

SMETA Corrective Action Plan Report (CAPR)

Version 6.0





| | Audit Details | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|---|----|-----------|-------------------|
| Sedex Company Reference: (only available on Sedex System) | | | Sedex Site Re (only available System) | | | |
| Business name (Company name): | | | | | | |
| Site name: | | | | | | |
| Site address: (Please include full address) | FuJIAN province, P R China | | Country: | | P R China | |
| Site contact and job title: | , Administr | ration | Dept. Manag | er | | |
| Site phone: | | | Site e-mail: | | | |
| SMETA Audit Type: | ∑ Labour Standards | ⊠ F Safe | Health & Serviron | | ment | ⊠ Business Ethics |
| Date of Audit: | 05 th to 06 th June 2018 13/07/2018 | | | | | |

| | DUREAU VERITAS | | F | Report Owner (payee) |): |
|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------|--------|
| | | Audit Con | ducted By | | |
| Commercial | \boxtimes | Purchaser | | Trade Union | |
| NGO | | Retailer | | Brand Owner | |
| Multi- stakeholder | | | Combined Aud | dit (select all that app | ly) |

Audit Company Name & Logo: Bureau Veritas



Audit Content:

- (1) A SMETA audit was conducted which included some or all of Labour Standards, Health & Safety, Environment and Business Ethics. The SMETA Best Practice Version 6.0 April 2017 was applied. The scope of workers included all types at the site e.g. direct employees, agency workers, workers employed by service providers and workers provided by other contractors. Any deviations from the SMETA Methodology are stated (with reasons for deviation) in the SMETA Declaration.
- (2) The audit scope was against the following reference documents

2-Pillar SMETA Audit

- ETI Base Code
- SMETA Additions
 - Universal rights covering UNGP
 - Management systems and code implementation,
 - Responsible Recruitment
 - Entitlement to Work & Immigration,
 - · Sub-Contracting and Home working,

4-Pillar SMETA

- 2-Pillar requirements plus
- Additional Pillar assessment of Environment
- Additional Pillar assessment of Business Ethics
- The Customer's Supplier Code (Appendix 1)
- (3) Where appropriate non-compliances were raised against the ETI code / SMETA Additions & local law and recorded as non compliances on both the audit report, CAPR and on Sedex.
- (4) Any Non-Compliance against customer code shall not be uploaded to Sedex. However, in the CAPR these 'Variances in compliance between ETI code / SMETA Additions/ local law and customer code' shall be noted in the observations section of the CAPR.



SMETA Declaration

I declare that the audit underpinning the following report was conducted in accordance with SMETA Best Practice Guidance and SMETA Measurement Criteria.

- (1) Where appropriate non-compliances were raised against the ETI code / SMETA Additions & local law and recorded as non-compliances on both the audit report, CAPR and on Sedex.
- (2) Any Non-Compliance against customer code alone shall not be uploaded to Sedex. However, in the CAPR these 'Variances in compliance between ETI code / SMETA Additions/ local law and customer code' shall be noted in the observations section of the CAPR.

Any exceptions to this must be recorded here (e.g. different sample size): None

Auditor Team(s) (please list all including all interviewers):

Lead auditor: ZHIHUA ZHU Team auditor: NA Interviewers: 7HIHUA 7HU

Report writer: ZHIHUA ZHU ZHIHUA ZHU

Report reviewer: Prasad Lohar

Date of declaration: 15th June 2018 13/07/2018

Note: The focus of this ethical audit is on the ETI Base Code and local law. The additional elements will not be audited in such depth or scope, but the audit process will still highlight any specific issues.

