wage records, the minimum wage was RMB1510 in Aug & Sep 2018. It was unable to verify whether minimum wage was ensured according to local law in other months.
主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未保留完整的工资记录。工厂自2018年6月25日开始生产, 但是只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。根据已提供的工资记录, 2018年8月和9月工人的最低工资为1510元。但是不能判定在其他月份工人的最低工资是否符合法规要求。
- 5.2 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory paid wage later than legal requirement. Till the audit day (7 Dec 2018), the factory did not pay wages of Oct 2018 to workers.
主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂迟发工资给工人。截至审核当天(2018年12月7日), 工厂仍未发放2018年10月工资给工人。
- 5.3 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory only provided wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. It was unable to verify whether the factory paid wages reflecting worker's skill or education in other months. (Based on the provided wage records, there were different skill allowance to different positions.)
主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂只提供了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。不能准确评估在其他月份, 工资是否反映了不同技能和教育水平。(根据已提供的工资记录, 不同工做岗位有不同的技术津贴。)
- 5.4 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not access decent standard of living before and during the audit. And the factory only provided wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. It was unable to verify the payment condition of other months.
主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则, 原因是工厂未在审核前和审核过程中评估当地体面生活工资。而且工厂只提供了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。无法评估其它月份的工资状况。
- 5.5 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not provide adequate social insurance for employees as per legal requirement. Based on social insurance payment records of Oct 2018, the factory only provided retirement, injury, unemployment, child-bearing, and medical insurance to 50 employees. There were totally 121 employees in the factory. (Confirmed by interview, many workers did not want to pay their individual part of the soical insurance. They volunteered to give up it.) And the factory defined maternity leave was 128 days in the factory, which less than local law required. There was no employee applying maternity leave till the audit.
被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则, 原因是工厂未按照法规要求提供足够社保给员工。根据2018年10月的社保缴费记录, 工厂只为50名员工提供了养老、工伤、失业、生育和医疗保险。工厂总人数为121人。(根据访谈确认, 一些工人不愿意支付社保的个人缴费部分。他们自愿放弃购买社保。)工厂规定的产假为128天, 少于当地法规要求的产假天数。工厂暂无申请产假的员工。
- 5.6 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory only provided wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. It was unable to verify the deduction condition of other months.
被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则, 原因是工厂只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。无法判定其它月份的工资扣除情况。

Remarks from Auditee

Audit Type : Follow-up Audit	
Performance Area 6 : Decent Working Hours	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: D	Deadline date:31/03/2020
GOOD PRACTICES: Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:	
<p>The overall observation showed that the auditee partially respected the requirement of this performance area. Per document review, management interview and employees' private interview, the auditee complied with local requirement of the normal working hours of 40 hours per week. Based on the sampled employees' time records, the maximum overtime hours were 2 hours per day and 80 hours per month. Employees could have at least one day leave after consecutive 6 working days. Employees could refuse to work for overtime freely, without penalty. However, gaps were identified in implementation.</p> <p>整体观察表明,受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,被审核方遵循生产员工每周正常工作时间为40小时。抽样员工最大月加班为80小时/每月,最大日加班是2小时,最大连续工作天是6天。员工可以自由选择加班,不会受到任何的处罚。但在实际执行中仍存在差距。</p>	
6.2 -	<p>Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because workers' OT hour exceeded legal requirement. And due to incomplete wage records kept, it was unable to verify whether the factory provided enough OT wages to workers. Based on attendance records from 25 Jun 2018 to the audit date, it was noted that 100% sampled workers' monthly OT hours exceeded 36 hours in each month, the maximum was up to 165 hours in Aug 2018. And worker's daily OT hour exceeded 3 hours and up to 4 hours. The maximum weekly working hour of workers were 80 hours. The factory only kept wage records of Aug & Sep 2018. It was unable to verify whether the factory paid enough OT wages to workers in other month. Based on the provided records, the factory paid 150% and 200% of normal rate to worker as OT wages on weekdays and weekend days. Closed: It was noted that 20 out of 33 sample population employees worked in excess of the statutory overtime hour limits. A review of 33 sample population employees' time records (11 samples selected from March 2019 as current paid month, 11 samples selected from February 2019, 11 samples selected from January 2019) yielded the following: 1) 11 out of 11 sample population employees worked in excess of 36 overtime hours per month (i.e. 40-80 hours) in March 2019, which was not in compliance with the legal requirement; 2) 9 out of 11 sample population employees worked in excess of 36 overtime hours per month (i.e.66-76 hours) in January 2019, which was not in compliance with the legal requirement. Excessive overtime working hours will result in heavy workload; employees may not have enough rest and increase the risk of health safety issue. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI PA6.2 & Article 41 of the Labor Law of the PRC</p> <p>上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则,原因是工人加班时间超法规要求。由于工资记录不完整,无法判定工厂是否支付足额的加班费给工人。根据工厂提供的2018年6月25日至审核当天的考勤记录,发现100%的抽样员工在每个月的月加班均超过36小时,最大在2018年8月达165小时。而且工人的日加班超过3小时,达到4小时。工人的最大周工时为80小时。工厂只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。无法判定在其他月份工厂是否支付了足额的加班费给工人。根据已经提供的工资记录,工厂按照正班工资的150%和200%支付工人平时加班和周末加班工资。未改善:根据工厂提供的工时记录,审核员发现员工加班时间超出了法定标准。审核员从工厂提供的工时记录中抽取33个样本(其中从最近工资支付月2019年3月抽11个,从2019年2月抽11个以及从2019年1月抽11个),发现共有20名员工加班时间超出了法定标准。具体为:11/11名抽样员工在2019年3月的加班时间为40-80小时,超过每月加班时间不能超过36小时的法律规定;9/11名抽样员工在2019年1月的加班时间为66-76小时,超过每月加班时间不能超过36小时的法律规定。繁重的工作会引起超工时地加班工作,而过长的工作时间会对员工的健康造成一定的损害。工厂管理层表示会尽快改善。请参看BSCI PA 6.2及《中华人民共和国劳动法》第41条</p>
6.4 -	<p>Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because one day off per seven days was not ensured to workers. Based on workers' attendance records from 25 Jun. 2018 to the audit date, it was noted that 100% sampled workers had no one-day-off per seven days in each month. The maximum consecutive working time was 19 days, which from 2 Jul 2018 to 20 Jul 2018. Closed: The maximum consecutive working time was 6 days during testing period.</p> <p>上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则,原因是未保证工人七休一。根据工人2018年6月25日至审核当天的考勤记录,发现100%的抽样工人在每个均未保证七休一。最大连续上班时间为19天,从2018年7月2日至2018年7月20日。已改善:此次审核发现工厂最长连续上班时间为6天。</p>
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: E	Deadline date:31/03/2019
Good practices	
None.	
Areas of improvement	
<p>Consolidated finding: The overall observation shows the auditee partially fulfils the requirement of performance area 6. The factory established a policy on working hour system. Worker's working time was recorded by manual records and finger printing system. According to the policy and implementation records, all workers worked 8 hours per day, 5 days per week as regular hours. The factory arranged workers worked overtime based on production plan and workers had right to choose overtime working or not. Workers could take a rest during the work time when they felt tired. The processes and implementation were verified by interview and document review, however, gaps have been identified in implementation.</p> <p>综合概况:整体观察显示被审核方部分符合该绩效区域的要求。工厂制定了工时政策。工人的工作时间用手工考勤和指纹系统记录。根据工时政策以及工厂实际的执行情况,所有工人正班工作是每天8小时,每周5天。工厂会依据生产计划安排工人加班,员工可自愿选择是否加班。员工在工作期间如果觉得疲惫,可自由选择休息一会儿。以上方面从员工访谈以及文件信息等方面进行了验证,但是,工厂在执行方面也有不符合amfori BSCI要求的地方,如下:</p>	
6.2 -	<p>Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because workers' OT hour exceeded legal requirement. And due to incomplete wage records kept, it was unable to verify whether the factory provided enough OT wages to workers. Based on attendance records from 25 Jun 2018 to the audit date, it was noted that 100% sampled workers' monthly OT hours exceeded 36 hours in each month, the maximum was up to 165 hours in Aug 2018. And worker's daily OT hour exceeded 3 hours and up to 4 hours. The maximum weekly working hour of workers were 80 hours. The factory only kept wage records of Aug & Sep 2018. It was unable to verify whether the factory paid enough OT wages to workers in other month. Based on the provided records, the factory paid 150% and 200% of normal rate to worker as OT wages on weekdays and weekend days.</p> <p>主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则,原因是工人加班时间超法规要求。由于工资记录不完整,无法判定工厂是否支付足额的加班费给工人。根据工厂提供的2018年6月25日至审核当天的考勤记录,发现100%的抽样员工在每个月的月加班均超过36小时,最大在2018年8月达165小时。而且工人的日加班超过3小时,达到4小时。工人的最大周工时为80小时。工厂只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录。无法判定在其他月份工厂是否支付了足额的加班费给工人。根据已经提供的工资记录,工厂按照正班工资的150%和200%支付工人平时加班和周末加班工资。</p>
6.4 -	<p>Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because one day off per seven days was not ensured to workers. Based on workers' attendance records from 25 Jun. 2018 to the audit date, it was noted that 100% sampled workers had no one-day-off per seven days in each month. The maximum consecutive working time was 19 days, which from 2 Jul 2018 to 20 Jul 2018.</p>

