RELOOM

HOW WE ASSESS FASHION BRANDS.

Our assessment methodology: what we measure, how it is weighted, how the score is calculated, how answers are labelled, and what it can and cannot tell you.



PUBLIC METHODOLOGY SUMMARY · VERSION 3.0
NOVEMBER 2026
SCORING RUBRIC INDEPENDENTLY REVIEWED BY ERM IBERIA
RELOOM.ME · INFO@RELOOM.ME

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

Reloom assesses fashion brands across five areas of impact. The assessment helps a brand understand where it stands, evidence what it does, and make claims it can stand behind. An assessment is only useful if the method behind it can be examined.

This document sets out that method in full: the pillars and their weights, the sub-categories within them, how much a given answer is worth, the six-step calculation, the internal rating bands, how answers are labelled documented or declared, and how evidence and claims are checked.

It also states which parts of the methodology we do not publish, and why.

WHAT WE PUBLISH

- The five pillars and their weights
- Every sub-category, and its weight
- Illustrative examples of the questions asked
- The full six-step calculation logic
- The four question types and their ranking
- The internal rating bands and their thresholds
- What “documented” and “declared” mean
- How evidence and claims are checked
- The frameworks and regulation the rubric draws on
- The limitations of the assessment

WHAT WE DO NOT PUBLISH

- Individual brand scores or ratings
- The full question set, the answer options and their point values
- The weighting multiplier for each question type
- The thresholds behind the high-volume production cap

Reasoning. A brand with access to the exact arithmetic could optimise its answers against that arithmetic rather than change its practice. Withholding the detailed mechanics stops the assessment becoming a form-filling exercise. Brand scores are not published because the score is a tool for the brand’s own progress, not a public rating.

Independent review. ERM Iberia, an independent third party, reviewed the Reloom scoring rubric, and we revised it in response. The review covers the scoring rubric, not the claims checker or the regulatory recommendations. We welcome methodological challenge from brands, retailers, researchers and civil society organisations.

WHAT A RELOOM ASSESSMENT IS, AND IS NOT

A Reloom assessment is a structured review of a brand's sustainability practices. The brand completes it, links supporting documents to its answers, and receives an internal score, a gap analysis, regulatory recommendations and outputs it can share.

Reloom only assesses brands that take part. We do not build assessments of brands from public information alone.

It is not verification or assurance.

Reloom reviews documents. It does not audit factories, visit sites or test products, and it does not confirm that a practice happens as described.

It is not a certification, label or seal of approval.

Reloom does not accredit brands and does not license a mark for use on products. A brand cannot present its Reloom assessment as a sustainability label, or as evidence that it is "sustainable".

It is not a public rating.

Reloom does not publish brand scores or rank brands against each other. The score exists so that a brand can track its own progress over time.

It is not a product-level environmental claim.

An assessment describes a company's practices, systems and outcomes. It does not describe the environmental footprint of an individual garment.

It is not legal advice.

The claims checker and regulatory recommendations flag risk against published rules and guidance. Brands remain responsible for their own claims.

It is a point-in-time assessment.

Suppliers, materials and ownership change. Every output states the date of the assessment and the date each document was linked.

Terminology. Reloom does not describe brands, answers or reports as "verified", "certified" or "audited" by Reloom. Evidence review is a documentary process, and those terms imply a level of assurance we do not provide. We describe what we do: we assess, we review documents, and we label each answer documented or declared.

03 — EVIDENCE LABELS

DOCUMENTED AND DECLARED

Every answer a brand gives carries one of two labels. The label travels with the answer into every output: the brand's results, the claims register, the public profile and the retailer report.

LABEL	WHAT IT MEANS	WHAT IT DOES NOT MEAN
DOCUMENTED	The brand has linked at least one supporting document to the answer, such as a policy, certificate, audit report, supplier list, wage record or test report. Reloom has checked that the document is relevant to the answer, is in date and comes from the named source.	That Reloom has confirmed the practice happens as described, or that the document itself is accurate.
DECLARED	The brand gave the answer without a supporting document, or the document linked was not accepted because it was not relevant, out of date or incomplete.	That the answer is false or that the practice is absent. Many smaller brands do real work they have not formally documented.

On the Reloom website, documented answers are marked with a paperclip and declared answers with a bullet.

