

JO-IN Information Protocol

How will the Jo-In project deal with information that is received from factory assessments?

As is explained in the Jo-In interview protocol and the Jo-In Assessment protocol, the Jo-In project is intending to collect a large amount of information about factories during the assessment phase of the project. While this information mostly concerns the three main focus areas of the project (freedom of association and collective bargaining, hours of work and wages), adherence or non-adherence to any of these three aspects of the code of conduct mean very little unless it is put into a larger context of the factory situation. This larger context includes information about past audits and remediation efforts, ongoing projects to improve workplace conditions, factory revenue and costs, relationship with brands and average size of orders, percentage of factory revenue going to wages, etc.

In order to address issues about the confidentiality of the factories and information concerning brand payments and factory income, the Jo-In project is proposing to separate information received from the assessors into three different categories:

1. Public report that can be shared with stakeholders. Factories will be coded with an alphabetical number and all information that could be attributed to the factory or brand involved will be screened and coded;
2. Factory assessment report with names, location and other information openly shared. This information will provide the input for the discussion of factory remediation and will only be shared with Jo-In staff, the Steering Committee, the brands sourcing from the factories and the factories themselves;
3. Separated coded system for sensitive information obtained, which will serve as indirect input for remediation discussions on living wages. The raw data obtained in this category will only be seen by the assessors, Jo-In Staff and the relevant MSI's, all of whom will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement. This information will be presented under a different code system from information obtained in category 1, so as to make it impossible for anyone who does not have this code to attribute it to a specific factory. Information relating potentially sensitive information about annual turnover, profit margin and productivity levels, etc. will be presented as ratios. For example, data will be divided by the number of employees to make it comparable, while ensuring that it is not attributable to any specific factory participating in the Jo-In Project. To make the data more relevant, information will be given concerning the degree of vertical integration within the factory and whether the factory in question produces high-end goods (luxury items, special added value items), middle end items (special collections, small orders) or basic products (underwear, t-shirt, etc.).

Below is an overview of how the data will be treated and into which category it will fall. Please note that this is not intended to be an exhaustive list but rather a list of examples of how the information will likely be treated. In the event that information currently included in category one would clearly identify the factory or the brand, the information will either be moved to category 2 or coded further. Similarly, if information that is currently identified in category 2 could be shared with a larger audience without compromising the name of the factory or the brand involved, it may be done so after all the information is compiled by Jo-In and reviewed by the Steering Committee.

	Public (coded)	Jo-In internal report*	Separate coded**
Factory size	X	X	
Number of employees		X	
Annual turnover			X
Location and name of factory		X	
Customer range and historical relationship		X	
Relationship and size of the share of MSI member brands in their output		X	
Products (nr. of styles, seasonal, complexity, batch size, knitted or woven, vertical integration, etc.)		X	
Products (High end, medium, basic)	X		X
Labour processes (assembly lines, bundling, group work/level of automation)		X	
Number of outsourced products and services;		X	
Management systems already in place and for how long	X	X	
Roles of unions and other worker representative systems	X	X	
Human resource practices (including turnover, outsourced services etc.)		X	
Overview of historical audits (when they first started, etc.)	Partial	X	
Improvements made as a result of the past audits and improvements currently underway (implementation of remediation plans, corrective actions)	X	X	
Observed improvements by both labour and management	X	X	
Use of complaint mechanisms	X	X	
Programs to involve subcontractors in code implementation and levels of success/progress;	X	X	
Level of cooperation between the brands and the factory in improving working conditions (including relationship between sourcing and auditing departments)		X	
Worker training	X	X	
Management training	X	X	
Review of current performance on freedom of association and collective bargaining and hours of work based on surveying most recent audit reports, worker interviews, data from trade unions, management interviews, brand	X	X	

interviews, historical use of complaint mechanisms and any other source			
Analysis of current status and perceived shortcomings on freedom of association and hours of work	X	X	
Overview of average wages	X	X	
Overview of costs margins per product			X
Overview of average income per man hour worked			X
Overview of percentage of wages paid over factory income			X
Overview of average productivity per worker			X
An overview of the cost of living in the area based on worker interviews, governmental and/or NGO, trade union data	X	X	
Overview of what is considered a living wage by the different societal stakeholders	X	X	

* To be shared with the Steering Committee, brands and factories.

** To be shared with relevant MSI and Jo-In Staff (both will be subject to confidentiality agreement). Ratios, and other data will be widely shared after it is coded and not attributable to any factories or brands.