The Human Cost Hidden Within Supply Chains

Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple.

Foreword

Every purchase order rests on a human being. On any given day in 2021, an estimated 49.6 million people worldwide were living in modern slavery, including 27.6 million in forced labour, according to the International Labour Organisation, Walk Free and the International Organisation for Migration. Behind contracts, factories and shipments are workers whose conditions may be invisible to the organisation benefiting from their labour. Ethical sourcing asks a blunt question: how confidently can any buyer say its value was not extracted through exploitation?

Globalisation has built supply networks of extraordinary depth. A buyer may know its immediate supplier intimately while knowing almost nothing about the farms, mines, processors and labour agencies operating three or four tiers upstream. Forced labour, child labour and unsafe conditions can hide behind apparently reputable brands. The ILO estimates such exploitation generates around US$236 billion, roughly £175 billion at current exchange rates, in illegal profits every year — money stolen directly from workers' wages.

A signed code of conduct does not answer this question. It records an intention, not a fact. Modern slavery statements and supplier declarations establish what an organisation expects; they cannot, on their own, establish what is actually happening on a farm or in a workshop several contracts removed from the buyer. Procurement's task is to convert declarations into evidence — to know the difference between a supplier saying the right thing and a worker experiencing it.

No organisation can inspect every workplace in its supply chain, and few possess the commercial leverage to control conditions across sprawling international networks. The 2024 Global Slavery Index estimates that G20 countries import US$468 billion of at-risk goods annually — electronics, garments, palm oil, cocoa and solar panels prominent among them. Realistic ethical sourcing therefore means directing scrutiny towards the categories, geographies and workforces where the evidence of risk is strongest, rather than promising uniform certainty everywhere.

Procurement alone cannot end forced or child labour, but every purchasing decision either reinforces exploitative conditions or resists them. Price, lead time, contractual terms and willingness to fund remediation all matter. The test of ethical sourcing is not how a policy reads in a boardroom, but whether it still shapes a purchasing decision when protecting workers costs money, time or a valued supplier relationship.

When Low Prices Conceal a Human Cost

Global sourcing has cut costs and widened choice by opening markets that were once inaccessible. That efficiency can mask a darker ledger. Behind a competitively priced contract may sit workers facing excessive hours, withheld wages, debt bondage or forced labour. The ILO's 2024 estimates put the average illegal profit extracted per forced labour victim at around US$10,000 (roughly £7,400) a year — money that should have been a wage, not a windfall for an exploiter.

Exploitation rarely surfaces in the relationship between a buyer and its direct supplier. It tends to occur further upstream, where raw materials are grown, extracted or first processed. Each additional tier adds distance between a purchasing decision and the person affected by it. In cocoa, coffee, cotton and minerals, that distance can span several countries and dozens of intermediaries before a recognisable, branded product ever reaches a UK shelf.

A Tier 1 supplier can pass every check an organisation runs — financial due diligence, a signed code of conduct, a modern slavery statement — while itself sourcing materials or labour from businesses whose practices would be unacceptable to the end customer. Responsible behaviour at the point of contract says nothing about behaviour three tiers back. Assurance built solely on the immediate supplier relationship therefore measures the wrong thing.

A single manufactured product can incorporate raw materials, components and processing activity from numerous countries and businesses simultaneously. Contractors subcontract, subcontractors engage labour agencies, and commodity traders aggregate materials from many small producers before anything reaches a recognisable brand. Knowing the identity of the contractual supplier therefore does not reliably tell a procurement team who actually produced what the organisation is buying, or under what conditions that production took place.

Case Study: Leicester's Garment Factories

In 2020, investigations into Leicester's garment sector — which supplies UK high-street and online fashion retailers, including Boohoo — found workers paid as little as £3.50 to £4 an hour, less than half the National Minimum Wage then in force (£8.72). A 2022 survey of 116 Leicester garment workers, commissioned in the scandal's aftermath, found 56 per cent still paid below minimum wage, 55 per cent without holiday pay and around a third with no contract or payslip. The National Crime Agency opened a modern slavery investigation into the sector. The case is a reminder that exploitation risk sits within UK domestic supply chains, not only overseas.