HOW THE LABEL IS SET

- No accepted document is linked to the answer: the answer is **declared**.
- An accepted document is linked: the answer is **documented**, and outputs name the type of document. For certificates, this is its type: scope, transaction or product certificate.
- Where an answer relies on third-party accreditation or assessment that the brand describes but has not supplied, it is worded "The brand reports…".
- When a linked document expires, such as a certificate or an audit, the answer returns to declared until the brand links a current one.

Effect on the score. Documented and declared answers are scored the same way. The label shows how much of the picture is backed by documents; it does not add or remove points.

04 — WHAT WE MEASURE

THE FIVE PILLARS

Every brand is assessed against the same five pillars. The weights are fixed, published, and applied identically to a two-person label and to a global group.

They were set by reference to where the sector's impact is concentrated, drawing on Textile Exchange, the Ellen MacArthur Foundation, the ILO, the Fashion Transparency Index and the EU due-diligence frameworks.

PLANET — 25%

Climate and Scope 3 emissions, water use, wastewater and chemical pollution, hazardous waste, microplastics, biodiversity. Approximately 80–90% of the sector's environmental harm occurs in the value chain, is irreversible, and cannot be offset by reporting.

PEOPLE — 25%

Labour and human rights, fair wages and progress toward living wages, health and safety, worker voice and grievance mechanisms, consumer safety, diversity and inclusion, community impact. Around 75 million people work in the industry, the majority in high-risk geographies. Social outcomes are not substitutable by policy documents, so People carries the same weight as Planet.

CIRCULARITY AND MATERIALS — 25%

Material selection, design for longevity and recyclability, resale, repair and take-back, packaging, waste reduction. Design and material decisions determine 70–80% of a garment's lifetime impact, which is why this pillar is weighted alongside Planet and People rather than below them.

SUPPLY CHAIN — 15%

Traceability, supplier onboarding and assessment, due diligence, disclosure of sourcing. Weighted below the impact pillars because transparency measures systems rather than outcomes; weighting it more heavily would reward reporting sophistication over performance. Without it, however, no other claim can be substantiated.

ANIMAL WELFARE — 10%

Sourcing and welfare standards for leather, wool, cashmere, down, silk and exotic skins. Narrower in scope than the other pillars, as many brands use no animal materials, but material where it applies. The pillar scales with a brand's actual exposure (section 08).

Each pillar is divided into weighted sub-categories, set out in section 05.

SUB-CATEGORIES AND THEIR WEIGHTS

Each pillar is divided into sub-categories, weighted within the pillar. Areas of direct environmental or social harm, and areas of large-scale or systemic impact, carry more weight. Enabling functions such as governance, environmental management and internal visibility carry less, so that they cannot substitute for performance.

Sub-category weights are percentages of their own pillar, not of the overall score. A sub-category weighted at 22% of Planet contributes 22% of 25%, approximately 5.5% of a brand's overall score.

The example questions are illustrative. The full question set, the answer options and the point values attached to them are not published.

PLANET — 25% OF THE OVERALL SCORE

SUB-CATEGORY	WEIGHT	EXAMPLE OF THE KIND OF QUESTION ASKED
Climate	22%	Have you measured Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions, and by what percentage have absolute Scope 3 emissions changed against your baseline year?
Water pollution & wastewater	17%	Do your wet-processing suppliers treat wastewater before discharge, and is effluent tested against ZDHC or equivalent limits?
Water consumption	13%	Do you measure water use at Tier 2 processing facilities, and have you set and met a reduction target?
Hazardous chemicals & waste	13%	Do you operate a Restricted Substances List and a Manufacturing RSL, and how is supplier compliance confirmed?
Environmental pollution (non-water)	10%	Do you monitor air emissions, soil contamination and pollution incidents at manufacturing sites?
Non-hazardous waste	10%	What proportion of production waste is diverted from landfill, and is that figure tracked year on year?
Environmental management	8%	Do you hold ISO 14001 certification, or operate an equivalent environmental management system?
Nature & biodiversity	5%	Do you assess biodiversity and deforestation risk in the regions from which you source raw materials?
Microplastics	2%	Do you take measures to reduce microfibre shedding from synthetic materials in production or in use?

