

STRUCTURE

Salewa USA, LLC DBA Oberalp North America
3600 Pearl Street
Suite 2
Boulder, CO 80301
Canada Business Number 851852350RM0001
ID Number 20061372151

Salewa USA, LLC DBA Oberalp North America is a subsidiary of the Mountain Experience Beteiligungs-Holding GmbH, headquartered in Austria and a member of the Oberalp Group. The Oberalp Group includes a portfolio of outdoor product equipment brands including Salewa, Dynafit, Pomoca, Wild Country, Evolv, and LaMunt. The headquarters of the Oberalp Group is located in Bolzano, Italy.

The Oberalp Group was founded in 1981 by Heiner Oberrauch and remains under the exclusive ownership and leadership of the Oberrauch family, based in Bolzano, Italy.

ACTIVITIES

Oberalp North America handles the sales, marketing, operations, distribution, and customer service functions in the United States and Canada for five brands within the Oberalp Group— Salewa, Dynafit, Pomoca, Wild Country, Evolv. We conduct sales operations in Canada via an office in the United States, leveraging our established distribution channel of retailers to efficiently reach our Canadian customers. Our North American office in the US allows us to streamline logistics and ensure timely delivery, providing our clients with seamless access to our products and services across North America. Our presence in Canada consists of non-employee sales agents, a third party distribution center, and a Canadian bank.

SUPPLY CHAIN

Sourcing

We own the factory that produces our ski touring skins in Switzerland, a footwear facility in Romania and a factory for the production mohair velvet for our ski touring skins in Germany.

The rest of our products are manufactured at external facilities, and this means we have to pick our production partners carefully and make sure we install fruitful and long- term partnerships.

We work with the best factories, in countries that have production expertise. In 2023 we worked with factories across 22 countries.

We produce our bindings, skis, ski boots, skins and some of our technical hardware – like via ferrata sets and ropes – some apparel, and some of our footwear in Europe. This allows us to easily monitor every step of production, making sure it meets our safety and performance requirements.

Around 80% of our FOB turnover is made of textile products, an industry where the risk of labour issues is relatively high. Thus, the focus of our Social Compliance and Due Diligence efforts is allocated to the factories where cut and sewn goods are produced, especially if located in Asian countries.

Planning, sourcing, and purchasing activities are conducted independently by the different divisions. Each division has its own internal structure, sourcing strategies and partners; however, common to all is the integration of due diligence and social compliance responsibilities throughout each of the respective teams, and with all suppliers, whether they be the factories directly, or agents who act as intermediaries between us and the factories. In cooperation with the Sustainability team, sourcing and costing managers are regularly briefed about local living costs, potential hazards and risks, and actual working conditions so they are empowered to make informed decisions.

DUE DILIGENCE

Human Rights Due Diligence

We are aware that our sourcing strategy (beginning, maintaining and ending the collaboration with our suppliers) and all our decisions affect the workers employed in our supply chain and the communities they live in. As a company active in the garments and footwear industry, we have to get deeper knowledge on the partners involved in the making of our goods to identify and address the actual and potential adverse impacts we could cause or contribute to in the supply chain. To achieve this, human rights due diligence (HRDD) and the sourcing process need to be integrated, so that the first can inform and influence the decisions of the second, and the second can provide input on objective and perceived risks so that due diligence can be refined, commensurate and actions can be better prioritized. Having structured and effective due diligence procedure and sourcing strategy is essential to prevent and minimize risks and violations. This is particularly important in our case because, from the results our supply chain mapping, the one we work with is fragmented, externally owned and located in many countries, with different cultures and political systems, with uneven coverage or guarantees on legal protection and social security measures, and especially with different degrees of dialogue and circumstances enabling equal treatment or advancement of workers' living standards. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) and the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains in the Garment and Footwear Sector set the basis of the direction we

are committed to following. The six-step framework developed by the OECD to help companies in creating their own due diligence process, which we have adopted in dealing with our supply chain:

Step 1 – Embed a Responsible Business Conduct (RBC) into policies and management systems: we are progressively tailoring our internal policies and management systems to better respond to the risks in our supply chain, and integrate them in our sourcing practices;

