

Based on research by



Sustainable Cotton Ranking

Assessing company performance



PHOTO: SIDDHARTI TRIPATHY

Commissioned by



Solidaridad





REPORT PREPARED BY RANK A BRAND

Rank a Brand is an international NGO by and for consumers that assesses and ranks consumer brands in several sectors on sustainability and social responsibility.
www.rankabrand.org

Research team Mario Dziamski (head of research) and Radboud van Delft (managing director)

The team consisted of Marloes Boere, Marine de Waziers, Bianca Festa, Emily Ghadimi, Hilary Haskell, Barry Konst, David Ollivier de Leth, Eefje Notten, Annika Reinds, Angela Rojas, Heinz Rotter, Martje Rozmus, Petra Schoof, Eva Schouten, Trix Vahl, Marieke van Asperen, Judith van den Bosch, Dieter van der Meeren, Olga van Genechten, Ype van Woersem and Pia Wunderl

Edited by Barney Jeffries

Published June 2016

Production and publishing team Richard Holland (WWF), Elly Peters (WWF), Isabelle Roger (Solidaridad), Keith Tyrell (PAN UK), Bram Verkerke (Solidaridad) and Justin Woolford (WWF)

Design Axioma Communicatie

All photo copy rights Solidaridad

Cover photo Siddharth Tripathy

For more information please contact:
Pesticide Action Network UK, www.pan-uk.org or info@pan-uk.org
Solidaridad, www.solidaridadnetwork.org or
info@solidaridadnetwork.org
WWF Market Transformation Initiative, panda.org/markets or
[contact mti@wwf.nl](mailto:contact@mti@wwf.nl)

Any reproduction in full or in part must mention the title and credit the above-mentioned publisher as the copyright owner.

PAN UK: Pesticide Action Network UK (PAN UK) is the only UK charity focused on tackling the problems caused by pesticides and promoting safe and sustainable alternatives to pesticides in agriculture, urban areas, homes and gardens.

Solidaridad: Solidaridad is an international civil society organization with more than 45 years of global experience in facilitating the development of socially responsible, ecologically sound and profitable supply chains.

WWF: is one of the world's largest and most experienced independent conservation organizations, with over 5 million supporters and a global network active in more than 100 countries.



Contents

1. Executive summary	4
2. Introduction	6
2.1. Background and objective	6
2.2. Rationale and method	6
2.3. Solutions	8
3. Methodology	11
4. Summary of results	12
4.1 Overall	12
4.2 Ranking	13
4.3 Policy	14
4.4 Actual uptake	15
4.5 Traceability	15
5. Conclusions and recommendations	18
5.1 Conclusions	18
5.2 Recommendations	18
6. Appendices	19
6.1. Questionnaire	19
6.2. Detailed results per company	20

1. Executive summary

Cotton is a key raw material for the textile industry. Various sustainability initiatives exist but many problems and challenges remain, and conventional cultivation often comes with serious environmental impacts and poor labour conditions. Although there is a significant amount of more sustainable cotton now available, accounting for around 13 per cent of global supply in 2015, the **Mind the Gap** report shows that less than one fifth of what is produced is actually being bought as more sustainable.

With the aim of evaluating progress and accelerating change, **Pesticide Action Network UK** (PAN UK), **Solidaridad** and **WWF** commissioned **Rank a Brand** to assess major cotton-using companies on their published cotton sustainability performance. In total, 37 companies, estimated globally to use the most cotton in their products, were ranked across three areas: policy, actual use in products (uptake), and traceability. This report offers an overview of current company performance together with recommendations for improvement. Each company's individual performance on sustainable cotton is also presented. For the purposes of this research, only organic cotton, Fairtrade cotton, Cotton made in Africa (CmiA), Better Cotton (BCI) or recycled cotton are considered to be 'more sustainable'.

Summary of main results

No company achieved the maximum available score of 19.5 points, mainly because no company uses 100 per cent more sustainable cotton according to the criteria used in this research, or is fully transparent about its policies and cotton supply chain. Of the 37 companies evaluated, only eight scored three points or more. With a score of 12.0, IKEA Group is the best performing company as well as being the only company to rank in the green zone. C&A Global (9.0), H&M Group (9.0) and Adidas Group (7.75) follow in the yellow zone, while Nike (6.75), M&S (5.5), VF Corporation (3.25), and Kering (3.0) are in the orange zone. Another 17 companies scored less than three points, while a further 12 provided little or no information and therefore scored no points, all falling in the red zone.

Performance has been assessed at company level to reflect the need for company-wide change in transforming the entire cotton market. Some companies may be performing better than their

ranking suggests but have scored lower because they are not communicating policies and practices publicly. It is also possible that specific brands are performing better than their parent company as sustainability practices can vary significantly between different brands owned by the same company.

A number of companies participate in sustainable cotton initiatives. For example, ten of those assessed here are members of the **Better Cotton Initiative** (BCI) and support minimizing the use of highly hazardous pesticides (HHP),¹ improving working conditions, addressing biodiversity issues and reducing water consumption. Other companies participate in different collaborative initiatives and/or cotton programmes, and some, in addition to using Better Cotton, Fairtrade, organic or CmiA cotton, focus on using recycled cotton. Most of the companies assessed do not have clear cotton policies.

Main conclusions

While significant progress has been made by a few leading companies working hard to deliver sustainability, there is significant room for improvement in company sourcing and reporting on sustainable cotton. Although some major brands and manufacturers have published policies and commitments, in general, there is a widespread absence of publicly available information on policies, sourcing and supply chain traceability across the textile sector – all of which are necessary for overall market transformation.

Main recommendations

While the leading companies have made good progress, more action is needed to make a lasting difference in the cotton sector. All companies using large quantities of cotton can strengthen their business by taking responsibility for impacts and pursuing sustainability. In doing so, these companies can make a major contribution to people and planet.

PAN UK, Solidaridad and WWF recommend low-scoring companies:

- Develop and publish a policy for sourcing more sustainable cotton for their products, including time-bound targets – companies serious about sustainability should be sourcing 100% more sustainable cotton by 2020 at the latest
- Consider joining an organization such as the BCI or Textile Exchange.

PAN UK, Solidaridad and WWF recommend companies already on the way to sustainability continue improving performance:

- Encourage all their suppliers to participate in credible sustainability programmes
- Increase the amount of more sustainable cotton they source and purchase to send a strong market signal for sustainability
- Report transparently on cotton sourcing and sustainability
- Map supply chains and use traceability tools.

PAN UK, Solidaridad and WWF consider the following standards to be the most credible for companies seeking to source more sustainable cotton at the production level:

- Organic cotton
- Fairtrade cotton
- Cotton made in Africa (CmiA)
- Better Cotton (from the BCI).

















































































































































































































































































































































































Another sustainable option is recycled cotton.

ALL COMPANIES USING LARGE QUANTITIES OF COTTON CAN STRENGTHEN THEIR BUSINESS BY TAKING RESPONSIBILITY AND PURSUING SUSTAINABILITY

¹ See PAN International List of Highly Hazardous Pesticides, 2015

SCORE OVERVIEW COTTON



IKEA Group	           	12,00
C&A Global	        	9,00
H&M Group	        	9,00
Adidas Group	         	7,75
Nike, Inc.	       	6,75
Marks & Spencer	         	5,50
VF Corporation	         	3,25
Kering	         	3,00
Inditex Group	         	2,50
Burberry	         	2,25
Associated British Food	         	2,00
Hanesbrands Inc.	         	2,00
Carrefour	         	1,75
PVH	         	1,75
Casino Group	         	1,25
China Resources Enterprise Ltd.	         	1,25
Macy's, Inc.	         	1,25
Hudon's Bay Co.	         	1,00
Walmart	         	1,00
LVMH	         	0,75
Target Corp	         	0,75
Fast Retailing	         	0,50
GAP Inc.	         	0,50
L Brands	         	0,50
Wesfarmers	         	0,50
Auchan Groupe	         	0,00
Coach Inc.	         	0,00
Dillard's Inc.	         	0,00
Foot Locker Inc.	         	0,00
Hermès International SA	         	0,00
JCPenney	         	0,00
Lotte Co. Ltd.	         	0,00
Nordstrom Inc.	         	0,00
Ralph Lauren Corporation	         	0,00
Richemont SA	         	0,00
Ross Stores	         	0,00
TJX	         	0,00

	Leading the way
	Well on the way
	Starting the journey
	Not yet in the starting blocks

2. Introduction

2.1. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVE

Background

The apparel and textile industries receive notable public scrutiny for conditions in their factories in developing countries, fuelled by high-profile tragedies, such as the building collapses and fires in Bangladesh, and ongoing reports of child labour. In contrast, the cotton farming – a key raw material for the sector – has received considerably less attention, though it too has serious environmental and social impacts. With an estimated 40 million cotton farmers in developing countries producing three-quarters of the world's cotton, more than 100 million families are directly engaged in cotton production², and a further 250 million in farm labour and primary processing are dependent on cotton³. Cotton production merits much more attention than it currently receives.