PEOPLE AND CIRCULARITY

PEOPLE — 25% OF THE OVERALL SCORE

SUB-CATEGORY	WEIGHT	EXAMPLE OF THE KIND OF QUESTION ASKED
Labour & human rights	23%	Do you conduct human rights due diligence across Tier 1 and Tier 2, and what remediation has followed the issues identified?
Fair wages & compensation	23%	Can you evidence payment of at least the legal minimum wage at Tier 1, and what progress has been made against a recognised living wage benchmark?
Health & safety	14%	Is a health and safety management plan implemented at Tier 1, and what are the recorded incident rates?
Worker voice & grievance	12%	Do workers in your supply chain have access to an independent grievance mechanism, and how many cases were raised and resolved?
Consumer safety	10%	Are products tested for harmful substances against OEKO-TEX or an equivalent standard?
Governance	8%	Is there board-level accountability for sustainability performance, and is it linked to remuneration?
Diversity, equity & inclusion	5%	Do you have diversity, equity and inclusion targets for leadership and other employee levels?
Community impact	5%	Do you invest in or support the communities in which your products are made?

CIRCULARITY AND MATERIALS — 25% OF THE OVERALL SCORE

SUB-CATEGORY	WEIGHT	EXAMPLE OF THE KIND OF QUESTION ASKED
Materials & products	40%	What proportion of your materials are certified recycled, organic or otherwise preferred (for example GOTS, GRS, RWS), and how has that proportion changed?
Designing for sustainability and circularity	30%	Do you apply design criteria for durability, repairability and recyclability, and are they applied across all new styles?
Circular initiatives	20%	Do you operate take-back, repair or resale services, and what volume of garments has passed through them?
Packaging	10%	Is your packaging recycled, recyclable or FSC-certified, and across what share of orders?

SUPPLY CHAIN AND ANIMAL WELFARE

SUPPLY CHAIN — 15% OF THE OVERALL SCORE

SUB-CATEGORY	WEIGHT	EXAMPLE OF THE KIND OF QUESTION ASKED
Supplier assessment & onboarding	100%	Do you publish a supplier list, and to which tier? Are suppliers assessed against social and environmental criteria before onboarding, and reassessed thereafter?

This pillar has a single sub-category, so the pillar weight applies to it directly.

ANIMAL WELFARE — 10% OF THE OVERALL SCORE

SUB-CATEGORY	WEIGHT	EXAMPLE OF THE KIND OF QUESTION ASKED
Animal welfare	100%	Do you have policies or initiatives in place to prevent animal abuse in your supply chain? Do you audit suppliers of animal-derived materials against your animal welfare standards?

This pillar has a single sub-category. The pillar weight itself scales with a brand's exposure to animal-derived materials, as set out in section 08.

> **Reading the weights together.** A sub-category weight determines how much of a pillar a topic accounts for. It does not determine how much any individual answer is worth; that is set by the question type (section 06). A brand scoring well on a heavily weighted sub-category through disclosure alone will still score substantially below a brand that has implemented and measured its practice in the same area.

06 — QUESTION WEIGHTING

HOW ANSWERS ARE WEIGHTED

The rubric contains more than 160 scored questions. Each is classified into one of four types according to what the answer demonstrates, and the type determines how much the question is worth.

A brand that publishes a policy scores. A brand that implements that policy and can show the result scores several times more.

1 — ACTION — OUTCOME	**Weighted highest.** Implemented action with measured results: emissions reduced, wages raised, waste diverted, expressed in numbers.
2 — ACTION — IMPLEMENTED	**Weighted second.** Operational, live initiatives: third-party audits, certifications such as GOTS or SA8000, programmes running in the supply chain.
3 — STRATEGY / RISK	**Weighted third.** Intent and planning: targets, transition plans, risk and materiality assessments, board oversight.
4 — DISCLOSURE	**Weighted lowest.** Reporting of current practice: published reports, codes of conduct, monitoring systems, self-reported data.

The effect of this structure. Because outcome and implementation questions account for the majority of the achievable score, documentation alone cannot produce a high result. A brand answering every disclosure question perfectly, with nothing implemented, scores approximately **12%**. Adding a complete set of strategies, targets and risk assessments, still with nothing implemented, brings it to approximately **47%**. These two ceilings are the structural basis of the rating bands in section 09.

We publish the ranking and its consequences, but not the multiplier attached to each type, as those values are the specific input a brand would calibrate its answers against. A question's type is separate from its documented or declared label: a declared outcome answer is still an outcome answer.