Step 2 - Identify and assess actual and potential adverse impacts: we have created a three levels scoping exercise. The first level helps us in identifying the countries we should focus more on basing on the general situation of the area analysed, the second enables us to get more information on the most frequent risks in the footwear and garment sector of the countries, the third one make us aware of the individual risks we find in the factories;

Step 3 - Cease, prevent and mitigate adverse impacts: depending on the severity and likelihood of risks identified in the previous step, we prioritise the ones that need our attention and create a plan to limit the adverse impacts;

Step 4 - Track implementation and results: the results of the risk-assessment and the actions taken to minimize risks and violations are tracked, for continuous improvement;

Step 5 - Communicate how impacts are addressed: we report on the risks and impacts, prioritisation criteria and processes, and actions and outcomes to address impacts against targets. We share the challenges, efforts and results in our annual Social Report and their evaluation can be found in the Brand Performance Check carried out by Fair Wear Foundation. Both documents can be found on the company and brands' websites.

Step 6 - Provide for or cooperate in remediation: we participate in remediation.

The global supply chain is subject to various changes linked to the geographical area and the political and economic system, so it is important that due diligence is integrated not only into sourcing but also into the company's management system and in a corporate policy. This needs to be updated and regularly revised to reflect and address the risks at each stage of their development, always with the aim of eliminating, preventing or mitigating them.

The important role of due diligence in the corporate structure needs to be formalised in a clear policy that guides current and future efforts, illustrates the principles that inspire the company and the methods it uses to assess and manage risk, and reiterates priorities, commitment and accountability: the Responsible Business Policy.

Responsible Business Conduct

We operate under a Responsible Business Conduct (RBC) policy as intended in the OECD's "Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct". It reflects the company's commitment to protecting and respecting the environment, the human rights and the dignity of every individual and community we come into contact with, within our supply chain. The policy acts as a guide that supports us in improving living conditions while preventing, mitigating, and remediating any negative impact we might cause, contribute to, or are directly linked to.

Even though our possibilities are limited, because of geographical distance and economic circumstances, such as our size compared with our suppliers', we are convinced that good management practices on our side, open discussion about shared values and social standards that must be upheld, and collaboration with competitor brands and stakeholders who want to improve workers' lives, lead to change for the better (see our Social Report).

Code of Conduct

Our RBC policy is complemented by the Oberalp Code of Conduct (CoC). Building on the most relevant International Human Rights Treaties, particularly the Core Conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), and in line with FWF's Code of Labour Practices, our own Code of Conduct sets forth the guiding principles and backbone of our company and all of our business relationships. At its core it's the shared responsibility, both on our part and expected from our suppliers: geared towards sustainability and compliance, as well as ethical behaviour towards all workers at all stages of our business and supply chain. Moreover, it is an information tool for making all employees and suppliers aware of their rights and duties. Our RBC and CoC prescribe that our business with suppliers and in turn, their business practices be free from corruption, direct or indirect, including planned, attempted, requested or successful transfer of a benefit as a result of bribery or extortion.

Oberalp Code of Conduct

- Child labor is not tolerated
- All employees must be treated with respect and dignity
- Employment must be based on ability and no discrimination is tolerated
- Employment must be freely chosen
- Payment of a living wage must be guaranteed
- Hours of work must be reasonable; overtime exceptional, voluntary and duly paid
- Working conditions must be decent and safe
- Freedom of association must be guaranteed
- The employment relationship must be formally established by means of a written contract

Risk assessment

The due diligence process is not always the same, it varies according to the likelihood and severity of an adverse impacts that may or have occurred; the negative impacts are also called "harms" and the issues that could result in such harms are defined as "risks". The greater the likelihood and severity (i.e. scale, scope and irremediability), the more extensive the due diligence needs to be.

Thus, we take a methodological approach when assessing human rights risks to ensure that the most salient ones are identified.

The global supply chain presents different risks, some specific to each country or region and others common to all factories. Before initiating the business relationship with a new supplier, a risk assessment is carried out, possibly in collaboration with other sourcing brands. It is then updated on an annual basis, and this analysis enables us to carry out a better process of due diligence, assessment, prevention, mitigation and remediation.

We have divided our risk assessment into three layers: country rights indicators, labour standards risks, supplier risks.