DBID : 378772 and Audit Id : 149608

Audit Date : 25/04/2019

Audit Type: **主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守该原则,原因是未保证工人七休一。根据工人2018年6月25日至审核当天的考勤记录,发现100%的抽样工人在每个月均未保证七休一。最大连续上班时间为19天,从2018年7月2日至2018年7月20日。**

Remarks from Auditee

Audit Type : Follow-up Audit	
Performance Area 7 : Occupational Health and Safety	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: B	Deadline date:31/03/2020
GOOD PRACTICES: Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:	
<p>The overall observation showed that the auditee partially respected the requirement of this performance area. Per factory tour, document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the auditee basically complied with occupational health and safety (OHS) regulations. The auditee established fire safety policy, the emergency evacuation plan, and also regularly carried out risk assessment for safe, healthy and hygienic working condition. The auditee regularly conducted fire drills for employees. Further, the auditee provided safety training to employees. However, gaps were identified in implementation. Remark: The checkpoint 7.23 should be rated as N/A because of no transportation was provided for employees. But no N/A option both offline and online, therefore it was input as NOT RATED.</p> <p>整体观察表明,受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过现场走访、文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,审核发现被审核方基本遵守了适合其业务活动的职业健康与安全法规。被审核方建立了消防程序文件,应急预案等,并定期执行了有关安全、健康和卫生工作条件的风险评估,定期组织员工进行消防演习,对员工进行安全培训等。但是,在实际执行中存在差距。备注:7.23 选项应该选择N/A,因为没有交通福利提供给员工。但是由于offline 和online 报告中都没有N/A 选项可选,因此,“NOT RATED” 选项在该项。</p>	
7.1 -	<p>Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish complete management system on health and safety. And health & safety issues were identified due to management negligence. Not Closed: It was noted that the health & safety management system was not operated effectively, which resulted in some findings on PA7 regarding violations on legal occupational health and safety regulations were identified during the audit. The facility management represented that they would try their best to correct this issue. Please refer to BSCI PA 7.1</p> <p>上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则。原因是工厂未建立完善的健康安全管理体系。审核中有发现健康安全存在问题。未改善: 在评估中发现,被审核方部分尊重此项要求:工厂的健康安全管理体系没有有效运行,导致在PA7发现关于违反法定的职业健康安全问题。工厂管理层表示会尽可能改善。请参看BSCI PA7.1</p>
7.2 -	<p>Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish the procedure on work-related injury dispose. And the factory did not provide work-related injury insurance for all employees. Based on social insurance records of Oct 2018, only 50 out of 121 employees were provided with injury insurance. Not Closed: According to the social insurance payment receipt provided by factory management, it was noted that only 37 out of 97 (38.14%) employees were provided with accident insurance in April 2019. Therefore, accident insurance didn't cover all employees. Accident social insurance didn't cover all employees maybe cause the problem between the employer and the employee, which maybe reduce employees' worked efficiency. The facility management represented that they would enhance the social insurance training to employees and would try their best to improve the purchase rate in the future. Please refer to BSCI PA 7.2 and Article 73 of the Labor Law of the People's Republic of China.</p> <p>上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立工伤处理程序。而且工厂未提供工伤保险给所有员工。根据2018年10月的社保记录,工厂只未50名员工(工厂共有121名员工)购买了工伤保险。未改善: 审核员发现工厂的社会保险覆盖不足。根据厂方提供的2019年4月社会保险缴费单据显示工厂仅为37/97名员工(38.14%)提供工伤保险,工厂的工伤没有覆盖全体员工。没有为全体员工提供工伤保险有可能会引起雇主与雇员之间的问题产生,这有可能会降低员工的工作效率。工厂管理层表示会加强社保的宣传,尽可能增加社保的购买比例。请参看BSCI PA 7.2 及《中华人民共和国劳动法》第73条。</p>
7.3 -	<p>1. Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not carry out regular risk assessment for safe, healthy and hygienic working conditions. And they did not provide occupational health examination to worker under hazard factors, such as spray painting workers, silk screening workers, and foam forming workers, mould workers. Not Closed: It was noted that factory did not carry out regular risk assessment for safe, healthy and hygienic working conditions. The worker or worker representative involved in the OHS risk assessment would help to improve BSCI system much better. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action. Please refer to BSCI PA 7.3</p> <p>1. 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未针对安全、健康和卫生工作条件进行定期风险评估。未改善: 工厂未针对安全、健康和卫生工作条件进行定期风险评估。员工或员工代表参与风险评估会有助于更好地改善BSCI系统。工厂管理层表示会改善。请参看BSCI PA7.3</p>
7.5 -	<p>1. Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the fire drill of the factory did not cover dormitory area. Closed: It was noted that the last fire drills provided during this audit had cover dormitory areas. 2. Previous Finding: Not Closed: It was noted that the factory did not provided the occupational health checks to employees who were in contact with occupational disease factors (e.g. dust, noise and hazardous materials). The occupational health checks to employees would help the facility management know the situation about employees, which could prevent occupational disease from happening. The facility management represented that they would try their best to correct this issue. Please refer to BSCI PA 7.5 and Article 35 Law of the People's Republic of China on the Prevention and Treatment of Occupational Diseases Remark: this finding was cited under PA7.3 in previous audit.</p> <p>1. 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂的消防演习未包括宿舍区域。已改善: 该次审核发现工厂消防演习已经包括了宿舍区域。2. 上次问题点: 工厂未给接触职业危害的工人提供职业健康体检,如喷油工人、丝印工人和发泡成型工人、工模工人。未改善: 审核员发现厂方没有为车间接触职业病危害因素(如:粉尘,噪音和有毒有害物质)的员工提供职业健康体检。职业体检可以让工厂及时了解员工的健康状况,以防止员工职业病的产生。工厂管理层表示会尽可能改善。请参看BSCI PA7.5和《中华人民共和国职业病防治法》第35条。备注:该问题前次审核被放在PA7.3.</p>
7.6 -	<p>Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not provide proper PPE to related workers. For instance, no earplugs provided to foam forming workers; not certified masks provided to silk screening & spray painting workers (and no producing factory information on it); and provided cotton masks instead of dustproof masks to mould polishing workers. Not Closed: It was noted that painting workers were not wearing goggles, moulding workers no wearing earplugs and dustproof mask. Not wearing proper PPE would do harm to workers' health. Factory management represented that they will take improvement as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI PA7.6 Article 42 of Law of the People's Republic of China on Production Safety.</p> <p>上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未给员工提供合适的PPE,例如未给成型、吸塑工人提供耳塞,给印刷及喷油工人提供的口罩无合格证、生产厂家信息。工厂给工模工人提供的口罩是棉纱口罩而不是防尘口罩。未改善: 工厂喷漆的员工没有佩戴护目镜,工模车间员工没有佩戴耳塞和防尘口罩。没有佩戴劳保用品会对员工健康造成损害。工厂表示尽快改善。请参看BSCI PA7.6和《中华人民共和国安全生产法》第42条</p>
7.7 -	<p>Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not provide secondary containment, safety label or MSDS for the chemicals, such as paint. Closed: It was noted that the factory provided safety label and MSDS for the chemicals, such as paint. Not Closed: It was noted that 30% chemical stored in the chemical warehouse were not placed in secondary containers. Secondary container could prevent the environment from be polluted if the chemical material divulged. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action as soon possible Please refer to Article 20 of Regulation for Safety of Hazardous Chemical, an entity producing or storing hazardous chemicals shall and BSCI PA 7.7</p> <p>上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂使用的化学品如油漆等无二次容器,有效标示及MSDS。已改善: 审核发现工厂使用的化学品如油漆等有效标示及MSDS。未改善: 审核发现在化学品仓的30%化学品没有放置在二次容器中。二次容器可以有效防止化学品在泄漏时对环境污染造成的污染。工厂管理层表示会尽快改善。请参看《危险化学品安全管理条例》第20条和BSCI PA7.7</p>