07 — CALCULATION

HOW THE SCORE IS CALCULATED

Every score is produced by the same six-step sequence. There is no analyst discretion in the arithmetic and no manual adjustment of a brand's final number.

Scores are private. Each brand sees only its own score, to track its progress over time. Reloom does not rate brands publicly, publish scores or rank brands.

01

RAW SCORE

Each answer option carries a fixed point value; selected answers are summed. Multi-select questions are additive, with caps applied where several answers describe substantially the same action, so that similar effort is not counted twice.

02

NORMALISATION

Each question is converted to a 0–100 scale (points scored divided by points available), so that questions are comparable regardless of how many options they contain.

03

QUESTION WEIGHTING

Each normalised question score is multiplied by its weight, determined by the four question types in section 06.

04

SUB-CATEGORY SCORE

Within each sub-category, weighted question scores are aggregated as a weighted average, so that higher-weight questions move the sub-category score proportionally more.

05

PILLAR SCORE

Sub-category scores are combined into a pillar score using their sub-category weights. Areas of direct harm and systemic scale carry more weight; enabling and governance areas carry less.

06

OVERALL SCORE (0–100)

The five pillar scores are combined using the published pillar weights: Planet 25%, People 25%, Circularity and materials 25%, Supply chain 15%, Animal welfare 10%, adjusted for exposure as set out in section 08.

No manual overrides. A brand's score is the output of the rubric. Reloom staff cannot adjust a score upward because a brand is a paying customer, or downward for any other reason. An analyst can correct an answer that the documents do not support; every such change is recorded and shared with the brand, and the corrected answer is rescored through the same six steps.

PROPORTIONALITY AND APPLICABILITY

A six-person label does not have an HR department. A fully vegan brand has no animal supply chain to audit. Assessing brands against questions that cannot apply to them would produce a number that measures company size rather than sustainability performance.

SCOPING

A short set of scoping questions establishes each brand's size, structure, operational control and material mix, and tailors the question set accordingly. Two rules govern this:

- **Questions that are removed are removed from the denominator, not scored as zero.** A brand is not penalised for failing to do something it structurally cannot do.
- **"We do not do this" is not equivalent to "this does not apply to us".** A brand with employees but no diversity and inclusion process has a genuine gap, and scores zero for it. Only questions that are genuinely inapplicable are removed.

COMPANY SIZE

Some questions are gated by company size, on the basis that a brand with no employees cannot operate an employee programme. Size gating can only remove a question from the denominator; it cannot award points that a brand has not earned.

REMOVING OR SCALING A PILLAR

Where a pillar is genuinely inapplicable, it is removed rather than scored zero, and its weight is redistributed proportionally across the remaining pillars. Where a pillar applies only in part, it scales: scrutiny should track exposure. The Animal welfare pillar is the clearest case, set out overleaf.

> **High-volume production.** Proportionality also operates in the other direction. Business models characterised by very high style volumes, very short design-to-market cycles and disposable price points cannot achieve a top rating on the strength of their sustainability programmes alone; a cap applies. We publish the principle. We do not publish the thresholds, as they are the values a brand would otherwise manage to.

HOW THE ANIMAL WELFARE PILLAR SCALES WITH EXPOSURE

A brand offering a handful of leather belts does not carry the same animal-welfare risk as a leather-goods house. The Animal welfare pillar therefore operates on four exposure tiers, set by a single scoping question.

Scoping question. "Approximately what proportion of your product range, by number of styles or SKUs, contains animal-derived materials — leather, wool, cashmere, silk, down, fur or exotic skins? Exclude minor trims such as buttons, thread or small labels."

The tier determines both which animal questions a brand is asked and how much the pillar contributes to its overall score. Freed weight is redistributed proportionally across the other four pillars; it is not discarded. Weights are rounded to one decimal place.