It also helps us in prioritizing the factories with the most severe actual and potential adverse human rights outcome, following the UNGP No. 24: "Where it is necessary to prioritise actions to address actual and potential adverse human rights impacts, business enterprises should first seek to prevent and mitigate those that are most severe or where delayed response would make them irremediable."

We collaborate with many factories, and it is not possible to identify all potential and actual negative impacts at once, and work to prevent, mitigate and remediate them all simultaneously.

Therefore, each identified risk is assigned a different degree of likelihood and severity, and we focus more on the risks that have higher values. Likelihood is a measure that identifies the degree of probability that a given event will occur and is measured on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being certain.

Severity is another useful measure for understanding how to prioritise, as it measures the seriousness of the impact. It has three sub-indicators: scale (objective seriousness), scope (how many people may be affected) and irremediability (inability to remedy over time).

Country rights indicators

The first risk analysis step, that we call risk scoping, researches the countries we work with through the combination of four indices: the World Bank Governance Indicators, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)'s Human Development Insights, the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)'s Global Rights Index and the World Economic Forum's Gender Gap Index.

The World Bank Governance Indicators (WGI) is a research dataset summarizing the views on the quality of governance provided by a large number of enterprise, citizen and expert survey respondents in industrial and developing countries. The data are gathered by a number of survey institutes, think tanks, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and private sector firms and report on six broad dimensions of governance: Voice and Accountability; Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism; Government Effectiveness; Regulatory Quality; Rule of Law; Control of Corruption.

A statistical tool, called Unobserved Components Model, is used to construct a weighted average of the data from each source for each country.

The resulting measure is a percentage that goes from 0% (minimum) to 100% (maximum) which enables a broad cross-country comparison; moreover, looking at the evolution of the indicators over time, it is useful to evaluate broad trends.

The UNDP's Human Development Insights (HDI) is a summary measure for assessing long-term progress in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, access to knowledge and a decent standard of living. The health dimension is assessed by life expectancy at birth, the education dimension is measured by means of years of schooling for adults aged 25 years and more and expected years of schooling for children of school entering age. The standard of living dimension is measured by gross national income (GNI) per capita. The HDI uses the logarithm of income, to reflect the diminishing importance of income with increasing GNI. The scores for the three HDI dimension indices are then aggregated into a composite index using geometric mean.

The result is a percentage that reflects the human development classification of a certain country. From 0% to 54% is low; from 55% to 69% is medium; from 70% to 79% is high and from 80% to 100% is very high.

The World Economic Forum's Gender Gap Index (GGI) benchmarks the current state and evolution of gender parity across four key dimensions: Economic Participation and Opportunity, Educational Attainment, Health and Survival, and Political Empowerment. It is the longest-standing index which tracks progress towards closing these gaps over time since its inception in 2006.

Economic Participation takes into consideration the male and female unemployment levels, levels of economic activity, and remuneration for equal work.

Economic Opportunity analyses the duration of maternity leave, number of women in managerial positions, availability of government-provided childcare, wage inequalities between men and women. Political Empowerment measures the gap between men and women at the highest level of political decision making through the ratio of women to men in ministerial positions and the ratio of women to men in parliamentary positions.

Educational Attainment captures the gap between women's and men's current access to education through the enrolment ratios of women to men in primary-, secondary- and tertiary-level education. Health and wellbeing provide an overview of the differences between women's and men's health and the effectiveness of governments' efforts to reduce poverty and inequality, adolescent fertility rate, percentage of births attended by skilled health staff, and maternal and infant mortality rates.

The Global Rights Index (GRI) is a world-wide assessment of trade union and human rights by country, made by the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC). The given ratings are based on 97 indicators derived from the labour standards of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), and specifically violations of trade union rights, such as limitations on collective bargaining and the right to strike, inhibiting trade union membership, state surveillance, violence and killings

against trade unionists and restrictions on freedom of speech. The index analyses the compliance with collective labour rights by governments and employers and assigns a rating per country on a scale from 1 through to 5+, where 1 means “sporadic violations of rights”, 2 “repeated violations of rights”, 3 “regular violations of rights”, 4 “systematic violations of rights”, 5 “no guarantee of rights” and 5+ “no guarantee of rights due to breakdown of the rule of law”.