- 7.8 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory established the accident and emergency procedure, but not posted it in workshop. Closed: Factory had established the accident and emergency procedure, and placed it in workshop.
上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂制定了意外以及应急程序,但是未张贴在车间现场。已改善:工厂制定了意外以及应急程序,且有放置在车间现场。
- 7.9 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not post proper warning sign in the workshops. Such as PPE warning sign, Not-use in fire accident for elevator, Hot water sign for drinking facility. And 10% electric box had no warning signs. Closed: Factory had posted proper warning sign in the workshops. Such as PPE warning sign, Not-use in fire accident for elevator, Hot water sign for drinking facility. And 10% electric box had no warning signs.
上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂车间未张贴合适的警告标示,例如:工厂车间未张贴PPE警告标示,工厂电梯未张贴发生火灾时停止使用的警告标示,饮水机区域未张贴小心烫伤的警告标示。10%的电箱缺少小心触电的警告标示。已改善:工厂车间均有张贴合适的警告标示,例如:工厂车间未张贴PPE警告标示,工厂电梯未张贴发生火灾时停止使用的警告标示,饮水机区域未张贴小心烫伤的警告标示。10%的电箱缺少小心触电的警告标示。
- 7.10 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not record the work-related accident and analyze the root cause and adept corrective and prevention action and etc. Closed: Factory would record the work-related accident and analyze the root cause and adept corrective and prevention action. However, no work-related accident happened in past year. 2. Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not conduct occupational hazard factor test for the workshops. The spray painting, silk screening, mould polishing, foam forming processes produced waste air; and foam forming, mould polishing produced noise. Not Closed: It was noted that noise, dust and hazards material were generated in the factory, which might cause occupational diseases to employees. However, factory did not conduct testing of factors of occupational hazards accordingly. Regular occupational hazards testing would be helpful to protect employees' health. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action. Please refer to BSCI PA 7.10 and Article 20 of Provisions on the Supervision and Administration of Occupational Health at Work Sites Remark: this finding was cited under PA7.25 in previous audit.
上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未针对工伤进行记录、原因分析和采取预防纠正措施。已改善:工厂有对工伤进行记录、原因分析和采取预防纠正措施。但此次审核未发现有工伤出现。2. 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未对车间的职业危害因素进行检测。喷漆、工模和发泡成型产生废气,发泡成型和工模产生噪声。未改善: 审核员发现工厂车间有噪音,粉尘和有毒有害气体产生,对员工存在潜在的职业病危害。但工厂并未对车间进行职业危害因素检测。定期职业危害因素检测有利于员工健康保护。工厂管理层表示会改善。请参看BSCIPA7.10和《工作场所职业卫生监督管理规定》第20条 备注:该问题前次审核被放在PA7.25。
- 7.11 - 1. Previous Finding:** The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not provide structure safety certificate of one 3-storey office building, two 4-storey production buildings, one 3-storey dormitory building for review. The building was completed in 2011. Factory mentioned that the building was rented from land owner, no such document provided to them till the audit. Closed: Factory had provided structure safety certificate for all buildings for review during this audit. 2. New Finding: It was noted that the dormitory building was changed from measurement building, but no updated fire acceptance check provide for review. The dormitory building had a total construction area of 2730 square meters. No the updated fire acceptance check for buildings is provided for review, the facility management could not certificate that all buildings were compliance with the local legal requirement. The facility management represented that they would try their best to take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI Code of Conduct7.11, Article 24 of the Construction Project Fire Safety Supervision and Management Regulation (Extract) and Article 13 of the Construction Project Fire Safety Supervision and Management Regulation 3. New Finding: It was noted that factory management failed to provide the safety inspection reports for one boiler being used in the facility for review. No the safety inspection reports could not certificate the equipment was compliance with the local law requirement. The facility management represented that they would try their best to take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI Code of Conduct7.11 and Article 28 of Safety Monitoring Regulation of Special Equipment
1. 上次问题点: 被审核方部分符合该原则,原因是工厂未提供一栋3层办公楼、两栋4层厂房和一栋3层宿舍的竣工验收报告供审核,建筑竣工于2011年。工厂表示厂房是从房东处租用,截至审核时,房东未提供该资料给工厂。已改善:此次审核工厂提供了建筑的工程竣工验收报告进行审核。2. 新问题点: 厂方未能宿舍的更新消防验收合格证明,宿舍由检测中心用途变更为住宿,建筑面积约2730平方米。没有更新消防验收报告提供,工厂管理层就不能证明这些建筑物是符合当地法律要求的。工厂管理层表示会尽可能地改善这个问题。请参看BSCI PA 7.11 及《中华人民共和国消防法》第13条。3. 新问题点: 审核发现工厂未能提供正在使用的1台锅炉的安全检验报告。没有安全检验报告就不能证明设备是符合要求。工厂管理层表示会尽可能地改善这个问题。请参看BSCI PA 7.11 及《特种设备安全监察条例》第28条
- 7.15 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee does not respect this principle because there were about 20% exits and evacuation staircase missed proper signs or lamps. For instance, one safe exit of staircase in building C missed exit sign; no exit sign installed for paint room at 3F and spray painting room at 4F; one safe exit of mould workshop in building B missed exit sign, another exit of this workshop had wrong type of exit sign (with arrow); one exit at 1F of dorm missed exit sign and emergency light, another exit of this floor had wrong type of exit sign (with arrow); no evacuation sign or emergency light installed in dorm staircase. Closed: It was noted that all exits were installed with properly safety exit signs and emergency light.
上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂约20%的出口及疏散楼梯缺少合适的指示标示及应急灯,例如C栋楼梯间1个楼安全出口无标示;3楼调油房、4楼手工喷漆房无出口标示;B栋1楼工模房1个安全出口无标示,另1个出口标示不正确(带箭头);宿舍楼楼梯间1楼一个出口无指示标示及应急灯,另一个出口安装的指示标示带箭头;宿舍楼楼梯间未安装指示标示及应急灯。已改善:此次审核发现工厂的安全出口均有安装正确的出口标志和应急灯。
- 7.16 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was no evacuation plan provided in workshop and dormitory area. Closed: It was noted that evacuation plan had posted in workshop and dormitory during this audit.
上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未在车间及宿舍区张贴疏散图。已改善:此次审核发现车间及宿舍区已经张贴了疏散图。
- 7.17 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee partially respects this principle because three sewing machine missed needle plate at 3F of building B. Not Closed: It was noted that 3 out of 3 sewing machines in the workshop on the 3rd floor of production building B were not installed with need guard. Safety device would prevent employees from being harmed. The facility management represented that the maintainer was negligence to install the protective devices after he maintained these machines. Please refer to Article 6.1.6 of Code of Design of Manufacturing Equipment Safety and Hygiene and BSCI PA7.17
上次问题点: 被审核方部分符合该原则,原因是B栋3楼3台车无挡针板。未改善: 审核发现B栋3楼车间的3/3台缝绉机没有安装针挡。保护装置可以有效地防止员工受伤。工厂管理层表示是维修工在维修后因为疏忽没有装回保护装置。请参看《生产设备安全卫生设计总则(GB5083-1999)》第6.1.6条以及BSCI PA7.17
- 7.18 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was no qualified first aider available in the factory. And no eye wash facility provided at chemical storage and using areas. Closed: There was two qualified first aider available in the factory. And eye washing facility was installed at chemical storage and using areas.
上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂没有配置急救人员。工厂未在化学品存储及使用区域安装洗眼器。已改善:工厂已配备2名急救人员,且已经安装洗眼器。
- 7.19 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't establish emergency procedures to deal with cases of trauma or serious illness. Closed: Factory had established emergency procedures to deal with cases of trauma or serious illness.
上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂没有建立意外伤害处理程序而未遵守原则。已改善:工厂已经建立意外伤害处理程序。
- 7.20 - Previous Finding:** The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't provide testing report of the drinking water for review. The factory used potable water from water pipe, there was no water consumption records were kept for review. Closed: It was noted that