TIER	SHARE OF RANGE	PLANET	PEOPLE	CIRCULARITY	SUPPLY CHAIN	ANIMAL WELFARE	QUESTION SET APPLIED
Core	Over 50%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	15.0%	**10.0%**	Full welfare and traceability set
Moderate	11–50%	25.6%	25.6%	25.6%	15.3%	**8.0%**	Substantially complete
Minimal / accessory	1–10%	26.4%	26.4%	26.4%	15.8%	**5.0%**	Core sourcing and policy questions only
Vegan	0%	27.8%	27.8%	27.8%	16.7%	—	None; the pillar is removed

WHY THESE THRESHOLDS

Assessment scrutiny should scale with a brand's actual exposure to an impact rather than apply uniformly regardless of relevance. The specific boundaries, however, are declared design choices rather than empirically derived figures. The 10% ceiling is set where animal materials cease to be a product line and become incidental; it is deliberately low. The 50% boundary separates brands that use animal materials from brands that are animal-material businesses. These thresholds remain open to revision on evidence.

How the exemption works. A brand's statement that it uses no animal-derived materials is accepted as given, and the pillar is removed. Like any other answer, the scoping answer is labelled declared unless a document supports it. A brand using recycled or deadstock animal materials remains subject to the questions that still apply to it.

09 — THE RATING

THE INTERNAL PROGRESS RATING

The overall score is a private number between 0 and 100: only the brand sees it. It is shown to the brand as a rating of zero to five looms, so the brand can see where it stands and track progress between assessments. Reloom does not rate brands publicly, publish scores or ratings, or rank brands.

The bands were set by stress-testing the rubric against brand archetypes ranging from small independent labels to large fashion groups, and confirmed through sensitivity analysis across both SME and large-brand profiles. They were not derived by working backwards from a desired distribution of brands. Three structural anchors fixed them: zero practice scores 0%, disclosure alone scores approximately 12%, and disclosure plus a full set of strategy and risk answers, with nothing implemented, scores approximately 47%.

SCORE	RATING	DESCRIPTION	BASIS FOR THE THRESHOLD
0–15		**Not yet started**	Identifies genuine non-engagement. A brand that honestly answers all disclosure questions already exceeds this range.
16–25	■	**Getting started**	Some governance and disclosure, not yet translated into implemented practice.
26–39	■■	**Building practice**	Real but early-stage foundations: a code of conduct, some monitoring, basic supply chain visibility. Sits below the 47% ceiling, so policies with nothing behind them cannot reach three looms.
40–54	■■■	**Making meaningful progress**	Implementation is contributing to the score. Brands in this range are there because implemented practice is scoring.
55–71	■■■■	**Leading practice**	Full marks on action alone reach approximately 53%; full marks on disclosure and strategy alone, approximately 47%. Neither clears 55%, so this band requires strength across all categories.
72–100	■■■■■	**Exceptional**	Requires strong implemented practice and measured outcomes across every pillar. Demanding, yet achievable for a committed brand within a few assessment cycles.

Every brand, at every rating, receives a full breakdown: performance by pillar and by sub-category, the specific gaps that cost the most points, and the share of its answers that are documented or declared.

The rating is for internal use. It is not a certification or a sustainability label, and brands may not display it on products, in marketing or in communications to retailers or consumers. Brands share their answers and evidence instead, through the outputs in section 12.

EVIDENCE REVIEW

Brands link supporting documents to individual answers in the portal. Each document is checked, and that check decides whether the answer is labelled documented or declared. Evidence review is documentary: it confirms what a document says, not what happens on the ground.

HOW DOCUMENTS ARE CHECKED

1. **Automated check.** Every document is checked by an AI model: does it relate to the answer, is it in date, does it name the brand or supplier, and is it the type claimed (for example, a scope certificate rather than a transaction certificate)?
2. **Consistent documents are accepted.** Where the check finds the document consistent with the answer, the answer is labelled documented.
3. **Inconsistencies go to an analyst.** Where the check finds an inconsistency, a Reloom analyst reviews the document and the answer.
4. **Follow-up.** Where a document does not support the answer, the brand is asked to add a better document or revise the answer. Until then, the answer is labelled declared.
5. **Sign-off before anything leaves Reloom.** Everything Reloom puts on its website or shares on a brand's behalf, including the public profile, claim verdicts and retailer reports, is reviewed and signed off by a member of the Reloom team.

ADDING EVIDENCE DURING THE YEAR

The checks are identical for every brand. Whether a brand can add evidence between annual assessments, and how quickly it is reviewed, depends on the purchased plan.

> **The limits of evidence review.** We read policies, audit reports, certificates, wage records, chemical management logs and supplier lists. We do not conduct our own factory audits and we do not visit sites. A brand may hold a valid certificate for a facility with problems that the certification process did not identify.

