

SMETA Corrective Action Plan Report (CAPR)

Version 6.1





		A	Audit Details			
Sedex Company Reference: (only available on Sedex System)	ZC: 286377281		Sedex Site Reference: (only available on Sedex System)		ZS: 293059909	
Business name (Company name):	Cutting Edge Industries Ltd.					
Site name:	Cutting Edge Indus	tries	Ltd.			
Site address: (Please include full address)	1612, South Salna, Salna Bazar, Gazip Sadar, Gazipur.	ur	Country:		Bangladesh	
Site contact and job title:	Md. Arif Ahmmed Khan (Sumon), DGM – HR, Admin & Compliance					Compliance
Site phone:	+8801678114348 Site e-mail:			sumon.khan@cuttingedgebd.com		
SMETA Audit Type Pillars:	∑ Labour Standards	⊠ Health & Safety		⊠ Enviror	nment	□ Business Ethics
Date of Audit:	05 & 06 February 2020					
Audit Compa	any Name & Logo:					

Audit Company Name & Logo: ITS Labtest Bangladesh Ltd.	Report Owner (payer):
intertek Total Quality. Assured.	Cutting Edge Industries Ltd.

Audit Conducted By							
Affiliate Audit Company	\boxtimes	Purchaser		Retailer			
Brand owner		NGO		Trade Union			
Multi– stakeholder			Combined Audit (select all that apply)				



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 6.1 (March 2019) 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): The audit duration took less time than expected as the audit was conducted in consecutively two days and support of the facility management was very prompt, transparent and no inconsistency found during audit process.

Auditor Team (s) (please list all including all interviewers): Md. Kamrul Hasan, Asst. Supervisor (RA 21700579), Ariful Islam-Auditor (RA 21700959), Shahina Kader - Auditor (RA 21703704), Khadiza Parvin - Auditor – (ASCA 21701361) Md. Fazlay Rabby Anabil - Auditor (ASCA 21703698).

Lead auditor: Md. Kamrul Hasan

Team auditor: Ariful Islam, Shahina Kader, Khadiza Parvin & Fazlay Rabby Anabil

Interviewers: Md. Kamrul Hasan Ariful Islam, Shahina Kader, Khadiza Parvin & Fazlay Rabby Anabil

Report writer: Khadiza Parvin.

Report reviewer: Mazharul Anwar (Auditor).

Date of declaration: 06 February 2020

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 in: 9:50 hours Day 1 Time out: 16:15 hours	Day 2 Time in: 9.50 Hours Day 2 Time out: 15: 40 hours	Day 3 Time in: NA Day 3 Time out: NA			
B: Number of auditor days used:	6.7 Man Days					
	Day 1: 05 Auditors in one day (05 Man Days) Day 2: 02 Auditors in one day (1.7 Man Days)					
C: Audit type:	Full Initial Periodic Full Follow-up Partial Follow-Up Partial Other If other, please define:	✓ Periodic☐ Full Follow-up☐ Partial Follow-Up☐ Partial Other				
D: Was the audit announced?	☐ Announced ☑ Semi – announced: Window detail: 4 weeks ☐ Unannounced					
E: Was the Sedex SAQ available for review?	Yes No If No, why not					
F: Any conflicting information SAQ/Pre-Audit Info to Audit findings?	☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes , please capture detail in appropriate audit by clause					
G: Who signed and agreed CAPR (Name and job title)	Md. Arif Ahmmed Khan (Sumon), DGM – HR, Admin & Compliance					
H: Is further information available (if yes, please contact audit company for details)	∑ Yes □ No					
I: Previous audit date:	04 February 2019					
J: Previous audit type:	Periodic					
K: Were any previous audits reviewed for this audit	☐ Yes ☒ No					
TOI THIS GUAIT	□ N/A					

Audit attendance	Management	Worker Representation	ves
	Senior management	Worker Committee representatives	Union representatives



☐ Yes ☐ No A: Present at the opening meeting? B: Present at the audit? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No C: Present at the closing meeting? D: If Worker Representatives were not Not applicable present please explain reasons why (only complete if no worker reps present) E: If Union Representatives were not Trade Union is not mandated by law. The facility has formed present please explain reasons why: participation committee for worker representation. (only complete if no union reps present)

Guidance

The Corrective Action Plan Report summarises the site audit findings and a corrective, and preventative action plan that both the auditor and the site manager believe is reasonable to ensure conformity with the ETI Base Code, Local Laws and additional audited requirements. After the initial audit, the form is used to rerecord actions taken and to categorise the status of the non-compliances.

N.B. observations and good practice examples should be pointed out at the closing meeting as well as discussing non-compliances and corrective actions.