Widespread and readily observable issues for the cotton sector include:

- Forced labour and child labour
- Excessive water use⁴, often in developing countries with water shortages
- Water pollution
- Inappropriate use of pesticides and herbicides
- Soil depletion
- Biodiversity loss
- High levels of debt among farmers due to high input costs.

A number of global initiatives have been launched to address, fully or partially, the social, economic and environmental impacts of cotton production. Although about 13% of cotton is grown more sustainably only a fifth of this is actually sourced by companies for their products. Some major companies have made public and time-bound commitments to sustainable cotton sourcing. These and other companies need to live up to their commitments, increase their purchases of cotton from credible sustainability programmes and report transparently on their sustainable cotton sourcing. This will enable them to meet the demands of their customers, shareholders and staff who want ethical products and contribute to the long-term sustainability of the cotton sector as a whole.

Objective

The objective is to highlight opportunities for improvement and accelerate transformation of the cotton market towards sustainability. Pesticide Action Network UK (PAN UK), Solidaridad, and WWF commissioned Rank a Brand to research the major cotton-using companies on their policies, actual uptake and traceability of sustainable cotton. The research presents a ranking comparing their performance and giving a transparent overview of the current status of sustainable cotton sourcing.

ALTHOUGH ABOUT 13% OF COTTON IS GROWN MORE SUSTAINABLY ONLY A FIFTH OF THIS IS ACTUALLY SOURCED BY COMPANIES FOR THEIR PRODUCTS

*Fortucci P. (Director, Commodities and Trade Division, FAO). 2002. Speech at the Seminar on Cotton and Multilateral Trade Negotiations organised by ICAC and the World Bank, July 2002.

3 International Cotton Advisory Committee (ICAC).

4 3,644m³ per tonne, which is the equivalent of nearly 1.5 Olympic swimming pools. (Chapagain, A.K., Hoekstra, A.Y., Savenije, H.H.G. and R. Gautam. 2006. The water footprint of cotton consumption: An assessment of the impact of worldwide consumption of cotton products on the water resources in the cotton producing countries. Ecological Economics 60(1): 186-203.

2.2. RATIONALE AND METHOD

Issue

Production of more sustainable cotton has never been higher, reaching 2,173,000 tonnes in 2014, or 8 per cent of the total global supply. This share is projected to rise to 13 per cent in 2015. International clothing companies have the opportunity to play a crucial role in securing the future of the sustainable cotton market, reducing cotton's environmental impact and improving labour conditions. However, companies are actively sourcing less than a fifth of available sustainable cotton with the remainder sold as conventional cotton. Without demand from buyers, sustainable cotton will remain a niche product and the cotton industry's social and environmental problems will persist.

Relevance of policy, actual uptake and traceability

Policy

Policy is included in the analysis because, although it might seem less relevant than accomplished results or hard figures, a company's sustainability policies provide a vital foundation and direction for its business operations. Publishing a policy can be a first step on the journey to more sustainable cotton sourcing.

Actual uptake

Policies do not deliver change if they are not implemented. The research methodology gives priority to actual uptake of sustainable cotton in products. Increased sourcing of more sustainable cotton leads to positive improvements in the cotton sector. Companies that publish the volume of cotton they use demonstrate that they take their role in the cotton sector seriously, and are willing to support sustainability efforts explicitly.

Traceability

Companies must pay attention to where their cotton is grown and processed, who their suppliers are, and how much cotton passes through their supply chains on annual basis. Such information helps a company and its suppliers to build longer-lasting relationships that help accelerate the transformation of the cotton market towards sustainability. Internally, traceability is an essential decision-making tool in setting and achieving a sustainable cotton

strategy. Traceability and transparency further facilitate increased accountability of companies towards their consumers, owners, supply chain partners and other stakeholders.

Focusing on companies

Brands and retailers have the ability to drive sustainable cotton demand through the requirements they set for their suppliers. These requirements can ensure that their products are not associated with unsafe or illegal labour practices or environmental damage.

The ranking used in this research focuses on companies rather than the individual brands they own. While sustainability practices can vary significantly between different brands, entire companies need to change sourcing practices in order to transform cotton production.

Choice of companies

The analysis focuses on the world's largest consumer-facing companies which use a significant amount of cotton in their products. These companies represent a cross-section of companies from apparel brands to super-market chains, and furniture to household stores. Due to the prominence of these companies in their respective sectors, they are in a position to encourage cotton farmers to grow sustainable cotton and supply chain actors to source and use it in their products. These companies buy from around 30,000 tonnes to more than 100,000 tonnes of cotton annually.

Due to the lack of publicly available data from the companies themselves, their respective use of cotton was estimated. The authors are aware that these estimates might be wrong, and invites companies to publish their actual (or own estimated) cotton use.



Introduction

2.3. SOLUTIONS

Sustainability standards and programmes have been developed over the last three decades to address the issues associated with conventional cotton cultivation. These standards provide guidance for farmers on more sustainable farming practices and assure buyers that a given product meets the specified requirements to be considered more sustainable.

Organic cotton was a ground-breaking programme in the late 1980s, followed by Fairtrade in 2004, CmiA in 2005 and Better Cotton in 2009. Each standard brings different advantages to the table, both in terms of the standards themselves and the systems supporting them. While organic cotton focuses on environmental impacts, Fairtrade emphasizes the social development of cotton farming – although in practice, around two-thirds of certified cotton farmers work with both standards. CmiA and Better Cotton cover both environmental, and social and economic impacts, but CmiA is limited in scope to Sub-Saharan Africa. Recycled cotton is another sustainable option.

Supplies of more sustainable cotton have increased significantly in the last few years, reaching unprecedented volumes and accounting for about 8 per cent of global production in 2014. This share is projected to be around 13 per cent in 2015. This positive development is already benefiting the environment and farmers.

From an analysis using the WWF Certification Assessment Tool, Rank a Brand found that the above-mentioned standards are the most credible for cotton farming at present. A brief overview on each standard is given below.

Organic cotton

Organic cotton is grown without the use of any artificial fertilizers or pesticides, so it avoids some of the negative environmental impacts of conventional cotton. After reaching a record level of 241,698 metric tonnes of fibre in 2010, organic cotton production declined for several years. In 2013-14 it grew again by 10 per cent to 116,974 metric tonnes. Organic cotton originates from 19 producer countries, with India accounting for nearly three-quarters (74 per

cent) of total supply, followed by China (10 per cent) and Turkey (7 per cent). The Americas, Africa and Central Asia account for the remaining amount (8 per cent).

Fairtrade cotton

Fairtrade emphasizes the social development aspects of cotton farming. Fairtrade cotton is produced in seven countries, mainly in India, but also in Africa and Central Asia. Production of Fairtrade cotton fluctuates at around 15,000 metric tonnes of fibre. Two-thirds of Fairtrade cotton is also organic.

Cotton made in Africa

CmiA focuses on the environmental, social and economic aspects of cotton production in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is produced in eight countries. CmiA production reached 399,808 metric tonnes in 2015.

Better Cotton

Better Cotton is produced according to standards agreed in multi-stakeholder processes. They address social, environmental and economic issues in cotton farming and production. Better Cotton farming has demonstrated considerably lower pesticide, fertilizer and water use than conventional cotton and better net profit for farmers.

In 2014, nearly 2 million metric tonnes of Better Cotton were produced, including 834,500 metric tonnes produced directly in line with the Better Cotton standard, and 1,167,500 metric tonnes produced under benchmarked standards (MyBMP, ABR and CmiA). Better Cotton is now grown in 20 countries.

Recycled cotton

Cotton can be recycled from waste generated during the textile production process (pre-consumer) and from discarded textile products (post-consumer). This type of cotton is often blended with other materials, including virgin cotton or polyester.

SUPPLIES OF MORE SUSTAINABLE COTTON HAVE INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY IN THE LAST FEW YEARS REACHING UNPRECEDENTED VOLUMES





3. Methodology

Selection of largest cotton users

Three methods were used to calculate which companies are currently the largest cotton users globally.