CLAIMS AND REGULATORY CHECKS

Reloom checks the environmental claims a brand makes against the EU Directive on Empowering Consumers for the Green Transition (Directive (EU) 2024/825, "ECGT"), which has applied since 27 September 2026. It also links what the assessment finds to the regulations that apply to the brand.

THE ECGT CLAIMS CHECKER

The checker scans a brand's public claims and records each one in a claims register with:

- the claim as written, and where it appears
- the ECGT risk it raises: for example a generic claim ("eco-friendly", "sustainable"), a whole-product claim based on one feature, an offset-based "carbon neutral" claim, or a label not based on a recognised scheme
- whether the brand's answers and documents can back it, and whether those answers are documented or declared
- a suggested next step: reword, add evidence, narrow the claim, or remove it

How much of a brand's public content is scanned, and how often it is re-scanned, depends on the purchased plan.

Certificates cited in claims are checked for what they actually cover. Better Cotton, for example, is a mass-balance programme and does not certify the cotton in a specific product; a carbon-neutral certificate cannot on its own support a product-level climate claim.

Scope. The checker covers environmental claims only. Social claims, such as those about wages or working conditions, are not checked.

REGULATORY RECOMMENDATIONS

Each assessment produces recommendations tied to the brand's answers, showing where a gap is also a regulatory exposure and which document would close it. Recommendations are scoped to the brand's size, markets and products.

REGULATIONS COVERED

REGULATION	WHAT IT COVERS	RELEVANT TO
ECGT (Directive (EU) 2024/825)	Environmental claims and sustainability labels made to consumers	Any brand selling to EU consumers
CSRD	Sustainability reporting	Larger companies in scope; thresholds being revised under the EU Omnibus simplification
CSDDD	Human rights and environmental due diligence across the value chain	The largest companies; also being revised under the Omnibus
EUDR	Deforestation-free sourcing of covered commodities, including cattle leather and rubber	Brands placing leather or rubber products on the EU market
ESPR and the digital product passport	Ecodesign requirements and product information; textiles are a priority product group	Brands selling textile products in the EU, once textile rules are adopted
PPWR	Packaging design, recyclability and labelling	Brands placing packaged products on the EU market
France's AGEC law	Product environmental information and the ban on destroying unsold goods	Brands selling in France
Other EU and national rules	For example, textile extended producer responsibility schemes	Added where they apply to the brand

What these checks are not. They flag risk against the text of the rules and published guidance. They are not legal advice and do not guarantee compliance. ECGT is applied through national law, which differs between Member States, and enforcement practice is still developing.

12 — OUTPUTS

WHAT BRANDS RECEIVE, AND WHAT THEY CAN SHARE

The score stays with the brand. What leaves Reloom is the brand's own answers and evidence, each labelled documented or declared, in the form the brand chooses to share. Which outputs a brand receives depends on the purchased plan.

OUTPUT	WHO SEES IT	WHAT IT CONTAINS
Brand results	The brand only	Internal score and rating, pillar and sub-category breakdown, the largest gaps, documented and declared share, regulatory recommendations
Claims register	The brand only	Each claim found, its ECGT risk, the supporting answers and documents, and a suggested next step
Public profile	Anyone	Brand information and the brand's answers, each labelled documented or declared
Retailer report	Retailers the brand shares it with	A curated set of answers as plain statements, each labelled documented or declared, with the assessment date. Depending on the purchased plan, a dated snapshot or a live report kept current as evidence is added, with a separate export for each buyer

HOW THE RETAILER REPORT IS BUILT

- It shows a fixed, curated set of answers written as plain statements, not the full question set, question references or point values.
- Each statement carries its label. Where an answer relies on third-party assurance that the brand has not supplied, it reads "The brand reports…".
- Certificates appear with what they cover (scope, transaction or product certificate), taken from the linked document.
- Supplier names appear only with the brand's agreement.
- A peer benchmark is optional and off by default. It does not show the brand's score or rating.
- It never describes the brand or its answers as "verified" or "certified by Reloom", and never shows a loom rating.

THE ASSESSMENT CYCLE

Every brand is reassessed against the full rubric once a year, as part of its subscription. Depending on the purchased plan, brands can also keep their evidence current in the portal between assessments.

EVERY YEAR

Full reassessment against the rubric, building on last year's answers. New assessment date on every output.