To ensure that good practice examples are highlighted to the supplier and to give a more 'balanced' audit a section to record these has been provided on the CAPR document (see following pages) which will remain with the supplier. They will be further confirmed on receipt of the audit report.

Root cause (see column 4)

Root cause refers to the specific procedure or lack of procedure which caused the issue to arise. Before a corrective action can sustainably rectify the situation, it is important to find out the real cause of the noncompliance and whether a system change is necessary to ensure the issue will not arise again in the future.

See SMETA BPG Chapter 7 'Audit Execution' for more explanation of "root cause".

Next Steps:

- 1. The site shall request, via Sedex, that the audit body upload the audit report, non-compliances, observations and good examples. If you have not already received instructions on how to do this then please visit the web site www.sedexglobal.com.
- 2. Sites shall action its non-compliances and document its progress via Sedex.
- 3. Once the site has effectively progressed through its actions then it shall request via Sedex that the audit body verify its actions. Please visit <u>www.sedexglobal.com</u> web site for information on how to do this.
- 4. The audit body shall verify corrective actions taken by the site by either a "Desk-Top" review process via Sedex or by Follow-up Audit (see point 5).
- 5. Some non-compliances that cannot be closed off by "Desk-Top" review may need to be closed off via a "1 Day Follow Up Audit" charged at normal fee rates. If this is the case, then the site will be notified after its submission of documentary evidence relating to that non-compliance. Any followup audit must take place within twelve months of the initial audit and the information from the initial audit must be available for sign off of corrective action.
- 6. For changes to wages and hours to be correctly verified it will normally require a follow up site visit. Auditors will generally require to see a minimum of two months wages and hours records, showing new rates in order to confirm changes (note some clients may ask for a longer period, if in doubt please check with the client).

Corrective Action Plan

Corrective Action Plan – non-compliances									
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
Working condition are safe and hygienic ETI base code 3.1 & Bangladesh Labor Rules, 2015 Rule 67 (2):	New	It was noted through facility visit that – a) 06 out of 12 employees of fusing machine were not wearing heat protected hand gloves while working in 3rd floor of production building 1. b) 5% employees of cutting section were not using face mask in 5th floor of production building 1. c) 06 out of 06 employees of heat seal machine operators were not using heat protected hand gloves while working in 5th floor of production building 1. d) 5% employees of overlock and flatlock machine operator in sewing section were not using face mask in 2 nd , 4 th and 5 th floor of production building 1. e) No eye goggles used by 02 out of 05 snap button operator in finishing section located at 1st floor of production building 1.	☐ Training ☐ Systems ☐ Costs ☐ lack of workers ☑ Other – please give details: Lack of awareness	It is recommended that the facility management should ensure the usage of relevant PPE in the mentioned area.	30 Days	Desktop	Yes - Md. Arif Ahmmed Khan (Sumon), DGM - HR, Admin & Compliance		
Working condition are safe and hygienic ETI base code 3.1	New	It was noted through facility visit that - a) 20 % needle guard of sewing machine was found displaced in sewing section located at 2nd, 4th and 5th floor of production building 1.	☐ Training ☐ Systems ☐ Costs ☐ lack of workers	It is recommended that the facility management should ensure the uses of the	30 Days	Desktop	Yes - Md. Arif Ahmmed Khan (Sumon), DGM		



& Bangladesh Other – please - HR, Admin & b) 30 % eye guard of flat lock, overlock, mentioned Labour Rules machines were found displaced in sewing give details: Lack machine safety Compliance 2015, Section section located at 2nd, 4th and 5th floor of of awareness guards. production building 1. 64(2): Working ☐ Training 120 Days New It was noted through facility visit, management Desktop Yes was Systems interview and floor layout plan review that condition are recommended building 5 (Dining building) was not included in ☐ Costs Arif safe and that facility Md. hygienic ETI floor layout plan. Note that building 5 was under ☐ lack of workers Ahmmed Khan management Other – please base code 3.1 construction. Also note that, there was a should update the (Sumon), DGM give details: Lack & Bangladesh finishing section in 5th floor of building-1 at - HR, Admin & floor layout plan. Labour Rules approved floor layout plan whereas facility is of monitorina Compliance 2015, Section operating sewing section instead of finishing 353 (4): section. ☐ Training Working New It was noted through facility visit and It is recommended 120 Days Desktop Yes condition are management interview that automatic fire ■ Systems that facility Costs safe and alarm and detection system was not installed management Md. Arif □ lack of workers yet at building 05. Note that manual fire alarm hygienic ETI should install Ahmmed Khan base code 3.1 system was installed in building 05. Also note Other – please automatic (Sumon), DGM fire & Bangladesh that only ground and 1st floor of building 05 is give details: Lack alarm - HR, Admin & and used as worker dining area & total 4353 National of monitoring Compliance detection system employees were working in the facility. Building Code throughout the 2006, Part 4, facility. Section 4.4: ☐ Training 30 Days Regular It was noted through employee's ID card review It is recommended Desktop New Yes ☐ Systems employment is that facility did not provide updated ID card that facility ☐ Costs provided, ETI around 30% to the employees as per rules. Few management Md. Arif base code 8.1 required information was missing in the ☐ lack of workers should Ahmmed Khan provide & Banaladesh employee ID card e.a. National ID Number. Other – please (Sumon), DGM updated Blood Group, Emergency Contact Number and - HR, Admin & Labor Ruleaive details: Lack information in ID 2015, Rule-19 Employee's Signature. of monitoring card to all Compliance (5): employees as per rules.