In order to provide an overall assessment of the countries, taking into account all the indices analysed, we convert each score for each indicator to a scale of 1 to 6. In the case of the GRI indicator, we have used the same scale as the research itself, with the sole exception of converting the score to 6 points if the risk is 5+. For the other three indicators, we used a logic similar to that of the HDI, where a percentage between 80% and 100% indicates a very high degree of development, which we translated into a very low risk.

The vast majority of countries have a precise indicator for all the aspects; where the indicator is not available, we conduct further research to exclude that the missing measure would impact the risk level of the country.

At the end of this first level of risk assessment, we were able to classify each country's level of risk based on its performance in terms of a living wage, health, education, freedom of association and access to remedy, gender and discrimination, politics, stability and corruption.

Country rights indicators serve different purposes. They are the basis for building an overview of the risks useful to consult when we are considering partnering with a new supplier in a specific area. The results help us in conducting a more accurate assessment of the prospective new factory considering the human rights perspective and the risk profile which can lead to choosing whether to start or not the new business relationship.

Assigning risk levels allows us to focus our attention on where the majority of violations occur. Time and economic resources are scarce, so we need to divert them to where better solutions can be achieved in identifying, preventing, mitigating and addressing the actual and potential adverse impacts we may cause or contribute to in the supply chain.

Moreover, by mapping the risk areas, we can be more precise in the subsequent steps. Knowing which areas present a higher degree of risk guides our due diligence work in the factories. We carry out a broad risk analysis on the different labour standards, but knowing which rights are most likely to be violated, we focus on understanding whether these risks are also present in the factories.

Labour standards risks

Countries rated medium, high and very high as a result of this mapping are subject to further risk analysis, this time focusing on labour standards and the textile sector.

On the other hand, very low and low risk countries are not investigated further immediately, unless the factory has special conditions, the country's balance does not change abruptly due to external events, or investigations or research focused on labour conditions change the perceived risk. Lower risk countries are still required to fill a specific questionnaire that we use to gather more information about single issues.

We also use risk assessment tools and specific requirements developed by the Fair Wear Foundation (FWF):

FWF's database provides a detailed analysis of labour standards risks and their likelihood for each country where they have a field team conducting country studies.

Fair Wear Country Studies are the result of research and analysis of different countries, giving a picture of the labour laws, working conditions and industrial relations within the garment industry in the country. The countries covered by the study are Myanmar (2016), Turkey (2017-2018), Bangladesh (2018), China (2020), Romania (2021), Vietnam (2021), Tunisia (2021). For other countries, we conduct our own risk analysis using various sources such as the FWF risk assessment, specific due diligence requirements, reports from NGOs and other stakeholders, and news from a variety of sources.

FWF risk assessments have been carried out for two countries where there is no active FWF team, but where specific risks can be identified. This was the case for Portugal in 2016 and Italy in 2020. For the first country, risks resulting from the strong impact of the 2008 crisis are presented: payment of a living wage, reasonable working hours and remuneration, and health and safety at production sites. In the case of Italy, the risk assessment makes frequent reference to the situation of workers in Chinese-owned factories.

Due diligence requirements are another resource we use to understand the most significant risks to labour standards in particular countries. Before the coup in Myanmar, due diligence requirements included checking more carefully that the factory did not use child labour and was not owned by the military. So, the requirements help us to identify which aspects are most at risk.

Reports from NGOs or other stakeholders provide us with data and information on countries where our main stakeholder is not present and where we have identified at least a moderate level of risk in the first tier: Albania, Belarus, Cambodia, Moldova and Ukraine.

The main source of information we use is the CSR Risk Check developed by MVO Nederland. This tool gives us an indication of the risks we may face when doing business in the textile sector abroad. News is another valuable way of learning about risks. We regularly monitor various channels (magazines, newsletters, websites, podcasts) to keep abreast of the latest developments in the economic, political and social context that may affect labour standards. The sources we consult most frequently are Human Rights Watch, Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, ILO publications.

Both our and FWF's tools provide a risk matrix, which is useful for gaining an overview of labour standards risks in our supply chain. We then prioritize the risks that are more likely to occur.