Commercial pressure compounds the risk. Buyers routinely demand lower prices, shorter lead times and rapid responses to shifting demand, and suppliers operating on thin margins often pass that pressure straight down their own supply chains. An organisation cannot credibly demand fair wages and reasonable hours from a factory while simultaneously setting prices or deadlines that make lawful employment practices commercially unviable for whoever ultimately does the work.

Ethical sourcing therefore has to move well beyond a modern slavery clause buried in a contract schedule. It requires organisations to identify where the human rights risk actually sits, decide how far to investigate, and build verification proportionate to what is at stake. Supplier questionnaires have value as a starting point, but on their own they confirm paperwork, not welfare. Mapping, worker engagement, independent evidence and targeted audits carry the weight that declarations alone cannot.

Discovering an unethical supplier is not, by itself, a solution. Terminating a contract overnight can strip income from already vulnerable workers without correcting the practice that harmed them, and can push the same exploitation towards a less scrupulous buyer. The more useful distinction is between deliberate abuse, which usually warrants exit, and inadequate control that a willing supplier can be helped to fix through a costed, time-bound corrective plan.

Visibility, influence and evidence define the limits of what procurement can achieve. No buyer can personally inspect every farm or factory connected to its spend, but foreseeable risk left uninvestigated is difficult to defend once something goes wrong. Effective sourcing channels scrutiny towards where vulnerability is greatest, and aligns contractual terms, purchasing behaviour and *escalation processes so they reinforce each other rather than quietly working against one another.*

A zero-tolerance policy is only as credible as the organisation's willingness to act on inconvenient evidence. Investigating beyond a comfortable supplier assurance, querying an established relationship, and taking proportionate action when a serious risk surfaces — even where it carries cost or reputational exposure — is what separates a working ethical sourcing programme from a well-worded document that nobody tests.

The honest position is that procurement cannot guarantee every worker in a fragmented international network is treated fairly; in the most complex chains, absolute certainty is not achievable. What can reasonably be expected is that an organisation understands its material human rights risks, investigates them with intent, uses whatever leverage it has, and responds credibly when concerns are raised — starting with its direct suppliers, but rarely ending there.

What Is Ethical Sourcing?

Ethical sourcing is the deliberate weighing of human rights and social conditions alongside price, quality and delivery in every purchasing decision. It asks whether commercial value has been achieved without transferring unacceptable costs onto the people who produced it — the workers, communities and vulnerable groups who sit furthest from the buyer's boardroom but closest to the actual point of production, extraction or assembly.

Legal compliance sets a floor, not a ceiling. A supplier can meet every requirement of local law while still falling well short of internationally recognised standards on wages, hours, freedom of association or safety. The gap matters most in countries where statutory protection is weak or poorly enforced; the UK's National Living Wage of £12.21 an hour (Apr 2026) for workers 21 and over is, by international comparison, a demanding benchmark that many overseas jurisdictions do not require or enforce.

Human rights sit at the centre of ethical sourcing because the consequences of failure are severe and frequently irreversible. Particular vigilance is warranted around forced labour, child labour, debt bondage, recruitment fees, passport retention and restrictions on a worker's freedom to leave employment — risks that typically surface several contractual relationships removed from the organisation that ultimately places the order.

Ethical sourcing nevertheless extends beyond labour conditions alone. It can encompass environmental protection, responsible mineral extraction, anti-corruption controls, equality and community impact, with priorities varying by sector and category. Human rights warrant particular weight regardless of category, however, because the people affected typically have the least bargaining power and the fewest realistic routes to escape or challenge the conditions imposed on them.

Ethical sourcing is a narrower discipline than ethical procurement, which concerns the integrity of the buying process itself — competition, conflicts of interest, bribery and professional conduct. A competitive tender run with complete procedural integrity can still deliver an ethically compromised supply chain if nobody examines what happens once the ink is dry and production actually begins several tiers upstream.