1. Primarily, publicly available cotton use figures published by companies themselves on their websites and annual reports were assessed. Some of the companies provided their cotton use information in metric tonnes. However, other companies expressed the information in dollar figures, which were then converted into metric tonnes using the global average price of cotton for the respective year.
2. Some companies expressed their cotton use in the quantity of items produced. This information was then converted into metric tonnes by calculating the average weight of each item (e.g. a t-shirt or bed sheets), and multiplying this by the total quantity.
2. Estimates were made for companies where no public data was available. The estimates used in this report are based on companies with comparable business profiles. Depending on sales volumes, appropriate cotton-use quantities were estimated. We are aware that these are estimates, and invites companies to publish their actual (or estimated) cotton use to improve these figures.

Criteria

The cotton ranking assesses each company's commitment and performance with regard to sustainable cotton, based on the following criteria:

- The existence and publicity of policies on cotton, in particular those aimed at:
 - Reducing the overall impacts of cotton production
 - Eliminating hazardous pesticides (HHPs)
 - Reducing water use
 - Addressing biodiversity issues
 - Using recycled cotton
 - Addressing labour rights violations
 - Targeting time-bound sustainable cotton use.
- Actual current use of more sustainable cotton coming from credible schemes, namely:
 - Organic certified cotton as defined by European Union Regulation 834/2007, the International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements (IFOAM) – known as

the world association of organic farming – and/or Naturland

- Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International (FLO) certified
- Cotton made in Africa (CmiA) verified
- Better Cotton Initiative (BCI) verified
- Recycled cotton.
- An evaluation of the traceability of its cotton supply chain, covering:
 - Country of origin
 - Specified yarn spinning suppliers
 - Specified fabric mill suppliers
 - Specified cut make trim suppliers.
- Participation in and/or (financial) support of more sustainable cotton programmes.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire was used to assess the selected companies. For the full questionnaire, see appendix 6.1. The scores were calculated as follows:

Policy: Questions related to policy were each worth 0.5 points.

Uptake: Companies received one point per 10% of sustainable cotton used in their products.

Traceability: We awarded one point for each question related to traceability.

Following the methodology set out above, companies were awarded a numerical score (0, 0.125, 0.25, 0.5 or 1) for each aspect of their reporting, giving a total score between 0 and 19.5. They were subsequently assigned to one of five categories reflecting their performance: red (below 3, indicating little or no effort on sustainable sourcing), orange (3-7), yellow (7-11), and green (11 or more). For each section (policy, actual uptake, traceability), similar colour coding has been applied, reflecting the actual score relative to the maximum possible score for that section. **See the ranking in section 4.2.**

Transparency and public reporting are vital for demonstrating sustainability leadership. Some companies may perform well in using sustainable cotton, but fail to share this information publicly. Because the ranking is based on

publicly available information, a poor score by a specific company may reflect a lack of publicly reported information.

How Rank a Brand assessed these companies

The Rank a Brand team researched publicly available reports and other web resources for references to more sustainable cotton use – including organic, Fairtrade, CmiA, Better Cotton and recycled cotton. Rank a Brand also searched for each company's reporting on policies and associated measures and targets intended to increase procurement of more sustainable cotton.

Draft scores were established in January and February 2016. All companies received a copy of their draft score, and were given the opportunity to provide additional information to better explain their policies and practices and to ask for clarification on the draft scoring. Companies were given six weeks in March-April 2016 to share additional information with Rank a Brand in order to resolve ambiguities and substantiate their claims. Companies received two reminders in March in order to encourage participation.

After the period during which companies could provide and publish additional information, the scoring was finalized in April 2016.



4. Summary of results

4.1 OVERALL

No company achieved the maximum available score of 19.5 points, mainly because no company uses 100 per cent more sustainable cotton according to the criteria used in this research, or is fully transparent about its policies and cotton supply chain. Of the 37 companies evaluated, only eight scored three points or more. With a score of 12.0, IKEA Group is the best performing company as well as being the only company to rank in the green zone. C&A Global (9.0), H&M Group (9.0) and Adidas Group (7.75) follow in the yellow zone, while Nike (6.75), M&S (5.5), VF Corporation (3.25), and Kering (3.0) are in the orange zone. Another 17 companies scored less than three points, while a further 12 provided little or no information and therefore scored no points, all falling in the red zone.

A number of companies participate in sustainable cotton initiatives. For example, ten of the assessed companies are members of the BCI. Companies that participate in BCI support actions on minimizing the use of hazardous pesticides, improving working conditions, addressing biodiversity issues and reducing water consumption. Some companies also participate in other collaborative initiatives or cotton programmes. A number of companies focus on using more recycled cotton instead of, or in addition to, using Better Cotton, Fairtrade, organic or CmiA.

In general, there is still a significant lack of information on sustainable cotton policies, actual uptake, and information on the traceability of cotton. A summary of the results can be found below. A detailed description by company can be found in Appendix 6.2.

**THERE IS STILL A
SIGNIFICANT LACK
OF INFORMATION
ON COTTON
POLICIES, ACTUAL
UPTAKE AND
TRACEABILITY**

4.2 RANKING

Company name	Policy	Uptake	Traceability	Total score
Maximum score	3.50	11.00	5.00	19.50
IKEA Group	2.00	8.00	2.00	12.00
C&A Global	3.00	4.00	2.00	9.00
H&M Group	2.50	3.00	3.50	9.00
Adidas Group	2.25	4.00	1.50	7.75
Nike, Inc.	2.75	2.00	2.00	6.75
Marks & Spencer	2.00	3.00	0.50	5.50
VF Corporation	2.25	1.00	0.00	3.25
Kering	2.00	0.50	0.50	3.00
Inditex Group	2.50	0.00	0.00	2.50
Burberry Group PLC	1.75	0.00	0.50	2.25
Associated British Foods	1.50	0.00	0.50	2.00
Hanesbrands Inc.	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00
Carrefour	1.75	0.00	0.00	1.75
PVH	1.75	0.00	0.00	1.75
Casino Group	1.25	0.00	0.00	1.25
China Resources Enterprise Ltd.	1.25	0.00	0.00	1.25
Macy's, Inc.	1.25	0.00	0.00	1.25
Hudson's Bay Co.	0.50	0.00	0.50	1.00
Walmart	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
LVMH	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.75
Target Corp	0.25	0.00	0.50	0.75
Fast Retailing	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.50
GAP Inc.	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.50
L Brands	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.50
Wesfarmers	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50
Auchan Groupe	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coach Inc.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dillard's Inc.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Foot Locker, Inc.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hermès International S.A.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
JCPenney	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lotte Co. Ltd.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nordstrom Inc.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ralph Lauren Corporation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Richemont SA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ross Stores	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TJX	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

■	Leading the way
■	Well on the way
■	Starting the journey
■	Not yet in the starting blocks

Summary of results

4.3 POLICY

The companies analysed differ substantially in their policies on more sustainable cotton. Among the 37 companies researched, nine stand out. C&A Global, Nike, Inc., Inditex Group and H&M Group scored best, closely followed by Adidas Group, VF Corporation, Kering, Marks & Spencer and IKEA Group.

C&A Global, Nike, Inc., and H&M Group have committed to using 100 per cent cotton from more sustainable sources by 2020. Adidas Group is even more ambitious, and is aiming to achieve the same goal by 2018.

By its own criteria, IKEA Group met its goal of using 100% cotton from more sustainable sources in 2015. However, in calculating its achievement, IKEA Group includes standards such as towards Better Cotton and e3 cotton, which are not recommended by PAN UK, Solidaridad and WWF. Another interesting case is presented by PHV. Its brand Tommy Hilfiger has committed to 100 per cent cotton from more sustainable sources by 2020. However, PVH has not formulated any goal at a group level, so did not obtain maximum points.

Among the remaining companies, only Marks & Spencer specifies a clear target at a group level (70 per cent by 2020). Some have non-specific policies: for instance, Burberry aims to use more sustainable cotton, but does not yet state how much or by when.

In the companies' policies, sustainable cotton standards seemingly play the most prominent role in addressing problems such as the use of highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs), water use, biodiversity and labour rights violations. However, the companies hardly give any information about the cotton that is not covered by a more sustainable cotton programme. This problem is especially apparent concerning HHPs. Only C&A Global scores the full points for its policy measures on eliminating HHPs.

Water seems to be the most prominent issue among the companies researched, followed by biodiversity. Policy measures address water

not only via sustainable cotton standards, but also through more strategically integrated approaches, including those identified by Nike, Inc., Kering, VF Corporation, Inditex and C&A Global. These companies scored full points for water issues. Only two companies scored full points for their biodiversity policies, C&A Global and Inditex Group. Both companies address biodiversity issues through the promotion of organic cotton and avoidance of pesticides.