Audit Type: factory had provide testing report of the drinking water and water consumption records for review. The result of tesing was compliance with standard.

上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未提供饮用水检测报告。工厂使用直饮水, 未提供用水发票。已改善: 此次审核工厂有提供饮用水检测报告和用水发票进行审阅。检测结果符合要求。

7.21 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't obtain food business license for canteen, and no health examination certificates obtained for the catering workers. And catering workers did not wear masks during operation. No food sample kept by the canteen. Not Closed: It was noted that the factory could not provide with the health certificates for 2 out of 3 canteen staffs for review during this audit. And catering workers did not wear masks during operation. No food sample kept by the canteen. No the health certificates could not provide the canteen staff compliance with the legal requirement. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI PA 7.21 and Article 45 of the Law of the PRC on the Food Safety

上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未获得餐厅的食品经营许可证和厨工的健康证。厨工在操作时未佩戴口罩。餐厅没有食品留样。未改善: 审核发现2/3名厨工没有健康证。厨工在操作时未佩戴口罩。餐厅没有食品留样。没有健康证无法证明厨工符合法律要求。工厂管理层表示会尽快改善。请参看BSCI PA 7.21和《中华人民共和国食品安全法》第四十五条

7.23 - NA. No transportation provided by the factory.
不适用。工厂未提供交通工具。

Remarks from Auditee:

Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: E

Deadline date:31/03/2019

Good practices

None.

Areas of improvement

The overall observation shows that the auditee partially fulfils the requirement of this performance area. The auditee established health and safety procedure and appointed Mr. Dai Kaijian/Admin manager for EHS operation. The fire facilities and electrical installations were monthly checked. Training program on health and safety were established yearly and training are provided to all workers when recruitment. The training covered the fire drill, PPE training, machine operation and chemicals, etc. First aid kits were available in each workshop and the supervisor checked it monthly and supplement or replace if needed. The factory did not provided transportation to workers. Gaps have been identified in implementation. (There are no structure safety certificate provided by the auditee, which makes the structure safety certificate documents not applicable.)