It is equally distinct from sustainable procurement, which typically weighs environmental, social and economic outcomes together across a purchase's full lifecycle. A product can carry strong environmental credentials — recycled content, low carbon transport — while still incorporating materials linked to exploitative labour. Environmental performance is not evidence, on its own, that the people who made the product were treated fairly.

Effective ethical sourcing starts before a contract is signed. Procurement teams should identify which categories carry elevated human rights exposure, understand the relevant country and commodity risk, and specify what evidence a bidder must supply. Building this into specifications and evaluation criteria embeds ethical performance as a genuine commercial requirement, rather than an afterthought bolted on once price and supplier selection have effectively already been decided.

Risk proportionality keeps the system workable. Applying identical scrutiny to office stationery and garments manufactured through several Asian subcontractors wastes effort on the former and under-resources the latter. Prioritising by severity, likelihood, geography and workforce vulnerability lets a *finite compliance team concentrate on cocoa, coffee, garments, seafood, electronics and construction — the categories the Global Slavery Index and Home Office both flag as highest risk.*

Declarations remain a reasonable starting point but a poor finishing line. Codes of conduct and modern slavery statements demonstrate that expectations were communicated; they cannot demonstrate that anyone met them. Stronger assurance draws on payroll records, recruitment documentation, worker interviews, independent audits and traceability data, with the intensity of evidence rising in step with the severity of the harm being tested against.

Visibility and verification answer different questions and are frequently confused. Mapping identifies who participates in a supply chain; verification establishes whether those participants comply with required standards. An organisation can successfully name a Tier 3 manufacturer while having no idea whether its workers are paid correctly or employed voluntarily — precision about who exists in a chain is not the same as evidence about how that chain actually treats people.

Due diligence does not end at contract signature. Risk profiles shift when a supplier restructures, adds a subcontractor, enters a new country or comes under sudden financial pressure. Continuing engagement, defined escalation triggers and periodic re-assessment matter as much as the original tender evaluation, because a supply chain judged low-risk at award can look materially different eighteen months into delivery.

Ultimately, ethical sourcing is proven through purchasing decisions and evidence, not through possession of a policy document. The aim is neither impossible omniscience nor blanket supplier exclusion based on geography alone, but a disciplined system for locating where people are vulnerable and using whatever commercial influence exists to reduce that vulnerability, purchase by purchase. Procurement, on this view, becomes not merely a mechanism for acquiring goods and services at the best price, but a genuine instrument of responsible corporate conduct.

Human Rights and the Modern Supply Chain

Human rights within a supply chain cover the basic protections owed to anyone producing goods or delivering services, regardless of nationality, employment status or location: freedom from forced and child labour, protection from discrimination, safe working conditions, reasonable hours and the right to organise. Procurement becomes directly relevant wherever organisational spend connects, however indirectly, with a person whose rights could be affected by it.

A UK buyer may contract with a domestic Tier 1 supplier. At the same time, production actually occurs through manufacturers, farms, mines and labour agencies spread across several countries, each of which may itself subcontract further. The legal distance between buyer and affected worker can therefore be considerable, even though the demand the buyer creates is what ultimately funds the economic activity employing that person, wherever they happen to be.

Global sourcing is not inherently exploitative — it has also driven employment, investment and technology transfer across developing economies. The risk arises specifically where economic opportunity meets weak governance, poverty or a severe imbalance of bargaining power. Under those conditions, workers can end up accepting terms that would be unlawful in the UK simply because no realistic alternative employment or effective legal protection is available to them.