In comparison to the issues mentioned above, labour rights violations on cotton farms receive much less attention. Aside from membership of collaborative initiatives like BCI or buying Fairtrade cotton, none of the companies researched presents a policy to combat labour rights violations at farm level for its entire cotton supply. Notably, several companies, regardless of their overall performance, avoid buying cotton from countries with well-documented rights violations, such as Syria, Turkmenistan, and especially Uzbekistan.

Cotton recycling is an important step towards sustainable textile production. Hence, it is covered in this research. Full points for policy measures on recycling were awarded to IKEA Group, H&M Group, Nike, Inc., Marks & Spencer, VF Corporation, Inditex Group, Hanesbrands and Walmart. Through different approaches, these companies implement expedient and systematic measures that address the recycling of cotton on a group level. IKEA Group indicates that the processing of recycled cotton in its products plays a significant role already, as 20 per cent of its cotton used in 2015 was recycled. Other companies such as Kering, PVH, C&A Global and Adidas Group also take action on recycled cotton.

IN THE COMPANIES' POLICIES, SUSTAINABLE COTTON STANDARDS SEEMINGLY PLAY THE MOST PROMINENT ROLE

4.4 ACTUAL UPTAKE

Not all companies that have a policy (or target) to use more sustainable cotton report on their actual uptake in products. Only eight of the companies researched have published some information on their current sourcing of sustainable cotton.

The best performing company for this research overall and for actual uptake is IKEA Group. By its own criteria, which include counting towards Better Cotton⁵ and e3 cotton as more sustainable, IKEA Group already sources 100 per cent of its cotton from more sustainable sources. Of this, 77.6 per cent meets the criteria used in this assessment (57.6 per cent BCI cotton and 20 per cent recycled cotton). This is the highest reported percentage of sustainable cotton for all companies in this research.

Another 18.4 per cent comes from farmers working towards Better Cotton, while the remaining 4 per cent comes from other approved sources, such as the e3 programme in the United States. IKEA Group has reported its absolute volume of all cotton, which is 140,000 metric tonnes.

The second best performing companies for actual uptake are C&A Global and Adidas Group. As of 2015, C&A Global purchased 30 per cent sustainable cotton produced in accordance with the organic cotton or Better Cotton standards. C&A Global's remaining share of cotton was conventional, with some cotton producers working towards the Better Cotton standard. Adidas Group reports a 43 per cent use of Better Cotton in 2015. Adidas Group also states that it uses organic cotton and "any other form of sustainably produced cotton", but does not specify the percentage share or the standards used. Neither company has yet reported the total volume of cotton sourced.

Next for actual uptake are H&M Group and Marks & Spencer. H&M Group used 31.4 per cent cotton from more sustainable sources (recycled, or produced in accordance with organic or Better Cotton standards). The remaining share is conventional cotton. Marks & Spencer used 32 per cent more sustainable cotton (recycled, organic, Better Cotton or Fairtrade).

Of the remaining companies, only Nike, Inc. and VF Corporation actually report on the percentage share of more sustainable cotton used in their respective supply chains. In 2015, Nike, Inc. used 26 per cent cotton from more sustainable sources (recycled, organic or Better Cotton). VF Corporation reported that it reached its goal of sourcing 1 per cent of the cotton in its clothes, or approximately 1,800 metric tonnes, from more sustainable sources cotton in 2013. It has not provided any more recent report on its cotton use.

Of the companies that do not report how much more sustainable cotton they actually use, Kering is an interesting case. Kering states that it strives to source organic cotton, and several of its brands use organic cotton already, including Stella McCartney, Bottega Veneta, Alexander McQueen, Gucci and PUMA. However, Kering does not specify what share of its absolute cotton volume is considered more sustainable. PHV mentions that its Tommy Hilfiger brand sourced around 514 metric tonnes of Better Cotton in 2014, but does not specify what share of the cotton used by the entire group is more sustainable.

Some companies, such as Carrefour and Inditex Group, report using organic cotton, but do not specify what share of their cotton is organic or from other more sustainable sources.

4.5 TRACEABILITY

This section received the lowest scores for all brands. Few companies report on the geographic origins of their cotton supply or publish a list of manufacturers of finished products, fabric or yarn. Some companies are using cotton traceability tools for part of their cotton use, predominantly through the BCI or CottonConnect's supply chain mapping.

H&M Group provides the most comprehensive insights concerning its supply chain relations on the final production stage, and is the only company which also provides information on yarn and fabric manufacturers further down its supply chain. In contrast, H&M Group does not specify what countries it sources its cotton from or the absolute volume of cotton sourced. H&M Group tracks its more sustainable cotton orders through the BCI and organic certification, but has no further tracking measures for its non-certified cotton.

IKEA Group has published an overview of the countries of origin for 86 per cent of its cotton sourced in 2015: India (36 per cent), Pakistan (21 per cent), China (13 per cent), Turkey (7 per cent), USA (5 per cent) and Brazil (4 per cent), with the remaining 12 per cent from other, unspecified countries. IKEA Group does not publish information concerning its supply chain relations on final production, including the fabric and yarn manufacturing stage. It states that it conducted a number of traceability assessments for its cotton supply chain in 2015, and will extend these assessments to the farm level in 2016.

Nike, Inc. achieved the same score for this category as IKEA Group. It provides comprehensive insights concerning its supplier relations for the final production stage, but does not report information regarding its fabric and yarn manufacturers. Nor does it specify which countries it sources its cotton from or absolute volumes of cotton sourced. Nike, Inc. reports that it has identified traceability of cotton as a priority for the company, and is collaborating with the Sustainable Apparel Coalition (SAC) on this issue.

⁵ Towards Better Cotton are company supported projects in countries where BCI is not present.

Summary of results

The next best performing companies on traceability include C&A Global and Adidas Group. C&A Global sources its cotton from India (90 per cent), China, Pakistan, Brazil and the US. CottonConnect provides C&A Global with value chain mapping. However, the company does not specifically mention the use of a traceability tool to track its use of non-certified cotton. In May 2015 C&A Global published a list of finished product manufacturers for the first time, but did not publish respective information concerning fabric and yarn manufacturers further down the supply chain. Adidas Group also provides comprehensive insights concerning its supplier relations for the final production stage, but does not publish information regarding its fabric and yarn manufacturers. It does not clearly specify the country source of its cotton and does not report the absolute volume of cotton sourced. While Adidas Group traces the geographic origins of its more sustainable cotton, it does not mention the use of a traceability tool for its non-certified cotton.

Although Hanesbrands Inc. does not present a detailed policy for sourcing more sustainable cotton or report on its actual uptake, it mentions that it sources almost all of its cotton from the United States, so received a better traceability score than most other low scoring companies. Similarly, Hanesbrands Inc. received relatively high scores for its supply chain relations on finished products, fabric and yarn manufacturing.

Marks & Spencer reports that it has developed and implemented a system to provide traceability for the principal raw materials used within its “General Merchandise” supply chain, and that it tracks its more sustainable cotton orders through the BCI and organic certification. Kering reports that it sourced around 25,000 metric tonnes of “plant fibres” in 2014 but does not specify the exact share of cotton. It indicates that the United States and Asian countries like China and Pakistan are key sourcing locations, but has not published a clear overview of origin of the cotton used. ABF tracks its more sustainable cotton orders through CottonConnect. Burberry Group publicly reports on a pilot traceability and farm impact reduction project for one of its key supply chains originating in Peru, but there are no further details of the outcomes of this initiative.

Hudson’s Bay publishes a list of factories producing private brand apparel and the Hudson’s Bay store brands, but does not specify a percentage share of production volume. It claims that not all factories have agreed to disclose their information to the public. Target Corp. publishes a list of all factories producing its own brand products, but it is unclear what percentage of its production volume these factories represent. Some of Wesfarmers’ companies (Kmart, Target and Coles) grant insights concerning their supplier relations on the final production stage, but Wesfarmers does not report on any other traceability policies.

All other companies provide little to no information on their supply chain traceability. For instance, none of these companies report on a traceability tool for non-certified cotton, nor do they clearly specify which countries their cotton is coming from.

**MANY COMPANIES
PROVIDE LITTLE TO
NO INFORMATION
ON THEIR SUPPLY
CHAIN TRACEABILITY**





5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

While some companies work hard to set the right example, most appear to do little or nothing to address the sustainability issues associated with cotton growing. There is therefore significant room for improvement in company sourcing and reporting on sustainable cotton.

Reporting

This report highlights positive developments and outcomes achieved by some companies, but clearly demonstrates the widespread absence of publicly available information on sustainable cotton sourcing. 12 companies did not provide any information, and a total of 28 did not report on their cotton sourcing.