Corrective Action Plan - Observations Observation New or **Details of Observation** Root cause Any improvement actions discussed Details of Observation (completed by the site) (Not uploaded on to SEDEX) Number **Carried Over** The reference Is this a new number of the observation observation identified at from the Audit the follow-up Report, or one carried for example, over (C) that is Discrimination still outstanding No.7 None None None Observed None None

Good examples					
Good example Number The reference number of the good example from the Audit Report, for example, Discrimination No.7	Details of good example noted	Any relevant Evidence and Comments			
Living Wages and Benefits: 5.2	Facility has provided attendance bonus to all employees as per company policy.	Document review and management interview.			
Living Wages and Benefits: 5.2	Facility has provided production bonus to the employee as per company policy.	Document review and management interview.			



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:	Md. Arif Ahmmed Khan (Sumon) Title: DGM – HR, Adr Compliance					
		Date: 06 February 2020				
B: Auditor Signature:	Title: Lead auditor 8 auditors Md. Kamrul Hasan & Khadiza Parvin Date: 06 February 2					
C: Please indicate below if you, the site management, dispute any of the findings. No need to complete D-E, if no disputes.						
D: I dispute the following numbered non	-compliances: None					
E: Signed: (If <u>any</u> entry in box D, please complete a signature on this line)	None	Title Date				
F: Any other site Comments: None						



Guidance on Root Cause

Explanation of the Root Cause Column

If a non-compliance is to be rectified by a corrective action which will also prevent the non-compliance re-occurring, it is necessary to consider whether a system change is required.

Understanding the root cause of the non-compliance is essential if a site is to prevent the issue reoccurring.

The root cause refers to the specific activity/ procedure or lack of activity/procedure which caused the non-compliance to arise. Before a corrective action can rectify the situation, it is important to find out the real cause of the non-compliance and whether a system change is necessary to ensure the issue will not arise again in the future.

Since this is a new addition, it is not a mandatory requirement to complete this column at this time. We hope to encourage auditors and sites to think about Root Causes and where they are able to agree, this column may be used to describe their discussion.

Some examples of finding a "root cause"

Example 1

Where excessive hours have been noted the real reason for these needs to be understood, whether due to production planning, bottle necks in the operation, insufficient training of operators, delays in receiving trims, etc.

Example 2

A non-compliance may be found where workers are not using PPE that has been provided to them. This could be the result of insufficient training for workers to understand the need for its use; a lack of follow-up by supervisors aligned to a proper set of factory rules or the fact that workers feel their productivity (and thus potential earnings) is affected by use of items such as metal gloves.

Example 3

A site uses fines to control unacceptable behaviour of workers.

International standards (and often local laws) may require that workers should not be fined for disciplinary reasons.

It may be difficult to stop fines immediately as the site rules may have been in place for some time, but to prevent the non-compliance re-occurring it will be necessary to make a system change.

The symptom is fines, but the root cause is a management system which may break the law. To prevent the problem re-occurring it will be necessary to make a system change for example the site could consider a system which rewards for good behaviour

Only by understanding the underlying cause can effective corrective actions be taken to ensure continuous compliance.

The site is encouraged to complete this section so as to indicate their understanding of the issues raised and the actions to be taken.

Disclaimer:

Any proposed Corrective Action Plan (CAP) closed utilizing a Desktop Review is limited by the evidential documentation provided by the facility in order to correct the non-compliance. The intent of this service is to provide assurance that the facility is on the correct path with its proposed or completed corrective actions. Intertek cannot be held responsible for the falsification of evidence or the effective implementation of the proposed corrective actions, which in many instances may only be truly validated by an onsite Audit visit owing to the limitations of the desktop review process. The facilities shall be wholly responsible for the correct and effective implementation of their proposed CAP.

Intertek nor any of its affiliates shall be held liable for any direct, indirect, threatened, consequential, special, exemplary or other damages that may result including but not limited to economic loss, injury, illness, or death arising from the inability of a facility to implement its CAP.



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

Click here for Auditors:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/BRTVCKP