IN BETWEEN

Depending on the purchased plan, brands add evidence and update answers as things change.

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT	Returning brands start from last year's answers and update what has changed. Scores, ratings and outputs are reissued with the new assessment date.
DURING THE YEAR	Depending on the purchased plan, brands can link new documents or update answers between assessments. Each change is checked as described in section 10. Labels and any live retailer report update as changes are accepted; a snapshot report keeps its original date.
EXPIRING DOCUMENTS	When a linked certificate or audit expires, the answer returns to declared until the brand links a current one.
MATERIAL CHANGE	A change to ownership or control, manufacturing locations, supplier categories, materials, workforce, certifications held, or product and packaging formulation must be reflected in the brand's answers when it happens. This is a contractual obligation of the subscription.
LAPSED SUBSCRIPTION	If a brand does not renew, its public profile and any shared live retailer report are taken down. Exports already sent to retailers keep their original assessment date.

BASELINE EXPECTATIONS

There is no minimum requirement to be assessed. Any brand that takes part is assessed, including brands that will score poorly.

Reloom does, however, treat the following as baseline practice for any fashion brand operating responsibly. These areas are weighted heavily throughout the rubric, documents in these areas go to an analyst whenever the automated check flags them, and a brand that cannot demonstrate them will score materially lower across People, Planet and Supply chain.

01	Payment of at least the legal minimum wage, and demonstrable progress toward a local living wage benchmark
02	A code of conduct or policy covering fair labour and human rights, including an explicit no-child-labour clause, applied across direct operations and Tier 1 manufacturing
03	Active prevention of child labour at owned facilities and manufacturing sites, through internal audits, third-party social audits, or documented prevention and remediation procedures
04	A health and safety policy or management plan, implemented directly or by Tier 1 suppliers
05	Measures to manage chemical and hazardous waste, for example MRSL/RSL compliance or waste handling logs
06	The ability to state where main materials originate and where garments are produced
07	A grievance mechanism through which concerns can be raised
08	Legal registration, and compliance with local labour and environmental regulation

A roadmap, not a gate. Brands that cannot yet demonstrate all of these are still assessed. The sub-category breakdown and recommendations are designed to be used as a roadmap.

LIMITATIONS

The following are known limitations of the methodology. They are stated here so that every Reloom output is interpreted appropriately.

Documented is not confirmed.

A documented answer means Reloom holds a relevant, in-date document. It does not mean Reloom has confirmed the practice. Documents can be incomplete.

We do not audit factories.

Certificates and third-party audit reports are our window into a supply chain, and that window can be incomplete or wrong.

The claims checker flags risk; it does not decide compliance.

ECGT is applied through national law, which differs between Member States, and enforcement practice is still forming.

Upstream data quality is a constraint.

Few brands can trace raw materials back to farm or extraction level. Where the industry has no visibility, neither do we.

Framework alignment is thematic, not formal.

The rubric draws on CSRD, CSDDD, GRI, SASB, CDP, EUDR, the OECD Guidelines, the UN Guiding Principles, the B Corp framework and the Copenhagen Fashion Week requirements. A thematic gap analysis was conducted against them. This is not formal alignment with, or compliance with, any individual framework.

Declared is not absent.

Smaller brands without formal reporting will show more declared answers, even where their practice matches that of a larger brand.

Automated checks are not perfect.

The automated check can accept a weak document or reject a good one. Analyst review of inconsistencies and sign-off before publication reduce this; they do not eliminate it.

The rubric rewards what can be evidenced.

A small brand doing substantive work informally may score below a larger brand doing adequate work with a compliance function. Size gating reduces this effect; it does not eliminate it.

A score is relative, not absolute.

It positions a brand against the industry as it currently operates. Producing and selling clothing has impact, and a rating does not change that.

Changes to the methodology. The methodology will continue to change as regulation develops and data availability improves. Where we change how brands are scored or labelled, we will publish what changed, the reasoning, and the effect on existing results.

16 — FEEDBACK AND CHALLENGE

CHALLENGE THIS METHODOLOGY.

Reloom welcomes challenge to this methodology: from brands that consider a result or a label to be wrong, from retailers using our reports, from researchers who consider a weighting to be unjustified, and from organisations holding evidence that contradicts what a brand has documented or declared.

info@reloom.me