> ***Case Study: Cobalt Mining in the Democratic Republic of Congo***
>
> *The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) holds more than half the world's cobalt reserves, a mineral essential to batteries powering phones, laptops and electric vehicles. UNICEF estimates around 40,000 children work in the country's mines, some as young as seven, earning roughly £1 to £1.50 a day for shifts of up to twelve hours. Amnesty International traced cobalt mined partly by children into the supply chains of major electronics and automotive brands. Because artisanal ore is frequently blended with formally mined material before processing, buyers several tiers downstream can purchase battery components with no practical visibility of the mine of origin.*

Vulnerability is not spread evenly. Migrant workers, children, agency labour and people working in *the informal economy face disproportionate exposure. Migrant workers are especially at risk where recruitment involves substantial fees, employer-controlled accommodation or confiscated identity documents — arrangements that can turn nominally voluntary employment into circumstances a worker is financially or physically unable to leave, regardless of what their contract says on paper.*

Forced labour rarely looks like a locked door. Coercion more often arrives through threats, withheld wages, engineered recruitment debt or the threat of reporting an undocumented worker to immigration authorities. This makes identification genuinely difficult, because affected workers can appear, on a conventional site visit, to be working entirely voluntarily. Procurement teams need to understand these indicators of coercion rather than expecting victims to identify themselves during a scheduled audit.

Child labour requires similar precision. Not every job undertaken by a young person is prohibited; international standards distinguish appropriate light work from activities that damage health, safety or education. The greatest concern surrounds children in hazardous work, excessive hours or informal, home-based production — settings in agriculture, artisanal mining and small workshops where conventional factory audits are structurally unlikely ever to reach.

The sector shapes the specific risk. Labour-intensive manufacturing sees excessive overtime and wage violations; agriculture relies heavily on seasonal or informally recruited migrant labour; construction involves complex, multi-layered subcontracting; mining can bring dangerous conditions and community displacement. Logistics, cleaning, security and social care — sectors operating far closer to home than a distant factory — can present comparable risks that UK buyers sometimes overlook precisely because the supplier feels familiar.

Production can move from a regulated, auditable factory into small workshops or private homes largely invisible to conventional supplier management. Subcontracting frequently happens without the buyer's knowledge, and sometimes without the knowledge of the Tier 1 supplier itself. Where this fragmentation occurs, a scheduled factory audit may faithfully examine the authorised workplace while missing entirely the informal production happening around the corner from it.

Sudden commercial pressure — a spike in demand, a compressed delivery schedule, an unexpected shortfall — can push an otherwise responsible supplier towards temporary labour or unauthorised subcontractors almost overnight. A supplier assessed as low-risk at the point of contract award can look very different a year later if it comes under sustained financial strain. Human rights due diligence therefore cannot be treated as a one-off exercise completed during tendering and then filed away.

Buyers can respond to identified harm through contractual requirements, corrective action plans, supplier development, commercial incentives, collaborative industry initiatives or, ultimately, suspension. The right response depends on the severity of the harm, the buyer's actual relationship to it, and whether the supplier shows genuine willingness to improve. Serious concerns demand escalation, but disengagement should rarely be the automatic first move when a workable alternative exists.

An organisation may directly cause harm through its own practices, contribute to it through purchasing behaviour that creates unreasonable production pressure, or be linked to it through materials sourced from an abusive supplier several tiers back. These are meaningfully different levels of responsibility. Recognising which applies in a given case lets a procurement team calibrate a response that actually matches its real relationship to the harm, rather than defaulting to the same reaction regardless of cause.

Procurement teams are not being asked to solve every social problem in the global economy single-handedly. They are being asked to ensure that significant, foreseeable human rights risks connected with organisational spend are recognised, investigated and managed in proportion to their severity — treating human rights as part of ordinary supply chain governance rather than as a separate compliance exercise disconnected from everyday purchasing decisions.

Where Does Procurement Responsibility Begin and End?

Procurement responsibility starts with decisions an organisation genuinely controls: what is specified, which suppliers compete, how tenders are evaluated and what obligations survive into the contract. These decisions shape working conditions throughout a supply chain. Where procurement *knowingly prioritises price or speed while disregarding a credible human rights warning, that responsibility cannot be discharged simply by inserting a clause and moving the risk onto the supplier's paperwork.*

The clearest responsibility sits within direct contractual relationships. Tier 1 suppliers can reasonably be held to selection criteria, contractual obligations, audit rights and performance management, and can be required to prohibit forced and child labour outright. Confining scrutiny to Tier 1 alone, however, leaves an obvious gap: much of the actual manufacturing, growing, extraction or labour supply happens through subcontractors operating well beyond that first, visible layer.