Policy

There is a significant lack of information on sustainable cotton policies. Standards play an important role in addressing water use, biodiversity, hazardous pesticides and labour rights issues. However, few companies specify what cotton-related policy measures they implement beyond this. Labour rights and recycling receive less attention than environmental issues in companies' sustainable cotton policies. Finally, only a few companies specify clear and time-bound targets for more sustainable cotton sourcing. Significantly, the companies with a clearly defined target scored best in the overall assessment.

Actual uptake

IKEA Group scores the highest for this report. It obtains 78 per cent of its cotton from sources defined as more sustainable in this research. Six other companies also report that part of their cotton supply is from more sustainable sources: Adidas Group, C&A Global, H&M Group, Marks & Spencer, Nike, Inc., and VF Corporation. However, very few companies clearly report their absolute volumes of cotton sourced, so it remains difficult to obtain a clear picture of cotton sourcing overall.

Traceability

Some companies work with the BCI and Cotton-Connect to trace more sustainable cotton to its source. However, public information regarding non-certified cotton and the geographic origins

of cotton is rare. Information is also limited regarding supply chain relations at the final production stage, and especially the fabric and yarn manufacturing stage. Among all companies researched, H&M Group demonstrates best practices concerning supply chain traceability, while IKEA Group provides the clearest information about the origin of its cotton.

Other considerations

The companies that received the highest scores share a number of values and goals:

- Membership of the BCI
- Commitment to use 100 per cent cotton from more sustainable sources by 2020 or earlier
- Policy on reduction of water use during cotton production
- Policy measures to minimize use of HHPs
- Policy measures on labour rights violations
- Policy measures on cotton recycling.

In contrast, even high scoring companies offer limited information regarding traceability for their entire cotton supply, supply chain relations, absolute volumes of cotton sourced and countries of origin.

While there are multiple companies that work hard to set the right example, many leading companies and their brands in the cotton industry still have much room for environmental and social improvement.

Most of the companies analysed do not have clear policies regarding a more sustainable cotton supply. These companies do not appear to prioritize sustainability or ethical business regarding the sustainability of their cotton supplies, or at least fail to adequately report on their efforts to do so.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

To reduce the negative social and environmental impacts of cotton growing, and the risks these pose to their business, companies should:

- Adopt policies on overall cotton sustainability, and specifically on the key topics of HHPs, sourcing, water, labour conditions and recycling
- Map their cotton supply chains down to country of origin of cotton
- Calculate their volume of cotton used annually
- Set a target for sustainable cotton sourcing by 2020, including the percentage of Better Cotton, organic, Fairtrade, CmiA and recycled cotton
- Develop a company-wide plan for meeting the target, including all brands in the company and all relevant departments – not just CSR or sustainability staff
- Join organizations such as BCI and/or Textile Exchange
- Seek advice from standards organizations and NGOs.

Companies that use large volumes of cotton in their products have a key role to play in encouraging the further expansion of the sustainable cotton market and supporting farmers to switch to more sustainable forms of production.

It is vital that all 37 of the companies assessed in this report send clear market signals by setting policies, increasing their purchases of cotton from more sustainable sources, and reporting transparently on their goals, performance and progress each year.

6. Appendices

6.1. QUESTIONNAIRE

Nr.	Question	Maximum points
POLICY		3.5
1	Does the company have a policy to reduce the impacts of its cotton raw material supply?	0.5
2	Has the company a policy to address the elimination of hazardous pesticide (HHP) use during field production for its entire collection?	0.5
3	Has the company a policy to address the reduction of water use during field production?	0.5
4	Has the company a policy to address biodiversity issues?	0.5
5	Has the company a policy to address cotton recycling?	0.5
6	Has the company a policy to address labour rights violations at the cotton production level?	0.5
7	Has the company a target to achieve 100% for more sustainable and time bound cotton use?	0.5
ACTUAL UPTAKE		11.0
8	Does the company use more sustainable cotton for more than 10% of its volume? (Company need to be clear about WHICH more sustainable cotton they use - only receive points for one of our endorsed standards)	1.0
9	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 20% of its volume?	1.0
10	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 30% of its volume?	1.0
11	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 40% of its volume?	1.0
12	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 50% of its volume?	1.0
13	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 60% of its volume?	1.0
14	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 70% of its volume?	1.0
15	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 80% of its volume?	1.0
16	Does the company use sustainable cotton for more than 90% of its volume?	1.0
17	Does the company use sustainable cotton for 100% of its volume?	1.0
18	Does the company report on the absolute volume of all cotton?	1.0
TRACEABILITY		5.0
19	Does the company use a traceability tool to track their use of non-certified cotton to its geographic origins?	1.0
20	Has the company published a list of finished products (garment & home textiles) manufacturers?	1.0
21	Has the company published a list of fabric manufacturers?	1.0
22	Has the company published a list of yarn manufacturers?	1.0
23	Does the company publish a list of the country of origin of the cotton used?	1.0
OTHER (NOT SCORED)		0.0
24	Does the company financially support a (more) sustainable cotton project in the field? If so, could you please briefly mention the details?	0.0
25	Is the company member/supporter of organizations that promote more sustainable cotton (e.g. BCI, CmiA, or any other)? If yes, which ones?	0.0

6.2. DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY



ADIDAS GROUP

Overall: 7.75

Adidas Group scored 7.75 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the best performing companies. Adidas Group aims to process 100 per cent Better Cotton by 2018, and has exceeded the 40 per cent threshold as of 2015.

Policy: 2.25

Adidas Group has set a target to use 100 per cent Better Cotton by 2018. Adidas Group has policies that address hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity issues, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. Adidas Group's reporting indicates that measures related to pesticides, water use, biodiversity and labour rights are implemented via the BCI. However, it does not clearly specify to what extent it implements cotton-related policy measures outside these collaborative initiatives to cover its entire cotton supply chain.

Actual uptake: 4.0

In 2015, 43 per cent of the cotton used by Adidas Group was considered more sustainable in accordance with BCI standards. Adidas Group also reports using organic cotton, but does not specify the certification standard or the volume used.

Traceability: 1.5

Adidas Group provides comprehensive insight concerning its supplier relations during the final production stage, but does not publish information regarding its fabric and yarn manufacturers. Also, Adidas Group does not clearly specify which countries it sources its cotton from or absolute volume of cotton sourced. Adidas traces the geographic origins of its more sustainable cotton, but does not mention the use of a traceability tool for its non-certified cotton.



ASSOCIATED BRITISH FOODS (ABF)

Includes Primark

Overall: 2.0

Associated British Foods (ABF) scores 2.0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. ABF does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply or its current share of sustainable cotton processed.

Policy: 1.5

ABF does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply. ABF's policies address hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity issues, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. ABF reports that it implements measures related to pesticides, water use, biodiversity and labour rights during the cotton production stage, via the CottonConnect programme. However, ABF does not clearly specify to what extent it implements cotton-related policy measures outside such collaborative initiatives to cover its entire cotton supply chain, including conventional cotton. Also, although ABF mentions recycling for multiple materials, it does not report on this initiative for cotton.

Actual uptake: 0

ABF does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable. ABF mentions some results of its CottonConnect programme, but does not communicate what part of their cotton use can be considered more sustainable, hence no points can be given.

Traceability: 0.5

ABF tracks its more sustainable cotton orders through the CottonConnect programme. However, ABF does not specifically mention the use of a traceability tool to track its use of conventional cotton. Also, ABF does not specify which countries it sources its cotton from or its absolute volume of cotton sourced. The same issue applies to traceability of its supply chain relations for finished products and fabric and yarn manufacturing: ABF provides only some vague information on the country level.

SCORED ZERO

AUCHAN GROUPE

Includes Simply Market, Jumbo, Pão de Açúcar

Overall: 0

Auchan Groupe scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. Auchan Groupe does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, report what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable, or communicate membership of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Auchan Groupe does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity issues, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Auchan Groupe does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Auchan Groupe is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for its cotton specifically.



BURBERRY GROUP

Overall: 2.25

Burberry Group scores 2.25 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. Burberry Group does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton is currently considered more sustainable.

Policy: 1.75

Burberry Group's policies address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. It implements measures via collaborative initiatives, such as the CottonConnect programme and BCI. However, Burberry Group does not clearly specify to what extent it implements cotton-related policy measures outside of these collaborative initiatives to cover its entire cotton supply chain, including conventional cotton. Furthermore, although Burberry Group has formulated a goal to move toward greater use of sustainable and recycled materials and processes, it does not report on the outcome of policy measures concerning cotton recycling. Although Burberry Group generally reports that it aims to reduce the environmental impact of its three key raw materials – leather, cotton and cashmere – it does not report a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Burberry Group does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0.5

Burberry Group publicly reports on a pilot traceability and farm impact reduction project for one of its key supply chains originating in Peru, but does not provide any further information. Burberry Group does not specify from which countries it sources its cotton or the absolute volume of cotton sourced. The same issue applies to traceability of its supply chain relations on finished products, or fabric and yarn manufacturing.