整体上生产商部分满足该部分的要求。生产商制定了健康安全程序并指定行政经理戴开健作为健康安全负责人。工厂每月对消防设施和电器检查。工厂每年制定年度计划对员工进行健康安全培训, 且新员工均进行入职培训。培训内容涵盖消防演习, PPE使用, 机械操作和化学品等等。每个车间配置了药箱, 主管每月检查药箱进行补充和更换。工厂未交通工具给员工。工厂在执行方面也有不符合amfori BSCI要求的地方, 如下: (工厂未提供竣工验收报告, 所以竣工验收资料未提供。)

7.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish complete management system on health and safety. And health & safety issues were identified due to management negligence.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则。原因是工厂未建立完善的健康安全管理体系。审核中有发现健康安全问题存在。

7.2 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish the procedure on work-related injury dispose. And the factory did not provide work-related injury insurance for all employees. Based on social insurance records of Oct 2018, only 50 out of 121 employees were provided with injury insurance.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未建立工伤处理程序。而且工厂未提供工伤保险给所有员工。根据2018年10月的社保记录, 工厂只未50名员工(工厂共有121名员工)购买了工伤保险。

7.3 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not carry out regular risk assessment for safe, healthy and hygienic working conditions. And they did not provide occupational health examination to worker under hazard factors, such as spray painting workers, silk screening workers, and foam forming workers, mould workers.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未针对安全, 健康和卫生工作条件进行定期风险评估。而且工厂未给接触职业危害的工人提供职业健康体检, 如喷漆工人、丝印工人和发泡成型工人、工模工人。

7.5 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the fire drill of the factory did not cover dormitory area.

被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则, 原因是工厂的消防演习未包括宿舍区域。

7.6 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not provide proper PPE to related workers. For instance, no earplugs provided to foam forming workers; not certified masks provided to silk screening & spray painting workers (and no producing factory information on it); and provided cotton masks instead of dustproof masks to mould polishing workers.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未给员工提供合适的PPE, 例如未给成型, 吸塑工人提供耳塞, 给印刷及喷漆工人提供的口罩无合格证、生产厂家信息。工厂给工模工人提供的口罩是棉纱口罩而不是防尘口罩。

7.7 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not provide secondary containment, safety label or MSDS for the chemicals, such as paint.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂使用的化学品如油漆等无二次容器, 有效标示及MSDS。

7.8 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory established the accident and emergency procedure, but not posted it in workshop.

被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则, 原因是工厂制定了意外以及应急程序, 但是未张贴在车间现场。

7.9 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not post proper warning sign in the workshops. Such as PPE warning sign, Not-use in fire accident for elevator, Hot water sign for drinking facility. And 10% electric box had no warning signs.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂车间未张贴合适的警告标示, 例如: 工厂车间未张贴PPE警告标示, 工厂电梯未张贴发生火灾时停止使用的警告标示, 饮水机区域未张贴小心烫伤的警告标示。10%的电箱缺少小心触电的警告标示。

7.10 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not record the work-related accident and analyze the root cause and adept corrective and prevention action and etc.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未针对工伤进行记录、原因分析和采取预防纠正措施。

7.11 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not provide structure safety certificate of one 3-storey office building, two 4-storey production buildings, one 3-storey dormitory building for review. The building was completed in 2011. Factory mentioned that the building was rented from land owner, no such document provided to them till the audit.

被审核方部分符合该原则, 原因是工厂未提供一栋3层办公楼、两栋4层厂房和一栋3层宿舍的竣工验收报告供审核, 建筑竣工于2011年。工厂表示厂房

DBID : 378772 and Audit Id : 149608 Audit Date : 25/04/2019

Audit Type : 是从房东处租用。截至审核时, 房东未提供该资料给工厂。

- 7.15 -** Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because there were about 20% exits and evacuation staircase missed proper signs or lamps. For instance, one safe exit of staircase in building C missed exit sign; no exit sign installed for paint room at 3F and spray painting room at 4F; one safe exit of mould workshop in building B missed exit sign, another exit of this workshop had wrong type of exit sign (with arrow); one exit at 1F of dorm missed exit sign and emergency light, another exit of this floor had wrong type of exit sign (with arrow); no evacuation sign or emergency light installed in dorm staircase.
被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂约20%的出口及疏散楼梯缺少合适的指示标示及应急灯, 例如C栋楼梯间1个楼安全出口无标示; 3楼调油房、4楼手工喷漆房无出口标示; B栋1楼工模房1个安全出口无标示, 另1个出口标示不正确(带箭头); 宿舍楼楼梯间1楼一个出口无指示标示及应急灯, 另一个出口安装的指示标示带箭头; 宿舍楼楼梯间未安装指示标示及应急灯。
- 7.16 -** Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was no evacuation plan provided in workshop and dormitory area.
被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未在车间及宿舍区张贴疏散图。
- 7.17 -** Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because three sewing machine missed needle plate at 3F of building B.
被审核方部分符合该原则, 原因是B栋3楼3台针车无挡针板。
- 7.18 -** Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because there was no qualified first aider available in the factory. And no eye wash facility provided at chemical storage and using areas.
被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂没有配置急救人员。工厂未在化学品存储及使用区域安装洗眼器。
- 7.19 -** Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't establish emergency procedures to deal with cases of trauma or serious illness.
被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂没有建立意外伤害处理程序而未遵守原则。
- 7.20 -** Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't provide testing report of the drinking water for review. The factory used potable water from water pipe, there was no water consumption records were kept for review.
被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未提供饮用水检测报告。工厂使用直饮水, 未提供用水发票。
- 7.21 -** Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory didn't obtain food business licence for canteen, and no health examination certificates obtained for the catering workers. And catering workers did not wear masks during operation. No food sample kept by the canteen.
被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未获得餐厅的食品经营许可证和厨工的健康证。厨工在操作时未佩戴口罩。餐厅没有食品留样。
- 7.23 -** NA. No transportation provided by the factory.
不适用。工厂未提供交通工具。
- 7.25 -** Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not conduct occupational hazard factor test for the workshops. The spray painting, silk screening, mould polishing, foam forming processes produced waste air; and foam forming, mould polishing produced noise.
被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未对车间的职业危害因素进行检测。喷油、工模和发泡成型产生废气; 发泡成型和工模产生噪声。