Responsibility extends beyond the contractual boundary, though its character changes with distance. A UK buyer may have no direct agreement with a Tier 3 factory or mine, yet its purchasing activity still connects to that operation's economic existence. Ethical procurement increasingly requires investigating material risk in these deeper tiers, rather than treating the absence of a signed contract as sufficient reason to leave a credible, serious concern uninvestigated.

This does not mean every purchasing organisation must identify every business in every chain feeding it. A single manufactured product can contain components sourced through hundreds of international relationships; pursuing universal traceability regardless of risk would consume resources for limited protective return. Responsibility is therefore necessarily targeted — concentrated on the categories, countries and employment models where credible indicators suggest serious harm is genuinely more likely.

Severity, not just probability, should drive how far an investigation extends. A low-probability risk can still justify substantial scrutiny where the potential outcome is forced labour or dangerous child labour. Standard commercial risk assessments tend to weight likelihood heavily because they were built for financial exposure; human rights due diligence instead has to weigh the seriousness and potential irreversibility of harm to a real person more heavily than the statistical odds of it occurring.

Knowledge changes the standard an organisation is held to. Credible information — from an audit, a whistleblower, a worker complaint, an NGO report or unusual supplier behaviour — creates a stronger obligation to investigate than existed beforehand. Once that evidence exists, continuing to purchase without reasonable follow-up becomes difficult to square with any meaningful commitment to ethical sourcing, whatever the supplier's original risk rating said at the point of contract award.

The useful distinction is between what an organisation actually knows, what it reasonably should know given proportionate due diligence, and what genuinely could not have been discovered. This keeps responsibility bounded rather than unlimited, while denying deliberately weak visibility systems any credit as a defence. A buyer that never looks cannot claim ignorance as a shield if competent supply chain management would plainly have surfaced the risk.

Commercial leverage sets a further practical limit. A multinational representing a large share of a supplier's turnover can demand real change; a smaller buyer purchasing standard goods through an intermediary may have little direct influence at all. Limited leverage does not eliminate responsibility, but it changes the available response — smaller buyers can pool influence through industry bodies, certification schemes or collective purchasing initiatives where individual weight is insufficient on its own.

Responsibility also extends to the buyer's own purchasing conduct. Ethical requirements ring hollow when a buyer simultaneously demands unrealistic prices, compressed lead times or unpredictable order volumes that create severe financial pressure on a supplier. These practices routinely encourage excessive overtime, informal labour and unauthorised subcontracting — meaning responsibility involves an honest look at whether the buyer's own behaviour has helped create the very conditions it says it wants eliminated.

Contract award is not a finishing line. Ownership changes, production relocates, subcontractors are added, and economic conditions deteriorate over the life of an agreement. A supply chain judged low-risk during tendering can look materially different years later, so contract management needs periodic review, updated risk assessment and targeted verification, with monitoring intensity tracking genuine changes in circumstance rather than running on a fixed, calendar-driven cycle.

Nor does responsibility end the moment a breach is found. Immediate termination protects the buyer's reputation but does not automatically protect the workers involved — it can simply remove their income, encourage concealment, or push the same production towards a less scrupulous buyer elsewhere. Where it is safe to do so, procurement should weigh whether remediation and continued, closer oversight could achieve a better outcome for the people actually affected than a clean commercial exit.

There remain circumstances where continued engagement is indefensible. Deliberate forced labour, systematic exploitation, falsified evidence or persistent refusal to implement agreed corrective measures show that remediation cannot realistically succeed. Procurement must then be prepared to suspend orders or terminate outright, in line with contractual rights and legal obligations — ethical sourcing carries little weight if commercial dependency is allowed to override action once serious, substantiated violations are confirmed.