Supplier risks

The final step in our risk assessment process considers each supplier's social compliance and human rights performance. The

aim of this step is to understand whether the risks identified at country and labour standards levels are also present in the factories. Starting with the most likely risks, we assess the potential severity of them at each site. Once we have an overview, we focus first on those with a higher likelihood and severity.

During site visits, email conversations and phone calls, we ask additional questions to understand whether risks are present or not, whether they are more or less likely to occur, and whether there are processes in place to identify them before they occur.

Factory self-assessments are another useful resource for understanding the presence of risk at the site level. Each time we start working with a factory, we ask them to complete a questionnaire covering the 8 labour standards, which we use as the basis for subsequent discussions. We also ask the factory to provide third-party social audit reports, if available.

Third-party audits allow us to go further, to see whether the risks we have identified have materialised or whether there have been violations that we did not anticipate. As soon as we see a finding in a report, we update the factory's risk profile to indicate that a negative impact has already occurred and analyse what other labour standards may be affected. We rely on third-party social audits conducted on behalf of other brands or requested by the factory, and if we deem it necessary to go deeper into an issue, we commission audits from the Fair Wair Foundation's audit teams.

Human rights-related controversies, such as complaints through the FWF hotline, factories' internal grievance mechanisms, or learned from other sources like the specialised press or denounced by NGOs also provide valid input to draw attention to where potential violations may be occurring or have occurred.

The third layer helps us to name the risks and to identify where we should focus our efforts in our supply chain. Without it, a fundamental part of our risk assessment would be missing. We believe that if we carry out a proper and complete risk assessment, we will also be able to anticipate and mitigate the risks in the specific factories, or even decide that a business relationship cannot continue because the risk of adverse impact is too great, or the mitigation efforts have failed.

The risk assessment tools are not static; they need to be updated every year to reflect the evolving context in the countries and the violations. At the same time, we are committed to updating the structure of the tool to include more sources of information that will lead us to more accurate results. We are already planning to include input from trade unionists, workers' representatives, and other local stakeholders to improve the tools.

FORCED AND CHILD LABOUR RISKS

Forced labour is defined as "all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty and for which the said person has not offered himself voluntarily" [ILO Forced Labour Convention 29, 1930: Art. 2(1)].

According to the ILO, the term child labour is defined as work that deprives children of their childhood, their potential and their dignity, and that is harmful to their physical and mental development. It refers to work that is mentally, physically, socially or morally dangerous and harmful to children; and/or interferes with their schooling by depriving them of the opportunity to attend school; obliging them to leave school prematurely; or requiring them to attempt to combine school attendance with excessively long and heavy work.

As defined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) in article 1, a child is a person under the age of 18. Children have rights, for example, the right to be protected from physical or mental violence (article 19) and the right to education (article 28).

The Oberalp Code of Conduct clearly states that workers must be free to choose to work and that we don't tolerate child labour - no exceptions are made.

The risk assessment process described in the previous section supports the work of taking steps to assess and eliminate the risks of child and forced labour.

The country rights indicators guide our efforts to look for signals of the presence of these two serious risks in our supply chain. In identifying labour standards risks, we check which countries have ratified the ILO Conventions on child and forced labour and have implemented them in national legislation.

As a result of this comprehensive risk assessment, we have identified a higher risk of forced labour in our textile supply chain in China, Myanmar, Tunisia, Bangladesh and Vietnam, and a risk of child labour in Myanmar, Bangladesh, Turkey and Tunisia.

Forced labour is one of the most difficult labour violations to detect. To identify its presence, we look for signs of the most common indicators: abuse of vulnerability, restriction of movement, violence, intimidation, withholding of identity documents, withholding of wages, debt bondage, forced overtime, low wages, high pressure and unauthorised subcontractors.

To identify or rule out the existence of these risks among our suppliers, we review and assess:

- the policies and procedures that factories have in place to minimise the risks, such as voluntary overtime, age verification, recruitment practices, grievance mechanisms
- previous audit findings related to child and forced labour
- the experience of quality controllers and other technicians - both Oberalp employees - in the factory

Another valuable tool in assessing the presence of child and forced labour risks and potential negative impacts is collaboration with other sourcing brands. We often share our concerns and plans and join forces to identify, prevent, mitigate and address the risks and negative impacts.