This report provides a summary of the findings and other applicable information found/gathered during the social audit conducted on the above date only and does not officially confirm or certify compliance with any legal regulations or industry standards. The social audit process requires that information be gathered and considered from records review, worker interviews, management interviews and visual observation. More information is gathered during the social audit process than is provided here. The audit process is a sampling exercise only and does not guarantee that the audited site prior, during or post—audit, are in full compliance with the Code being audited against. The provisions of this Code constitute minimum and not maximum standards and this Code should not be used to prevent companies from exceeding these standards. Companies applying this Code are expected to comply with national and other applicable laws and where the provisions of law and this Code address the same subject, to apply that provision which affords the greater protection. The ownership of this report remains with the party who has paid for the audit. Release permission must be provided by the owner prior to release to any third parties.



Audit Parameters

| | Audit Parameters | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--|
| A: Time in and time out | Day 1 Time Day 1 Time | | | Time in: 9:00 Time out:20:0 | 00 NA | | |
| B: Number of Auditor Days Used: | 1 auditor * 2.5 days =2.5 man days on site and 0.5 man days off site | | | | | | |
| C: Audit type: | | | e | | | | |
| D: Was the audit announced? | Annound Semi – a | nnounced: | Window de | tail: weeks | i | | |
| E: Was the Sedex SAQ available for review? | Yes No If No, why r | not: | | | | | |
| F: Any conflicting information SAQ/Pre-Audit Info to Audit findings? | Yes No If Yes , pleas | se capture o | detail in app | propriate audi | it by cla | use | |
| G: Who signed and agreed CAPR (Name and job title) | , / | Administratio | on Dept. Mo | ınager | | | |
| H: Is further information available(if Y please contact audit company for details) | ☐ Yes ⊠ No | | | | | | |
| I: Previous audit date: | 31/05/2017 | | | | | | |
| J: Previous audit type: | SMETA 4P | | | | | | |
| K: Was any previous audit reviewed during this audit | ⊠ Yes □ | No 🗌 N/A | | | | | |
| Audit attendance | Manage | ment | Worker Re | presentatives | 5 | | |
| | Senior manage | ment | Worker Co | | Jnion re | presentatives | |
| A: Present at the opening meeting? | ⊠ Yes | □No | ⊠ Yes | □ No □ | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | |
| B: Present at the audit? | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | ⊠ Yes | □ No □ | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | |
| C: Present at the closing meeting? | ⊠ Yes | □No | ⊠ Yes | □ No □ | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | |



| D: If Worker Representatives were not present please explain reasons why (only complete if no worker reps present) | na |
|--|----|
| E: If Union Representatives were not present please explain reasons why: (only complete if no union reps present) | NA |



Corrective Action Plan

| | Corrective Action Plan – non-compliances to Mondelez Customers Supplier Codes or Local Law | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Non- Compliance Number The reference number of the non-compliance from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7 | New or Carried Over Is this a new non- compliance identified at the follow-up or one carried over (C) that is still outstanding | Details of Non- Compliance Details of Non-Compliance | Root cause (completed by the site) | Preventative and Corrective Actions Details of actions to be taken to clear non- compliance, and the system change to prevent re- occurrence (agreed between site and auditor) | Timescale (Immediate, 30, 60, 90, 180,365) | Verification Method Desktop / Follow-Up [D/F] | Agreed by Management and Name of Responsible Person: Note if management agree to the non- compliance, and document name of responsible person | Verification Evidence and Comments Details on corrective action evidence | Status Open/Closed or comment |
| ETI 3.1 Working Conditions are Safe and Hygienic Major | New | It was found two workers did not wear earplugs on auto cutting position. | ☐ Training ☐ Systems ☐ Costs ☐ lack of workers ☐ Other – please give details: | Ensure the workers in all relevant positions wear appropriate PPE such as steel glove ear pluses during the work. Conduct occupational disease physical exam for all relevant workers. | 30 days | Desktop | Manager | Desktop verification was conducted on 13 Jul., 2018. The company had provided earplugs to relevant workers and conducted regular inspection. The result can be accepted. | Closed |
| ETI3.1 Working Conditions are Safe and Hygienic Major | New | It was noted Lack of needle guards on three sewing machines during factory tour. | ☐ Training ☐ Systems ☐ Costs ☐ lack of workers ☐ Other – please give details: | The factory should provide needle guards on sewing machines. | 30 days | Desktop | , Manager | Desktop verification was conducted on 13 Jul., 2018. Needle guards had been installed on the sewing machines. The result can be accepted. | Closed |