Responsibility therefore has no single, fixed contractual endpoint. It expands or contracts with the severity and likelihood of harm, the organisation's actual knowledge, its contribution to the problem and the influence it can realistically exercise. Procurement cannot guarantee ethical conduct at every tier of a global chain, but it can identify where the significant risks sit, investigate credible concerns properly, and show that purchasing decisions respond when evidence indicates people are being seriously exploited.

The workable boundary is reasonable, demonstrable due diligence rather than unlimited liability for everything happening upstream. Procurement should be able to explain why particular risks were prioritised, what evidence was sought, how it was verified, what influence was exercised and why a given course of action was chosen. Where these decisions are systematic and documented, ethical responsibility becomes a practical governance discipline rather than an impossible promise of total control.

The Scale of Forced Labour and Child Labour

Forced and child labour persist across agriculture, manufacturing, mining, construction and domestic work despite decades of prohibition and corporate commitment. The scale is why ethical sourcing cannot be treated as a marginal corporate responsibility exercise: 17.3 million of the 27.6 million people in forced labour worldwide are exploited within the ordinary private economy, not in isolated criminal enterprises operating outside legitimate commerce entirely — meaning the exploitation genuinely can, and does, connect with mainstream international supply chains.

Coercion, in International Labour Organisation (ILO) methodology, covers far more than workers held under lock and key. It reaches state-imposed forced labour, affecting 3.9 million people, and forced commercial sexual exploitation, affecting 6.3 million, alongside the 17.3 million in the wider private economy. Almost one in eight of all people in forced labour is a child, and more than half of those children are in commercial sexual exploitation — the single starkest illustration of why this scale cannot be dismissed as a marginal, developing-world problem.

Case Study: Child Labour in West African Cocoa

Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana supply around 60 per cent of the world's cocoa, much of it destined for UK chocolate brands. A 2020 National Opinion Research Centre (NORC) study, commissioned by the US Department of Labour, found 1.56 million children working in cocoa-growing households across the two countries, with 1.48 million exposed to hazardous tasks such as land-clearing with machetes, agrochemical handling and night working. Cocoa is typically aggregated from thousands of smallholders before reaching a processor, meaning a UK confectionery buyer's contractual supplier may be four or five tiers removed from the farms where the children were found.

The financial scale is equally stark. ILO research published in 2024 put annual illegal profits from forced labour at approximately US$236 billion, roughly £175 billion, up by around US$64 billion since 2014. Profits are highest in Europe and Central Asia at US$84 billion a year, ahead of Asia-Pacific at US$62 billion — a reminder that forced labour profits are not confined to the world's poorest *regions but run directly through wealthy, developed economies as well.*

Forced labour is not simply physical confinement. International estimates capture withheld wages, deceptive recruitment, debt bondage, restricted movement and abuse of vulnerability, alongside more overt coercion. Migrant workers face heightened exposure wherever employment depends on a recruiter, a visa sponsor or employer-controlled accommodation. Procurement teams looking only for dramatic evidence of physical coercion risk missing the quieter, far more common mechanisms through which a worker effectively loses the freedom to walk away from a job.

Children represent a substantial share of this vulnerability. The ILO and UNICEF's 2025 estimates found nearly 138 million children in child labour during 2024, including around 54 million in hazardous work likely to damage their health or development. That figure has fallen by over 20 million since 2020, a genuine improvement, though still far short of the international commitment to eliminate child labour, and progress would need to run roughly eleven times faster to hit a 2030 target.

Agriculture accounts for the largest single share of global child labour, covering farming, livestock, forestry and fishing. This matters enormously for procurement because agricultural commodities routinely pass through several intermediaries before reaching a manufacturer, retailer or UK supermarket shelf. Cocoa, coffee and cotton are frequently aggregated from thousands of small producers, which makes farm-level conditions genuinely difficult to establish from information supplied by the immediate contractual supplier several steps downstream.