Remarks from Auditee

Performance Area 8 : No Child Labour	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A	Deadline date:
GOOD PRACTICES: Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT: <p>The overall observation showed that the auditee fully respected the requirement of this performance area. Per factory tour, document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the factory established its child labor forbidden policy. It was noted that the HR related officer had to check the ID and age during the hiring process. Through management interview, worker representative interview and employee interview, all knew the child labor forbidden policy and confirmed no child labor in the factory. 整体观察表明,受审核方满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,审核发现工厂建立了禁止童工政策。负责招聘的相关HR人员知道他们必须严格核实新近员工的年龄。员工面谈,员工代表面谈和管理层面谈都证实清楚的知晓禁止童工政策并且确定工厂没有童工。</p> <p>8.3 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because no written policy about protecting children from any kind of exploitation was established in factory. No child labour in the factory. Closed: Factory had established policy and procedure on protecting children. No child labour in the factory. 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立保护儿童免受任何剥削的书面政策。工厂无童工。已改善: 工厂已建立保护儿童免受任何剥削的书面政策。工厂无童工。</p> <p>8.4 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because no adequate and remedial policies and procedures to provide for further protection in case children are found to be working. Closed: Factory had established policy and procedure to provide for further protection in case children are found to be working. 上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立充分的改善政策和程序,以便在发现儿童工作时为其提供进一步保护。已改善: 工厂已建立改善政策和程序,以便在发现儿童工作时为其提供进一步保护。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: D	Deadline date:31/03/2019
Good practices None.	
Areas of improvement <p>Consolidated finding: The auditee partially fulfils the requirement of this performance area. The factory established recruit policy, which covering recruit process and method. Training was provided. Based on interview with the HR staff who responsible for recruits, she knows how to verify the ID, ID copy of each employees were collected. After checking all personnel files of workers, no child labor was identified in the factory. The youngest worker of the factory was born on 21 Dec 1999 and entered to the factory on 24 Aug 2018. Gaps have been identified in implementation. 综合概况: 生产商部分符合该部分的要求。工厂建立了包含流程及方法的招聘程序,工厂有提供培训,根据与负责招聘工作的人事人员访谈,她知道如何辨别身份证,并保留了所有员工的身份证复印件。在审核过程中,通过查阅所有员工的人事资料,未发现有任何童工存在。工厂最小年龄工人出生于1999年12月21日,于2018年8月24日入职。工厂在执行方面也有不符合amfori BSCI要求的地方,如下:</p> <p>8.3 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because no written policy about protecting children from any kind of exploitation was established in factory. No child labour in the factory. 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立保护儿童免受任何剥削的书面政策。工厂无童工。</p> <p>8.4 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because no adequate and remedial policies and procedures to provide for further protection in case children are found to be working. 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立充分的改善政策和程序,以便在发现儿童工作时为其提供进一步保护。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee	

Audit Type : Follow-up Audit	
Performance Area 9 : Special protection for young workers	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A	Deadline date:
GOOD PRACTICES: Nil	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:	
<p>The overall observation showed that the auditee fully respected the requirement of this performance area. Per factory tour, document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the auditee had established Young Worker Management Procedure which established necessary mechanisms to prevent, identify and mitigate harm to young workers. Moreover, in the grievance mechanisms it was regulated that workers can lodge grievances if there was young worker not identified or not protected. Through management and workers review, site observation and document review, there was no young worker present, the youngest employee noted was 18 years old.</p> <p>整体观察表明,受审核方满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,审核发现工厂建立了预防、识别和减轻对未成年工伤害的未成年工特殊保护程序,并有未成年工的申诉机制来全部该程序执行。在本次审核中没有未成年工,最小的年龄是18岁。</p>	
<p>9.1 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish risk assessment procedure of young workers. Closed: Factory had established risk assessment procedure of young workers, and risk assessment had conducted.</p> <p>上次问题点:被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工风险评估程序。已改善:工厂已建立未成年工风险评估程序且进行了评估。</p>	
<p>9.2 - Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. No evidence to show they had understood management on working time of young workers. No young worker used by the factory. Closed: Factory had established protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. Risk assessment had conducted and including management on working time of young workers. No young worker used by the factory.</p> <p>上次问题点:被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有证据证明其了解关于未成年工工作时间的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。已改善:工厂已建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。风险评估有关于未成年工工作时间的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。</p>	
<p>9.3 - Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. No evidence to show they had understood management on working position of young workers. No young worker used by the factory. Closed: Factory had established protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. Risk assessment had conducted and including management on working position of young workers. No young worker used by the factory.</p> <p>上次问题点:被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有证据证明其了解关于未成年工工作岗位的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。已改善:工厂已建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。风险评估有关于未成年工工作岗位的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。</p>	
<p>9.4 - Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers, and no grievance mechanisms. No young worker used by the factory. Closed: Factory had established protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. Risk assessment was conducted and grievance mechanism was established in the factory. No young worker used by the factory.</p> <p>上次问题点:被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有申诉机制。工厂未使用未成年工。已改善:工厂已建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。风险评估已进行且申诉机制已建立。工厂未使用未成年工。</p>	
<p>9.6 - Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. No evidence to show they had understood management on registration and health examination of young workers. No young worker used by the factory. Closed: Factory had established protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. And procedure included management on registration and health examination of young workers.</p> <p>上次问题点:被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有证据证明其了解关于未成年工登记和体检的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。已改善:工厂建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。且程序有关于未成年工登记和体检的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: E	Deadline date:31/03/2019
Good practices	
None.	
Areas of improvement	
<p>Consolidated finding: The auditee partially fulfils the requirement of this performance area. No policy of young worker protection was established by the factory. No risk assessment procedure established. During the audit, no young workers were identified in the factory. Gaps have been identified in implementation.</p> <p>综合概况:生产商部分符合该部分的要求。工厂未制定未成年工的保护政策。没有制定风险评估程序。在审核过程中,未发现未成年工的存在。工厂在执行方面也有不符合amfori BSCI要求的地方,如下:</p>	
<p>9.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish risk assessment procedure of young workers.</p> <p>被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工风险评估程序。</p>	
<p>9.2 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. No evidence to show they had understood management on working time of young workers. No young worker used by the factory.</p> <p>被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有证据证明其了解关于未成年工工作时间的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。</p>	
<p>9.3 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. No evidence to show they had understood management on working position of young workers. No young worker used by the factory.</p> <p>被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有证据证明其了解关于未成年工工作岗位的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。</p>	
<p>9.4 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers, and no grievance mechanisms. No young worker used by the factory.</p> <p>被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工厂未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有申诉机制。工厂未使用未成年工。</p>	

9.6 Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not establish protection or risk assessment procedure of young workers. No evidence to show they had understood management on registration and health examination of young workers. No young worker used by the factory.
被审核方(生产商)部分遵循该准则,原因是工未建立未成年工保护或风险评估程序。没有证据证明其了解关于未成年工登记和体检的管理要求。工厂未使用未成年工。

Remarks from Auditee

Performance Area 10 : No Precarious Employment

1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A

Deadline date:31/03/2020

GOOD PRACTICES:

Nil

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:

The overall observation showed that the auditee partially respected the requirement of this performance area. Per factory tour, document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the auditee established human resource management procedures which regulated the standard of recruitment, remuneration, hours of work, disciplinary measures, promotion, trainings, termination of employment. As per interviewed workers, they all stated that they had understandable information of the factory before entering into employment. The factory signed labour contracts with employees within one month of recruitment according to legal requirement. The auditee did not use temporary job arrangements to cover workloads that lack pre-determined end dates. However, gaps were identified in implementation.