C&A GLOBAL

Overall: 9.0

C&A Global scores 9.0 out of 19.5 points, making it the second best performing company. C&A Global aims to source 100 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020, and has exceeded the 30 per cent threshold as of 2015.

Policy: 3.0

C&A Global has committed to using 100 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020. The company's policies address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. C&A Global implements measures via several collaborative initiatives, such as the CottonConnect programme, BCI, the Organic Cotton Accelerator and Textile Exchange. C&A Global's policy measures link strongly with C&A Foundation's operations. However, concerning labour rights, C&A Global has not yet explicitly addressed the entire cotton production chain. Also, the company does not receive maximum points for its cotton recycling policy because measures are only implemented on a pilot level in Europe and South America.

Actual uptake: 4.0

As of 2015, more than 30 per cent of the cotton purchased by C&A Global is considered more sustainable in accordance with the BCI and/or organic cotton standards. The remaining share of cotton processed is conventional cotton with some progress toward BCI cotton standards.

Traceability: 2.0

C&A Global sources its cotton from India (90 per cent), China, Pakistan, Brazil and the US. It implements value chain mapping with CottonConnect, but does not specifically mention the use of a traceability tool to track its use of non-certified cotton. C&A Global indicates that it sourced about 123,500 metric tonnes of cotton in 2015. In 2016, C&A Global published a list of finished products manufacturers for the first time, but did not publish respective information concerning suppliers further up the supply chain, namely fabric and yarn manufacturers.



DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY



CARREFOUR

Overall: 1.75

Carrefour scores 1.75 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. It does not communicate a target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton is currently considered more sustainable. Carrefour does not report membership of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 1.75

Carrefour does not communicate an explicit policy to address the elimination of hazardous pesticides, reduce water use or address biodiversity during field production for its entire collection of textile products. However, some of its private label textile products (TEX and TEX Home) are made of organic cotton and are GOTS certified. Carrefour does not publish policy measures to address labour rights violations at the cotton production level. Also, although Carrefour implements recycling measures related to waste, the company does not report on cotton recycling. Carrefour does not communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Carrefour offers products that contain organic cotton and are GOTS certified. However, Carrefour does not specify its overall share of more sustainable cotton processed.

Traceability: 0

Carrefour is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.



CASINO GROUP

Includes Monoprix, Leader Price, Boutchou, Arkitect, Tout Simplement..., Qualit 

Overall: 1.25

Casino Group scores 1.25 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. Casino Group does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 1.25

Casino Group only provides some general reporting regarding initiatives to reduce the impacts of its cotton raw material supply through sourcing organic cotton for some of its garments. It does not clearly specify to what extent it implements cotton-related policy measures to cover its entire cotton supply chain. Casino Group does not report any detailed policy about cotton recycling initiatives, and only provides information for consumers on how to recycle/donate their used clothing. Casino Group does not communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Casino Group does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Casino Group is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.



CHINA RESOURCES ENTERPRISE LTD.

Includes Vanguard supermarkets, Ng Fung

Overall: 1.25

China Resources Enterprise Ltd. (China Resources Textiles) scores 1.25 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. China Resources Enterprise does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton is currently considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 1.25

China Resources Enterprise Ltd. states in its "Green Procurement" initiative that the company has been increasing its procurement of organic cotton. However, it does not clearly specify to what extent it implements cotton-related policy measures to cover its entire cotton supply chain, including conventional cotton – for example, measures to eliminate hazardous pesticide use during field production. China Resources Enterprise Ltd. does not report any detailed policy about cotton recycling initiatives, nor does it communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

China Resources Enterprise Ltd. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

China Resources Textiles publishes a list of 12 suppliers, but has not published an explicit list of, or finished products, such as fabric. It does not specifically mention any traceability tool to track its use of non-certified cotton. Also, China Resources Enterprise Ltd. does not specify from which countries it sources cotton or the absolute volume of cotton processed.

SCORED ZERO

COACH, INC.

Overall: 0

Coach, Inc. scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. Coach, Inc. does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Coach, Inc. does not provide concrete reporting on a sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity issues, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Coach, Inc. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Coach, Inc. is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.

SCORED ZERO

DILLARD'S INC.

Overall: 0

Dillard's Inc. scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. Dillard's Inc. does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Dillard's Inc. does not provide concrete reporting on policies to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Dillard's Inc. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Dillard's Inc. is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.



FAST RETAILING

Includes Uniqlo, Comptoir de Cotonniers, J Brand, GU, Theory

Overall: 0.5

Fast Retailing scores 0.5 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weakest performing companies. Fast Retailing does not communicate a target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton is currently considered more sustainable. Also, Fast Retailing does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0.5

Fast Retailing has published very little information on an existing sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations. Fast Retailing only specifies that it verifies the sustainable operations of some of its Chinese cotton providers, including the appropriate use of pesticides and water. The company reports that it collects garments from its customers within its "all-product recycling initiative", but implements this initiative at stores for only two brands: Uniqlo and GU. Fast Retailing does not communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Fast Retailing does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Fast Retailing is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or cotton specifically.



DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY

SCORED ZERO



FOOT LOCKER, INC.

Overall: 0

Foot Locker, Inc. scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst-performing companies. Foot Locker, Inc. does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report what percentage of its current cotton supply is considered sustainable. Foot Locker, Inc. does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Foot Locker, Inc. does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Foot Locker, Inc. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Foot Locker, Inc. is not transparent with respect to its supply chain or for cotton specifically.

GAP INC.

Overall: 0.5

Gap Inc. scores 0.5 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weakest performing companies. Gap Inc. does not communicate a target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its cotton is currently considered more sustainable. Also, Gap Inc. does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0.5

Gap Inc. has published very little information on an existing sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations. Gap Inc. only communicates that the company is developing a strategy to protect people and the environment from the negative impacts of cotton production. It does not report a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Gap Inc. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Gap Inc. publishes only a very general overview of source countries for factories that supply branded clothing; it does not specify which countries it sources cotton from or its absolute volume of cotton sourced. Gap Inc. does not specifically mention the use of a traceability tool to track the company's cotton use.

H&M GROUP

Includes Monki, Weekday, Cheap Monday, & Other Stories

Overall: 9.0

H&M Group scores 9.0 out of 19.5 points, making it the second best performing company. H&M Group aims to source 100 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020, and has exceeded the 30 per cent threshold as of 2015.

Policy: 2.5

H&M Group has a target to use 100 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020. H&M Group has policies that address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. H&M Group's reporting indicates that it implements measures via several collaborative initiatives, such as the BCI and the Organic Cotton Accelerator. However, H&M does not clearly specify to what extent it implements cotton-related policy measures outside these initiatives to cover its entire cotton supply chain including conventional cotton.

Actual uptake: 3.0

In 2015, 30 per cent of the cotton used by the H&M Group was considered more sustainable. This cotton was either recycled or produced in accordance to organic cotton and/or BCI standards. The remaining share was conventional cotton.

Traceability: 3.5

Among all companies assessed, H&M Group provides the most comprehensive insights concerning its supply chain relations during the final production stage, as well as the fabric and yarn manufacturing stage. However, H&M Group does not specify from which countries it sources its cotton or its absolute volume of cotton procured. H&M Group tracks its more sustainable cotton orders through the BCI and organic certification. However, further tracking measures for the company's non-certified cotton have not yet been implemented.

DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY



HANESBRANDS, INC.

Includes Champion, Wonderbra

Overall: 2.0

Hanesbrands, Inc. scores 2.0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. Hanesbrands, Inc. does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its current cotton supply is considered sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 1.0

Hanesbrands, Inc. reports that it recognizes that growing cotton has an impact on the environment, including water usage and the use of pesticides and herbicides. However, Hanesbrands, Inc. does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water, biodiversity or labour rights violations. Nor does it report a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future, though the company reports that it recycles cotton fabric waste from cutting operations.

Actual uptake: 0

Hanesbrands, Inc. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 1.0

Hanesbrands, Inc. sources almost all of its cotton from the United States, but does not report which countries supply the remainder nor the absolute volume of cotton sourced. The same issue applies to traceability in regards to Hanesbrands, Inc.'s supply chain relations on finished products, and fabric and yarn manufacturing.