Once raw materials are aggregated, refined or processed, tracing their origin becomes considerably harder. Artisanal and small-scale mining illustrates the problem starkly: minerals extracted through informal, often hazardous operations can enter formal trading networks and emerge as apparently legitimate inputs, allowing a sophisticated manufacturer at the end of a long chain to purchase materials whose earliest production stage would clearly breach its own published ethical standards, entirely unknowingly.

Geography matters but should not become a shortcut. Human rights risk is generally highest where poverty, conflict and weak institutions intersect, yet forced labour is not confined to developing economies. It occurs within wealthy economies too, through informal employment, criminal networks and vulnerable migrant workforces — meaning an ethical sourcing system built solely around a list of high-risk countries can miss significant exploitation occurring much closer to the buying organisation's own operations.

The United Kingdom is not insulated. Home Office figures show 19,125 potential victims of modern slavery were referred into the National Referral Mechanism in 2024, a 13 per cent rise on the previous year and the highest annual total since the mechanism began in 2009. The Global Slavery Index separately estimates as many as 122,000 people may be living in modern slavery in the UK at any one time — a figure the NRM's own referral count captures only a fraction of.

These statistics require careful reading, because forced and child labour are inherently difficult to measure. Victims may fear employers, recruiters or immigration authorities and consequently avoid reporting their circumstances; informal workplaces sit outside regulatory systems altogether, and illegal subcontracting can be deliberately structured to conceal itself. Official estimates therefore represent a sophisticated attempt to measure something largely hidden, meaning the true scale facing procurement is plausibly greater than the headline figures alone suggest.

Nor does operating in a higher-risk country or sector automatically make a given supplier unethical. That assumption produces crude decision-making and can penalise responsible businesses that provide valuable, legitimate employment within otherwise vulnerable communities. Geographic and sector risk indicators should trigger proportionate investigation, not a blanket presumption of guilt — they identify where greater scrutiny is justified, not evidence that any particular named supplier has actually broken the law.

No single procurement organisation can eliminate forced or child labour globally, given that the underlying drivers include poverty, weak governance and conflict well beyond any buyer's control. Aggregate purchasing behaviour nevertheless creates real commercial incentives. When buyers consistently demand traceability, responsible recruitment and verifiable remediation, suppliers gain a genuine commercial reason to improve conditions throughout their own sourcing networks, rather than treating human rights compliance as an optional, easily-dropped extra.

The figures expose a persistent gap between formal prohibition and practical elimination. Forced labour is unlawful almost everywhere, and international commitment against child labour is decades old, yet well over 150 million people remain affected across the two categories combined. Procurement cannot assume legislation or supplier declarations have already closed that gap. The continuing scale of exploitation is precisely why ethical sourcing needs evidence reaching beyond corporate assurance and into the parts of a supply chain where vulnerable people actually work.

Beyond Good Intentions: Making Ethical Sourcing Measurable

Ethical sourcing ultimately stands or falls on whether commitments translate into better conditions for the people who make products and deliver services. Policies and supplier codes set expectations but cannot, by themselves, demonstrate that anyone met them. Credible governance requires organisations to identify where genuine risk sits, investigate proportionately beyond the immediate contract, obtain meaningful evidence, and act when practice on the ground diverges from what the organisation publicly claims to require.

Visibility is the central practical difficulty. A modern supply chain can span manufacturers, subcontractors, labour agencies, processors and informal producers across multiple jurisdictions, and even a well-run Tier 1 supplier may have only partial knowledge of its own upstream network. Knowing the contractual supplier is not the same as knowing the supply chain; genuine transparency requires progressive mapping, concentrated where geography, commodity and workforce characteristics point towards heightened exploitation risk.

Visibility alone guarantees nothing. Knowing a factory or farm exists says nothing about how its workers are actually treated. Verification requires stronger evidence — worker testimony, employment records, recruitment documentation, payroll data, independent assessment and targeted audit — with the bar rising as potential severity rises. Forced labour and hazardous child labour warrant substantially more rigorous verification than a comparatively minor procedural gap in an otherwise compliant supplier's paperwork.