整体观察表明,受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,审核发现工厂建立了人力资源管理程序,涵盖了人员招聘,薪资,工时,奖惩,晋升,培训,解除合同等各方面的规定。根据员工访谈,工人在应聘进入工厂前就对工厂各方面信息有了了解。工厂在员工入职一个月内与员工签订了劳动合同。没有采取雇佣临时工来完成长期任务的情况。但在实际执行中仍存在差距。

10.3 - Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the labor contract had no detail notifying words to related workers for the occupational hazard. Only a summary outline in labor contract, that could not make worker aware of that occupational hazard factor, working conditions and protection against occupational hazards. Not Closed: It was noted that occupational disease might result in the work process of some employees in the factory (i.e. painting workers). However, the facts, harmful effects, consequences, protective measures and necessary treatment of occupational diseases were not indicated in their employment contracts. The facts, harmful effects, consequences, protective measures and necessary treatment of occupational diseases indicated in their employment contracts would help employees' more knew the workstation's risk. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to Article 33 Law of the People's Republic of China on the Prevention and Treatment of Occupational Diseases and BSCI PA 10.3

上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则,原因是劳动合同没有具体的职业危害告知描述给相关工人。只有总结提纲,不足以使工人明白其将接触的职业危害、劳动条件和职业危害防护。未改善: 审核发现工厂某些工序的部分员工可能会导致职业病(如:喷漆员工)。然而职业病的有害后果,影响,防护措施和必要的治疗在劳动合同中没有记录。职业病的有害后果,影响,防护措施和必要的治疗在劳动合同中体现有利于员工了解到岗位的风险。工厂管理层表示会尽快改善。请参看《中华人民共和国职业病防治法》第33条和BSCI PA10.3

Remarks from Auditee:

Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: A

Deadline date:31/03/2019

Good practices

None.

Areas of improvement

Consolidated finding: The auditee partially fulfils the requirement of this performance area. Labor contracts were all concluded between the factory and workers, copies were issued to workers. The contracts statement included the description of working hours, training, rest time, leave wage, paying condition and etc. Based on interview statement of workers, workers understood the content of labor contract well and no illegal employment was identified during the audit. No foreign migrant and dispatching worker worked in factory. Gaps have been identified in implementation.

综合概况: 生产商部分符合该部分的要求。工厂和每个员工均签订了劳动合同并发放了合同副本给工人,劳动合同的内容包括工时,培训,休息时间和假期,报酬和支付条件。通过员工访谈,员工均了解劳动合同内容。审核过程中,工厂无不符合法规的用工形式存在。工厂无外国工人及派遣工。以上方面从员工访谈以及文件信息等方面进行了验证。工厂在执行方面也有不符合amfori BSCI要求的地方,如下:

10.3 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the labor contract had no detail notifying words to related workers for the occupational hazard. Only a summary outline in labor contract, that could not make worker aware of that occupational hazard factor, working conditions and protection against occupational hazards.

主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则,原因是劳动合同没有具体的职业危害告知描述给相关工人。只有总结提纲,不足以使工人明白其将接触的职业危害、劳动条件和职业危害防护。

Remarks from Auditee

Audit Type : Follow-up Audit

Performance Area 11 : No Bonded Labour	
1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A	Deadline date:
GOOD PRACTICES:	
AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:	
<p>Remark: No any non-compliance was raised in the previous audit, so this PA was not included in this follow-up audit scope. The rating in this PA remained unchanged just as it was in the previous audit. 备注: 前次审核中该执行领域未发现问题点。此次跟进审核未评审该执行领域。该执行领域等级保持不变。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee:	
Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: A	Deadline date:
<u>Good practices</u>	
None.	
<u>Areas of improvement</u>	
<p>Consolidated finding: The auditee fulfils the requirement of this performance area. The factory established the anti-forced labor requirement in factory rules. The management understood well the scope of forced labor. And according to onsite observation and interview statement of workers, workers confirmed that there were no evidence of force labor showed in the factory, for example, they could resign according to legal requirement without wage deduction, and they could leave the factory freely without being searched. No inhumane or degrading treatment was found during the audit and according to interview with workers.</p> <p>综合概况: 生产商符合该部分的要求。工厂的厂规里包括了反强迫劳动的要求, 工厂负责人理解哪些方式是属于强迫劳动的范畴。依据现场观察和员工访谈, 员工也很清晰地表明工厂内无强迫劳动的现象, 例如员工可以依照法规要求提出辞工而不会被克扣工资, 并且可以自由离开工厂。员工也未遇到任何被侮辱或非人道的待遇。</p>	
Remarks from Auditee	

Performance Area 12 : Protection of the Environment

1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: B

Deadline date:31/03/2020

GOOD PRACTICES:

Nil

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:

The overall observation showed that the auditee partially respected the requirement of this performance area. Per document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the auditee continuously identified the significant impacts and environmental implications associated to its activity, and established the proper procedure to ensure integration of local environmental law into the business performance.

整体观察表明,受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈,审核发现被审核方持续识别其商业活动的重大影响及对环境造成的后果,并且建立了合适程序来确保其商业模式中结合了当地环境法规。

12.2 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not conduct environment monitoring regularly according to EIA approval. And no environment procedure/policy established by the factory. Closed: Factory had conducted environment monitoring regularly according to EIA approval. And environment procedure and policy were established by the factory.

上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未按照环评批复要求进行环境监测。而且工厂未建立环境管理程序和政策。已改善:工厂已经进行了环境监测。且工厂建立了环境管理程序和政策。

12.3 - Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not obtain acceptance approval for environmental facilities. Not Closed: It was noted that factory management was unable to provide the approval document for on-site inspection and acceptance of completed environmental protection facilities for review. No the approval document for on-site inspection and acceptance of completed environmental protection facilities could not certificate the auditee compliance with the local environment requirement. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI PA 12.3 & Article 17 of the Regulations on Environmental Protection Check and Acceptance for Completed Construction Project

上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则,原因是工厂未获得环保设施三同时验收批复。未改善:审核发现工厂未能提供建设项目竣工环境保护验收文件以供查阅。没有环评验收文件就不能提供被审核方已经符合了当地环境要求。工厂管理层表示会尽快改善。请参看BSCI PA 12.3的要求及《建设项目竣工环境保护验收管理办法》第17条。

12.4 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not transfer the hazard wastes to qualified vender for disposal. The main hazardous wastes of the factory were chemical container, oil rags, etc. during the audit, no hazard wastes were stored in the factory. Not Closed: It was noted that the waste organic solvent and waste water treatment mud (HW06) were generated in the factory. However, the factory management was unable to provide the hazardous waste entrust disposal contract and relevant transfer manifest of these hazardous wastes for review. The hazardous waste should be retrieved and handled by qualified company. The facility management represented that they didn't achieve the environment document, so they could not transfer the waste. Please refer to BSCI PA 12.4 & Article 57 of Law of the People's Republic of China on Prevention and Control of Solid Waste Pollution.

上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则,原因是工厂未将危废交给有资质的单位进行处理。工厂的主要危废是化学品空桶,油抹布等。审核期间工厂未发现有存放危废。未改善:审核员发现工厂有废有机溶剂和废水处理污泥产生,但工厂不能提供相关的合法处置文件(与有资质回收商的合同与危废转移联单)。危险废弃物应依法交给有资质的单位做回收处理。工厂管理层表示会因为环评文件没有批下来,所以暂时没有办法做危废转移。请参看BSCI PA 12.4的要求及《中华人民共和国固体废物污染环境防治法》第57条。

12.5 - Previous Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not established water save procedure, and no monitoring conducted on water consumption of the factory. Closed: Factory had established water save procedure, and there was monitoring conducted on water consumption of the factory.