SCORED ZERO

HERMÈS INTERNATIONAL S.A.

Overall: 0

Hermès International S.A. scores 0 out of 19.5, making it one of the worst performing companies. Hermès International S.A. does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Hermès International S.A. does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Hermès International S.A. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Hermès International S.A. is not transparent with respect to its supply chain of in general or for cotton specifically.



HUDSON'S BAY CO.

Overall: 1.0

Hudson's Bay Co. scores 1.0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. Hudson's Bay Co. does not communicate a target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton currently processed is considered sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0.5

Hudson's Bay Co. does not report a clear target to use more sustainable cotton. It reports that its key supplier (M/S Trident) for branded towels is a member of the BCI, but does not communicate any policy on sustainable cotton on a group level. This issue also applies to cotton recycling and labour rights issues on the cotton growing level. Hudson's Bay's subsidiary Galeria Kaufhof offers textile products that contain organic cotton, mainly certified to the standards OCS 100, GOTS, or bioRe. These certifications at least partially address issues such as the use of hazardous pesticides, water consumption and biodiversity.

Actual uptake: 0

Hudson's Bay Co. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0.5

Hudson's Bay Co. publishes a list of factories producing private brand apparel and the Hudson's Bay store brands, but does not specify a percentage share of total production volume. According to Hudson's Bay Co., this is because not all factories have agreed to disclose their information to the public. Hudson's Bay does not specifically mention use of a traceability tool to track its use of non-certified cotton. Also, Hudson's Bay Co. does not specify which countries it sources its cotton from or its absolute volume sourced.



IKEA GROUP

Overall: 12.0

IKEA Group scored 12.0 out of 19.5 points. It is the best performing company for this research concerning policy, actual uptake. By its own criteria, IKEA Group met its goal of using 100% cotton from more sustainable sources in 2015. However, in calculating its achievement, IKEA Group includes the e3 standard and its own initiative 'towards Better Cotton' which are not recommended by PAN UK, Solidaridad and WWF. According to criteria used in this research, 77.6 per cent of IKEA's supply is more sustainable (57.6 per cent BCI cotton and 20 per cent recycled cotton).

Policy: 2.0

IKEA Group's policy addresses issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. Its reporting indicates that it implements measures related to pesticides, water use, biodiversity and labour rights via the BCI, towards Better Cotton and e3. IKEA Group's goal is to use only more sustainable cotton by the end of financial year 2015, so it has not set a post-2016 goal. It is not clear whether the company plans to achieve 100 per cent more sustainable cotton without standards such as towards Better Cotton and e3 cotton.

Actual uptake: 8.0

By its own criteria, IKEA Group met its goal of using 100% cotton from more sustainable sources in 2015. However, in calculating its achievement, IKEA Group includes the e3 standard and its own initiative 'towards Better Cotton' which are not recommended by PAN UK, Solidaridad and WWF. According to criteria used in this research, 77.6 per cent of IKEA's supply is more sustainable (57.6 per cent Better Cotton and 20 per cent recycled cotton). For the remainder, 18.4 per cent is sourced from farmers working towards the Better Cotton standard, and 4 per cent is e3.

Traceability: 2.0

IKEA Group publishes an overview of the countries of origin for 86 per cent of its cotton sourced in 2015: India (36 per cent), Pakistan (21 per cent), China (13 per cent), Turkey (7 per cent), US (5 per cent) and Brazil (4 per cent), with the remaining 12 per cent sourced from other, unspecified countries. It reports that it sourced about 140,000 metric tonnes of cotton in 2015. IKEA Group does not publish Information concerning supply chain relations for final products or fabric and yarn manufacturing. It states that it has conducted a number of traceability assessments for its cotton supply chain in 2015, and will extend these assessments to the farm level in 2016.



INDITEX GROUP

Includes Zara, Pull&Bear, Massimo Dutti, Bershka

Overall: 2.5

Inditex Group scored 2.5 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. Inditex Group does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable.

Policy: 2.5

Inditex Group's policies address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. Inditex Group implements measures via several collaborative initiatives, such as BCI and Textile Exchange. However, it does not clearly specify to what extent it implements policy measures to cover the company's entire cotton supply chain, especially in regards to hazardous pesticides use and labour rights violations. Inditex group does not report a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Inditex Group reports on using organic cotton. However, it does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Inditex Group is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically. Inditex Group has a policy to improve the traceability of all production, but does not specify reporting related to non-certified cotton.

DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY

SCORED ZERO



JCPENNEY

Overall: 0

JCPenney scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. JCPenney does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report what percentage of its current supply is considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

JCPenney does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity or cotton recycling. JCPenney's labour policy measures indicate that compliance teams must meet increased expectations and deal with the complexity of cotton from Uzbekistan, but do not specify whether labour rights violations are addressed for the entire cotton supply chain.

Actual uptake: 0

JCPenney does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

JCPenney is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.

KERING

Includes PUMA, Gucci, Volcom, Stella McCartney

Overall: 3.0

Kering scores 3.0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. Kering does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its current supply is considered more sustainable.

Policy: 2.0

Kering's policies address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. Kering implements measures via several collaborative initiatives, such as Textile Exchange and Organic Cotton Accelerator. Kering does not clearly specify to what extent cotton-related policy measures cover Kering's entire cotton supply chain, with the exception of measures aimed at water use. The company does not communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future. Though Kering does not report on a general policy concerning cotton recycling, some of its brands (PUMA, Volcom and Stella McCartney) have recycling measures in place.

Actual uptake: 0.5

Kering states that it strives toward organic cotton sourcing, and several of its brands process organic cotton already, including Stella McCartney, Bottega Veneta, Alexander McQueen, Gucci and PUMA. However, Kering does not specify what share of its absolute cotton volume is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0.5

Kering reports that it sourced around 25,000 metric tonnes of "plant fibers" in 2014, but does not specify the exact share of cotton. It indicates that the United States and Asian countries like China, Vietnam, Thailand and Pakistan are key sourcing locations for cotton, but has not published a clear overview of origin of the cotton used in its supply chain. The same issue applies to traceability in regards to its supply chain relations on finished products, and fabric and yarn manufacturing. Kering has a policy to improve the traceability of its raw materials, and states that through working with suppliers for the "Environmental Profit & Loss" assessment (EP&L) cotton tracking will improve. However, it does not specify any current progress on this initiative.

L BRANDS (LIMITED BRANDS)

Overall: 12.0

Includes Victoria's Secret, Pink, La Senza

Overall: 0.5

L Brands scores 0.5 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weakest performing companies. L Brands does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton is currently considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0.5

L Brands has published very little information on an existing sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity issues, cotton recycling or labour rights violations. L Brands only communicates that it established a pilot program in 2007 to source Fairtrade certified organic cotton from primarily women farmers in Burkina Faso. However, the latest reporting on this dates back to 2012. L Brands does not communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

L Brands does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

L Brands is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or cotton specifically.



LVMH

Includes Louis Vuitton, Donna Karen,
Marc Jacobs, Christian Dior

Overall: 0.75

LVMH scores 0.75 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weakest performing companies. It does not communicate a concrete target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply and does not report what share of its current supply is considered more sustainable. LVMH does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0.75

LVMH reports that it implements several measures to reduce the impact of its cotton raw material supply, especially regarding its water consumption. The company also mentions goals to increase the amount of Better Cotton used, but does not include specific targets. LVMH does not provide any information on policies regarding the use of hazardous pesticides, biodiversity, recycling or labour rights related to its entire cotton supply chain.

Actual uptake: 0

LVMH does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

LVMH is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically. LVMH reports that the traceability and compliance of the materials used in its products is a priority for the company, but does not report on any measures to track its use of cotton.



DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY



MACY'S, INC.

Includes American Rag, bar III, Belgique, JM Collection, Style&Co.

Overall: 1.25

Macy's, Inc. scores 1.25 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. It does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton is currently considered more sustainable. Macy's Inc. does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 1.25

Macy's Inc. only provides some general reporting on reducing impacts from its cotton raw material supply, such as sourcing organic cotton and aiming to trace production of its organic cotton. It does not clearly specify what policy measures it implements to cover the company's entire cotton supply chain, including conventional cotton. Macy's Inc. does not report any detailed policy about cotton recycling initiatives, and only provides information for consumers on how to recycle/donate their used clothing. Macy's Inc. does not communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Macy's, Inc. does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Macy's, Inc. is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or cotton specifically.



MARKS & SPENCER

Overall: 5.5

Marks & Spencer scores 5.5 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the better performing companies. It aims to process 70 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020, and has exceeded the 30 per cent threshold as of 2015.