A risk-based approach beats a universal one. Applying identical scrutiny across every supplier and category generates administrative volume while starving the highest-risk relationships of proper attention. Prioritising by severity, likelihood, geography, sector and available leverage accepts that perfect visibility is rarely achievable, and instead concentrates limited investigative resource — auditor time, translation budget, unannounced site visits — precisely where responsible intervention is likeliest to make a measurable, real difference to actual working conditions.

The buyer's own commercial behaviour has to form part of any honest assessment. It is contradictory to demand fair wages and safe hours from a factory while simultaneously imposing prices or delivery windows that make lawful employment practically unviable. Commercial pressure cascades until the weakest party in the chain absorbs the consequences — usually the worker with the least power to refuse. Responsible sourcing therefore requires purchasing practice and ethical expectation to actually align, not merely coexist on separate pages of the same contract.

Supplier engagement matters as much as supplier policing. Procurement should set clear expectations and require suppliers to extend equivalent standards through their own networks, but relationships built purely on compliance and punishment tend to encourage concealment rather than genuine improvement. Where a problem is genuinely fixable, collaborative remediation, capability building and continued verification frequently produce better outcomes for workers than immediate disengagement — the objective should always be protecting people, not protecting the buyer's own reputation.

That principle matters most once a violation is actually discovered. Termination can be necessary — particularly where exploitation is deliberate, or evidence has been falsified — but withdrawal can also strip a workforce of its income without correcting the underlying condition that created their vulnerability in the first place. Decisions should weigh severity, supplier cooperation, available leverage and the realistic consequences for affected workers, without ever quietly subordinating a serious, substantiated concern to short-term commercial convenience.

Measurement needs to move beyond activity counts. Recording how many suppliers signed a code of conduct or completed a questionnaire demonstrates administrative coverage, not worker safety. More meaningful indicators track supply chain visibility, risks actually identified, corrective actions *closed out, remediation outcomes and repeat violations. Ethical sourcing performance should ultimately be judged on whether an organisation's intervention measurably reduced real human rights risk, not on how much compliance paperwork it generated along the way.*

Governance matters because the hardest cases always involve competing pressures. A serious ethical concern can surface involving a strategically important supplier, a scarce commodity or a commercially valuable contract precisely when walking away is most costly. Clear governance establishes who can accept risk, who owns remediation, when senior leadership must be pulled in, and what circumstances trigger suspension. Without that clarity, even well-designed due diligence tends to fail exactly when the commercial stakes are highest.

Procurement carries more influence than it often credits itself with. Every specification, evaluation criterion, pricing decision and supplier review signals what an organisation genuinely values, as distinct from what its policy document states. When human rights expectations carry real commercial consequences, suppliers have a strong incentive to investigate their own networks. When those expectations evaporate the moment price or delivery becomes inconvenient, the commitment was symbolic all along — and suppliers generally learn that distinction faster than head office does.

The objective is not a flawless audit trail proving procedures were followed to the letter. It is measurably reducing the probability that spend contributes to exploitation — looking past Tier 1 assurance, questioning unexplained gaps, listening to workers directly, and recognising when a buyer's own commercial practices are themselves generating risk. The strongest programmes combine transparency, evidence, leverage and remediation within ordinary contract management, rather than treating human rights as a separate exercise bolted on beside it.

Ethical sourcing is a continuing discipline, not a certificate earned once and filed away. Supply chains, subcontractors and labour markets keep changing, and new vulnerabilities emerge as they do. Organisations have to keep testing whether their understanding remains current and whether controls still function as intended. Moving from stated commitment to verified practice means replacing assumption with evidence — and accepting that responsible procurement begins wherever a purchasing decision has any real capacity to shape how a person, somewhere in that chain, is actually treated.

Additional articles can be found at Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple. This site looks at procurement and supply chain management issues to assist organisations and people in increasing the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of their product and service supply to the customers' delight. *© Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple. All rights reserved.*