上次问题点: 主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则,原因是工厂未建立节水程序,也未对水资源消耗进行监控。已改善:工厂建立了节水程序,也对水资源消耗进行监控。

Remarks from Auditee:

Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: D

Deadline date:31/03/2019

Good practices

None.

Areas of improvement

Consolidated finding: The auditee partially fulfils the requirement of this performance area. No environment protection policy established by the factory. The water used by the factory was come from municipal water. No policy on saving water. No water consumption records were provided for audit review. Gaps have been identified in implementation. (There are no environment policy/procedure provided by the auditee, which makes the environment policy/procedure documents not applicable.)

综合概况:生产商部分符合该部分的要求。工厂未建立环保政策。工厂主要使用当地市政提供的自来水。工厂未制定了节约用水政策并且正在实施,而且没保留用水量记录供审核。工厂在执行方面也有不符合amfori BSCI要求的地方,如下:(工厂未提供环境政策/程序,所以环境政策/程序相关资料未提供。)

12.2 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not conduct environment monitoring regularly according to EIA approval. And no environment procedure/policy established by the factory.

主要被审核方(生产商)未遵守原则,原因是工厂未按照环评批复要求进行环境监测。而且工厂未建立环境管理程序和政策。

12.3 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not obtain acceptance approval for environmental facilities. 主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则,原因是工厂未获得环保设施三同时验收批复。

12.4 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not transfer the hazard wastes to qualified vender for disposal. The main hazardous wastes of the factory were chemical container, oil rags, etc. during the audit, no hazard wastes were stored in the factory. 主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则,原因是工厂未将危废交给有资质的单位进行处理。工厂的主要危废是化学品空桶,油抹布等。审核期间工厂未发现有存放危废。

12.5 - Finding: The main auditee partially respects this principle because the factory did not established water save procedure, and no monitoring conducted on water consumption of the factory.

工厂未建立节水程序,也未对水资源消耗进行监控。

DBID : 378772 and Audit Id : 149608

Audit Date : 25/04/2019

Audit Type: 主要被审核方(生产商)部分遵守原则, 原因是工厂未建立节水程序, 也未对水资源消耗进行监控。

Remarks from Auditee

Performance Area 13 : Ethical Business Behaviour

1- Followup Audit [Audit Id - 149608] Audit Date: 25/04/2019 PA Score: A

Deadline date:31/03/2020

GOOD PRACTICES:

Nil

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT:

The overall observation showed that the auditee partially respected the requirement of this performance area. Per factory tour, document review, management interview and employees' private interview, it was noted that the auditee has set up appropriate measures to ensure and demonstrate no corruption, extortion, embezzlement, bribery, falsified information or misrepresentation in the supply chain. The auditee identified the situations and activities where acts of corruption, extortion or bribery were most likely to occur in its context and policies/procedures against any act of corruption and takes active measures to prevent and remediate them.

整体观察表明, 受审核方部分满足这个PA的要求。通过文件查阅、管理层访谈和员工访谈, 审核发现工厂建立了合适的管理措施来确保及明确在供应链中不能存在行贿索贿, 挪用盗用公款, 贪腐, 提供虚假资料, 虚报等行为。在管理制度中明确了在哪些方面可能存在贪腐, 挪用公款或者贿赂等行为以及相应的预防管理措施。

13.1 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish policy on Ethical Business Behaviour, and they did not conduct training or risk assessment on it. Not Closed: The factory established policy and conducted training on Ethical Business Behaviour but did not conduct risk assessment on corruption. Risk assessment could reduce and avoid corruption issue. The facility management represented that they would take corrective action as soon as possible. Please refer to BSCI PA 13.1

上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未建立商业道德方面的政策, 也未针对该部分进行培训和风险评估。未改善: 工厂有建立了和培训商业道德方面的政策, 但没有进行廉政风险评估。廉政风险评估可以避免廉政问题。工厂表示会尽快改善。请参看BSCI PA 13.1

13.2 - Previous Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not keep complete wage records. They only kept wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review. Closed: Factory had provided wage records from October 2018 to March 2019 for review during this audit. No wage record keeping issue found.

上次问题点: 被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未保留完整的工资记录。工厂只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录供审核。已改善: 审核工厂该次提供2018年10月至2019年3月工资进行审阅, 没有工资记录保留确实问题。

Remarks from Auditee:

Full Audit [Audit Id - 139697] Audit Date: 06/12/2018 PA Score: D

Deadline date:31/03/2019

Good practices

None.

Areas of improvement

Consolidated finding: The auditee partially fulfils the requirement of this performance area. No formal policy established on ethical business behaviour. No risk assessment conducted. No negative evidence on confidential matters divulging was identified during the audit. Gaps have been identified in implementation.

综合概况: 生产商部分符合该部分的要求。工厂未建立商业道德方面的政策。没有做相关风险评估。审核时未发现有任何泄密的负面现象。工厂在执行方面也有不符合amfori BSCI要求的地方, 如下:

13.1 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not establish policy on Ethical Business Behaviour, and they did not conduct training or risk assessment on it.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未建立商业道德方面的政策, 也未针对该部分进行培训和风险评估。

13.2 - Finding: The main auditee does not respect this principle because the factory did not keep complete wage records. They only kept wage records of Aug & Sep 2018 for review.

被审核方(生产商)未遵循该准则, 原因是工厂未保留完整的工资记录。工厂只保留了2018年8月和9月的工资记录供审核。

Remarks from Auditee

Audit Type : Follow-up Audit
Summary



Audit Type	Date	Audit Id	PA1	PA2	PA3	PA4	PA5	PA6	PA7	PA8	PA9	PA10	PA11	PA12	PA13	Overall Rating
Follow-up Audit	25/04/2019	149608	D	A	A	A	C	D	B	A	A	A	A	B	A	C
Full Audit	06/12/2018	139697	E	E	B	E	E	E	E	D	E	A	A	D	D	E

Producer Photos



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
7-17 Without needle guard.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Dormitory building.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
First aid kit.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
7-21 Canteen staff no wearing mask.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Dormitory room.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Foam forming workshop.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
7-6 No wearing goggles.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Drinking water.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Mould processing workshop.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
7-7 Not explosive-protected lighting in chemical warehouse.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Emergency lighting testing.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Production building.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
7-7 Safety label posted but without secondary container.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Factory gate.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Safety exit sign and emergency light.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Assembly workshop.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Factory name.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Semi-finished product.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Canteen.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Finished product warehouse.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Strap workshop.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
CAC posted.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Fire alarm.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Sucking workshop.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Corrective action taken for 7-15 emergency light and evacuation sign in staircase.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Fire extinguisher.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Time record system.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Corrective action taken for 7-16 evacuation plan posted.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Fire hydrant testing.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Toilet.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Corrective action taken for 7-18 eye washing facility installed.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Fire hydrant.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Warning sign.JPG



External photo(s) of the production unit(s)
Corrective action taken for 7-9 warning sign posted.JPG