| | Corrective Action Plan – non-compliances to ETI Base Code | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Non- Compliance Number The reference number of the non-compliance from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7 | New or Carried Over Is this a new non- compliance identified at the follow-up or one carried over (C) that is still outstanding | Details of Non- Compliance Details of Non-Compliance | Root cause (completed by the site) | Preventative and Corrective Actions Details of actions to be taken to clear non- compliance, and the system change to prevent re- occurrence (agreed between site and auditor) | Timescale (Immediate, 30, 60, 90, 180, 365) | Verification Method Desktop / Follow-Up [D/F] | Agreed by Management and Name of Responsible Person: Note if management agree to the non- compliance, and document name of responsible person | Verification Evidence and Comments Details on corrective action evidence | Status Open/Closed or comment |
| ETI3.1 Working Conditions are Safe and Hygienic Major | New | It was found the cover of one electrical socket was damaged. | ☐ Training ☐ Systems ☐ Costs ☐ lack of workers ☐ Other – please give details: | All electrical sockets should be kept well cover. | 30 days | Desktop | Manager | Desktop verification was conducted on 13 Jul., 2018. All electrical sockets had been installed safety cover in the company. The result can be accepted. | Closed |
| ETI3.2 Working Conditions are Safe and Hygienic Minor | New | The company did not provide training in how to use PPE to two worker on cutting position. | □ Training □ Systems □ Costs □ lack of workers □ Other – please give details: | The company should provide health and safety training to new workers on time. | 30 days | Desktop | Manager | Desktop verification was conducted on 13 Jul., 2018. The company had provided the training about PPE using to relevant workers and conducted regular inspection. The result can be accepted. | Closed |



| | Corrective Action Plan – Observations Nothing to report | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Observation Number The reference number of the observation from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7 | New or Carried Over Is this a new observation identified at the follow-up or one carried over (C) that is still outstanding | Details of Observation Details of Observation | Root cause (completed by the site) | Any improvement actions discussed (Not uploaded on to SEDEX) | | | |
| | | Nothing to report | | | | | |



| | Good examples Nothing to report | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Good example Number The reference number of the non- compliance from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7 | Details of good example noted | Any relevant Evidence and Comments | | | | |
| | Nothing to report | _ | | | | |



Confirmation

| Please sign this document confirming that the above findings have been discussed with and understood by you: (site management) If actual signatures are not possible in electronic versions, please state the name of the signatory in applicable boxes, as indicating the signature. | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| A: Site Representative Signature: | | Title: Manager | | | |
| | | Date: 06 th June 2018 <mark>13 July 2018</mark> | | | |
| B: Auditor Signature: | Mr. Zhihua ZHU <mark>Mr. Zhihua ZHU</mark> | Title: Lead Auditor | | | |
| | | Date: 06th June 2018 13 July 2018 | | | |
| C: Please indicate below if you, the site r | management, dispute any of the findings. No nee | d to complete D-E, if no disputes. | | | |
| D: I dispute the following numbered non- | -compliances: None | | | | |
| E: Signed: | NA | Title | | | |
| (If <u>any</u> entry in box D, please complete a signature on this line) | | Date | | | |
| F: Any other site Comments: None | | | | | |





For more information visit: Sedexglobal.com

Your feedback on your experience of the SMETA audit you have observed is extremely valuable. It will help to make improvements to future versions.

You can leave feedback by following the appropriate link to our questionnaire:

Click here for Buyer (A) & Buyer/Supplier (A/B) members:

 $http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=riPsbE0PQ52ehCo3lnq5lw_3d_3d$

Click here for Supplier (B) members:

 $http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=d3vYsCe48fre69DRgIY_2brg_3d_3d$