

Title: Remake's Inaugural Transparency Report Sets New Standards

Written By: Svitlana Hrabovsky

Date: 11/19/20

With the triumph of its most recent #PayUp campaign, which successfully recovered over \$15 billion in lost wages globally, human rights nonprofit *Remake* is at it again with the release of its inaugural transparency report.¹

The report, which debuted live online on October 16th, creates a ranking system that holds brands equally accountable for their supposed (or not) sustainable practices.

Ayesha Barenblat, founder and chief executive officer of *Remake* said her influence for publishing the report was due to the fact that for too long, the research for sustainability has more often than not been paid for by the brands. In the end, this proves to be ineffective and hinders progress as there is no standard of accountability.

"Whenever brands don't meet the criteria, we just change the goal posts," says Barenblat. "You can't just buy your way for a sustainable future," she continued, in a way as if to entice the crowd and confront the way brands have recently begun to embrace sustainability, as if it were just another trend for them to pick up.

The report was comprised of diverse insight from experts in climate, human rights, water and waste, as well as consultations from university partners such as Timo Rissanen, associate professor of fashion and textiles at University of Technology Sydney, and Lynda Grose, chair of fashion design at California College of the Arts. Additionally, the ratings concluded by Remake's report are based solely on information that has been publicly shared.

Remake's core pillars are based on the ideas of "transparency, education and leadership development", and to stay true to these, research was funded by the Remake team, as well as its nonprofit partners and 600-member Remake ambassador network.

The report creates four possible categories for brands to fall into: "rock stars", "offenders", "wannabes", and "up-and-comers", each based on a scale of 100 points. The higher the score, the better in this case. An acceptable and desired score of over 50 may only be obtained if a brand meets the necessary criteria for workers' wellbeing as well as environmental sustainability. Other categories beyond these include traceability, transparency, use of sustainable raw materials, and diversity and inclusion, specifically in leadership roles.

Ranked lowest was popular streetwear brand Supreme, who earned a disappointing overall score of 0. The brand, which was recently acquired by VF Corp. in a 2.1 billion deal, earned the score due to its utter lack of public disclosure.

¹ [This Hashtag Unlocked \\$15 Billion of Lost Wages Due to Cancelled Orders From Gap, Levi's, and Other Brands](#)

“Earning 0 points in our framework, there is no mention of sustainability on the Supreme website,” read the Remake transparency report. “Time for Supreme to step up and address its carbon and human rights impact...”

Other brands who earned low scores for similar reasons included Boohoo, Urban Outfitters and Missguided, each of which earned only 5 points or less. In addition to a lack of public disclosure these brands also failed to set sustainability targets for the future. Speaking to Urban Outfitters, Remake said, “While we commend Urban for not using plastic bags in its brick-and-mortar stores, it has a long road ahead of it. Urban needs to be more transparent about its material, carbon, human rights and waste impacts. Urban partakes in greenwashing by talking up its philanthropic community initiatives rather than focusing on the impact of its products on workers’ lives and our planet.”

Other low-scorers, who could not reach a score above 36 points, included popular fast-fashion giants such as Zara, Uniqlo and H&M Group, as well as e-commerce “sustainability” favorites Allbirds and Everlane. Each of these failed to disclose any key details regarding worker wellbeing and transparency.

“Publishing photos of its factories tells us nothing about the wellbeing of workers, how much they are paid or how the brand monitors conditions,” read a note in reference to Everlane’s score.

Though Allbirds presents itself publicly as a sustainable brand, and has received previous acclaim for their efforts in accounting for carbon offsets and sharing factory locations, they ultimately keep consumers blind to who is making their shoes, how they are treated, and how well they are being paid for their labor, notes *Remake*.

Brands who scored enough points to make the “rock star” list include Patagonia, Mara Hoffman, Nudie Jeans, Mud Jeans, Outerknown, Organic Basics, Girlfriend Collective and Nisolo Shoes

Patagonia has long stood out as an industry standard for their sincerity towards being ethical and sustainable. *Remake* noted the brands use of Fair Trade Certified factories, as well as being transparent about worker wellbeing. Mud Jeans and Outerknown were also commended for their sustainable supply chains, which used water saving practices, such as the use of recycled water and reusable fabrics.

On the “wannabes” list, which implies progress but still a ways to go, were brands like Reformation, Madewell, Lululemon and Nike, to name a few. Scores in this category averaged between 18 and 62. Many were ultimately downranked due to greenwashing attempts, something that has unfortunately become an industry standard.

Brands in this category have become guilty of boasting of “one-off” sustainable collections. These, like Madewell’s eco-denim collection, often manage to catch the attention of the public, but do little to achieve an impact towards securing a sustainable textile economy for the future. Remake noted though they “may be practicing sustainability, [but] the unfortunate truth is that the rest of Madewell’s apparel line doesn’t come anywhere close in its transparency efforts,”

Opposingly, up and coming brands such as Prana, Known Supply and Soko Jewelry (all certified Benefit Corporations) were noted as being “small but mighty.”

A serious point of concern noted by Barenblat was nearly every brand's low scoring in the leadership, diversity and inclusion category.

“These brands are so good at marketing sustainability — is there any substance? Across the board, we downgraded every brand when we took a hard look at D&I,” she added.

“[Representation] looks fundamentally different than the Black and brown women who bring our clothes to life.”

As for the future, Barenblat is hopeful that brands will continue to make necessary improvements, and that what she has created with the report becomes a “go-to resource to get brands to disclose in a fair and easy-to-understand way.”²

² [Supreme, Allbirds, Everlane Among Remake's Sustainability 'Offenders'](#)