Policy: 2.0

Marks & Spencer has a target to use 70 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020. Its policies address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. Marks & Spencer's reporting indicates that it implements measures via several collaborative initiatives, such as the BCI and Fairtrade. However, it is not clear what policy measures it implements outside these initiatives to cover its entire cotton supply chain.

Actual uptake: 3.0

In 2015, 32 per cent of the cotton used by the Marks & Spencer was considered more sustainable, meeting organic, BCI and/or Fairtrade standards. The remaining share was conventional cotton.

Traceability: 0.5

Marks & Spencer reports that it has developed and implemented a system to provide traceability for the principal raw materials within its "General Merchandise" supply chain. The company also reports that it tracks its more sustainable cotton orders through the BCI and organic certification. However, Marks & Spencer does not specifically mention the use of a traceability tool to track its use of non-certified cotton. Marks & Spencer does not specify which countries its cotton is sourced from, and is not clear about its absolute volume of cotton sourced. The same issue applies to traceability in supply chain relations on finished products, and fabric and yarn manufacturing.



NIKE, INC.

Overall: 6.75

Nike, Inc. scores 6.75 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the better performing companies. Nike aims to process 100 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020, and has exceeded the 20 per cent threshold as of 2015.

Policy: 2.75

Nike, Inc. has a target to use more sustainable cotton by 2020. Nike, Inc.'s policies address issues including hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violation. Nike, Inc. reports that it implements measures related to pesticides, water use, biodiversity and labour rights via the BCI. With the exception of water use, Nike, Inc. does not clearly specify to what extent cotton related policy measures cover its supply chain.

Actual uptake: 2.0

In 2015, 26 per cent of the cotton used by Nike, Inc. was considered more sustainable. This cotton was either recycled or produced in accordance with organic cotton and/or BCI standards. The remaining share was conventional cotton.

Traceability: 2.0

Nike, Inc. provides comprehensive insights concerning its supplier relations at the final production stage, but does not provide information regarding its fabric and yarn manufacturers. It does not specify which countries it sources its cotton from or the absolute volume. However, Nike, Inc. reports that the traceability of its cotton has been identified as a priority, and it collaborates with the Sustainable Apparel Coalition (SAC).

SCORED ZERO

NORDSTROM INC.

Overall: o

Nordstrom Inc. scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. It does not communicate a target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply or what share of its cotton processed is currently considered sustainable. Nordstrom Inc. does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: o

Nordstrom Inc. does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: o

Nordstrom Inc. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: o

Nordstrom Inc. is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.



PVH

Includes Calvin Klein, Tommy Hilfiger, Speedo

Overall: 1.75

PVH scores 1.75 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. PVH's reporting on policy measures for more sustainable cotton is mainly limited to the operations of its brand Tommy Hilfiger. Only for Tommy Hilfiger does PVH report a target to source 100 per cent more sustainable cotton by 2020. PVH does not communicate the share of more sustainable cotton used for its entire range of textile products.

Policy: 1.75

Only Tommy Hilfiger reports a target to use only sustainable cotton by 2020. PVH has policies that address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. Its reporting indicates that the Tommy Hilfiger brand implements measures related to pesticides, water use, biodiversity and labour rights via the BCI. In contrast, PVH does not clearly specify what policy measures it implements to cover the rest of its cotton supply chain. PVH reports measures concerning cotton recycling for Tommy Hilfiger only.

Actual uptake: o

PVH does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable. PVH only reports that Tommy Hilfiger sourced around 514,000kg of Better Cotton in 2014.

Traceability: o

PVH is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.

SCORED ZERO

RALPH LAUREN CORPORATION

Overall: o

Ralph Lauren Corporation scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. It does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. Ralph Lauren Corporation does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: o

Ralph Lauren Corporation does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: o

Ralph Lauren Corporation does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: o

Ralph Lauren Corporation is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.



SCORED ZERO

RICHEMONT SA

Includes Chloë, Peter Millar

Overall: 0

Richemont SA scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst-performing companies. It does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its cotton supply is currently considered more sustainable. Richemont SA does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Richemont SA does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Richemont SA does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Richemont SA is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.

DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY

SCORED ZERO

ROSS STORES

Overall: 0

Ross Stores scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. It does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. Ross Stores does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Ross Stores does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Ross Stores does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Ross Stores is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.



TARGET CORP.

Overall: 0.75

Target Corp. scores 0.75 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weakest performing companies. It does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. Target Corp. does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0.25

Target Corp. has published very little information on an existing sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations. It only specifies that it has conducted a life-cycle assessment of a T-shirt – starting from growing cotton to end-of-life disposal. Target Corp. has reported no clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Target Corp. does not specify what share of its cotton processed is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0.5

Target Corp. publishes a list of all factories producing its own brand products. However, it is unclear what percentage of production volume these factories represent. Target Corp. does not provide any other information on fabric or yarn manufacturers, and does not specifically mention the use of a traceability tool to track its non-certified cotton. The company does not specify which countries it sources from or its absolute volume of cotton.

SCORED ZERO

TJX

Includes T.J. Maxx, T.K. Maxx, Marshalls

Overall: 0

TJX scores 0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the worst performing companies. It does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its cotton supply is currently considered sustainable. TJX does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

TJX does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity issues, cotton or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

TJX does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

TJX is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton specifically.

DETAILED RESULTS BY COMPANY



VF CORPORATION

Includes The North Face, Lee, Wrangler, Napapijri, Timberland, Jansport, Eastpak, Vans

Overall: 3.25

VF Corporation scored 3.25 points out of 19.5, making it one of the weaker performing companies. VF Corporation does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its cotton supply is currently considered more sustainable.

Policy: 2.25

VF Corporation's policies address issues concerning hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling and labour rights violations. VF Corporation implements measures via collaborative initiatives, such as the BCI. However, it does not clearly specify to what extent it implements cotton related policy measures outside of these initiatives to cover VF Corporation's entire cotton supply chain. VF Corporation does not communicate a target to use more sustainable cotton. However, it reports that it recycles denim waste.

Actual uptake: 1.0

For 2013 VF Corporation reported that it reached its goal of using 1 per cent cotton from more sustainable sources in its clothes, or approximately 1,800 metric tonnes. However, more recent figures on the share of more sustainable cotton processed have not been reported.

Traceability: 0

VF Corporation reports that it annually sources about 200,000 metric tonnes of cotton, but does not specify which countries it sources its cotton from. The same issue applies to traceability regarding its supply chain relations for finished products or fabric and yarn manufacturing. VF Corporation reports policy measures to improve traceability of raw materials such as down and wool, but does not report on non-certified cotton.



WALMART

Overall: 1.0

Walmart scores 1.0 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weaker performing companies. It does not communicate any target to achieve a more sustainable cotton supply, and does not report the share of its current cotton supply that is considered more sustainable. Walmart does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 1.0

In 2010, Walmart announced its ambition to be the largest purchaser of organic cotton. However, it has not published any policies on how it will reach this goal or a status update. Walmart does not provide any information on policies regarding the use of hazardous pesticides, biodiversity or labour rights for its entire cotton supply chain. However, Walmart does implement several measures for utilizing post-consumer textile waste. So far, Walmart has developed methods for post-consumer textiles to be turned into such items as bow ties, purses and polyester hang tags. Walmart does not communicate a clear target to use more sustainable cotton in the future.

Actual uptake: 0

Walmart does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0

Walmart is not transparent with respect to its supply chain in general or for cotton supply specifically.



WESFARMERS

Includes Coles, Kmart (Australia), Target (Australia)

Overall: 0.5

Wesfarmers scores 0.5 out of 19.5 points, making it one of the weakest performing companies. Wesfarmers does not communicate any target to achieve a 100 per cent more sustainable cotton supply, or what share of its current cotton supply is considered more sustainable. It does not communicate whether it is a member of any collaborative initiative on more sustainable cotton.

Policy: 0

Wesfarmers does not provide concrete reporting on its sustainable cotton policy to address issues such as hazardous pesticides, water use, biodiversity, cotton recycling or labour rights violations.

Actual uptake: 0

Wesfarmers does not specify what share of its cotton is considered more sustainable.

Traceability: 0.5

Some of Wesfarmers' companies (Kmart, Target and Coles) provide insights concerning their supplier relations during the final production stage. However, Wesfarmers does not publish information regarding fabric and yarn manufacturers. It does not specify which countries it sources its cotton from or its absolute volume of cotton. Wesfarmers does not specifically mention the use of a traceability tool to track its use of non-certified cotton.