We also constantly monitor and improve our purchasing practices to ensure that we do not contribute to high pressure and overtime, and we have a strict policy on subcontracting to minimise the risk of unauthorised facilities.

We have found no evidence of child or forced labour risks among our suppliers. The assessment is updated frequently to allow for the possibility of a change in outcome.

REMIEDIATION

We have not found any cases of child or forced labour among our suppliers, but we have already developed a standard remediation process in case we do find one in the future. Granted: Each case may be different.

If we do find a case of child labour, we will work with a local stakeholder who can help us with remediation, identify the root causes that lead the factory to employ a child (poor recruitment practices or a non-functioning age verification system), ensure that the child completes his or her education, and talk to the family to understand their needs, and engage the factory actively in remediation, so that preventive action is taken and the risk of recurrence of child labour is eliminated.

As we don't tolerate child labour in our supply chain, if factory does not cooperate and remediate within the set timeframe, we will initiate a responsible exit from the factory.

In the event of a case of forced labour, we will work with a local stakeholder who can help us with remediation, identify the root causes that led the factory to this situation, assess whether our conduct contributed to the case, evaluate the factory's policies and identify areas for improvement, and work with the supplier to immediately stop the use of forced labour.

REMIEDIATION OF LOSS INCOME

We have not found any cases of child or forced labour among our suppliers, so we have not experienced any loss of income, but we have already developed a standard procedure for recovering lost income should we find any. Granted: Every case may be different.

In the case of child labour, we will work with the supplier to calculate the monthly wage that needs to be paid to the child's parents until the child reaches working age to compensate for the loss of income and ensure that it is paid to them; we will have the child reinstated in the same factory when he or she reaches working age.

In the case of forced labour, we will ensure that the time worked is compensated and that factory policies and processes are changed and aligned to avoid the recurrence of forced labour.

TRAINING

Often run in partnership with the Fair Wear Foundation (more information on this organisation can be found in the 'Assessing Impact' section), our training sessions aim to raise awareness of labour rights and workplace risks - including forced and child labour - and to equip workers and factory management with the knowledge and skills to improve their working relationships. A typical session lasts one day and involves 25 workers and 25 managers.

We want to make sure that workers are able to assess whether the factory, or a buyer, is violating their rights and are able to speak up. A poster with the labour standards and a contact number or email address is displayed in the factory so that workers and their representatives, including trade unions and civil society organisations, can lodge complaints about working conditions and rights violations.

Both the training and the complaint line are ways to monitor and eliminate forced and child labour.

ASSESSING EFFECTIVENESS

The Fair Wear Foundation (FWF) is our most important partner in the improvement of the well-being of the workers in the factories.

FWF is a non-profit organization that works with brands, factories, trade unions, NGOs and sometimes governments to improve working conditions in supply chains where garments are made.

It conducts and shares research on workplace-related issues, provides a platform for open exchange of information with other brands and stakeholders, and has local teams in manufacturing countries that conduct worker training, seminars and audits. Another important part of FWF's work is to help us deal with worker complaints.

Working with the FWF is a big commitment. Each year, it reviews our work against a set of indicators (Brand Performance Check) to assess whether we have comprehensive Responsible Business Conduct practices and are implementing our Code of Conduct effectively. It assesses our internal organization and processes, our efforts and results in preventing and reducing risks in our operations and supply chain, our approach and handling of the year's major events, worker complaints and audits, and gives us a rating in a report that is published on their website.

An important recognition of this came in 2016 when FWF awarded us Leader status as a result of our concerted efforts to support and integrate social compliance into our operations through ongoing due diligence, informed sourcing and

purchasing practices, monitoring and remediation activities, internal and external training and capacity building, information management and efforts to increase transparency.

ATTESTATION

In accordance with the requirements of the Act, and in particular section 11 thereof, I attest that I have reviewed the information contained in the report for the entity or entities listed above. Based on my knowledge, and having exercised reasonable diligence, I attest that the information in the report is true, accurate and complete in all material respects for the purposes of the Act, for the reporting year listed above.

Andrew Saunders
President
May 24, 2024

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "A. Saunders", is written over a light blue grid background.

I have the authority to bind SALEWA USA, LLC.