Certification Components	PRESENT	SOMEWHAT PRESENT	ABSENT	Evidence	Recommendations
Prospective Accountability					
1. Development (Standard-setting)					
1.1 Standard creation *NB: To ensure this review reflects the recent efforts of the standard-holder, the most recently completed standard created was used - IFA Aquaculture Standard*					
Procedural Transparency					
Civil Society stakeholder representation in standard development (e.g. St. Comm, round tables, working groups, etc)			1	Aquaculture Technical Committee – consisting of six retail/food service members and six producer/supplier members. No civil society members hold a representative seat within standard development itself. Civil society, however, are invited to focus groups, technical meetings on specific topics and targeted consultation. Example collaborations outside of representation include IUCN, OXFAM for example.	Increase civil society representation at the governance level, as well as at standard creation and revision. Currently civil society participation is limited to consultation. Board and Committee members should be representative of economic, social and environmental interests.
Public standard development process document for new standards	1			https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/170925_P_Standard-Setting_Procedure_public_V3_en.pdf	
Public Terms of Reference and outline of process			1	The public consultation webpage outlines the process of the Version 6 Integrated Farm Standard https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/ However, no public Terms of Reference could be found or provided that details the following: standard scope, geographic application, standard justification, objectives/outcomes the standard revision sets to achieve (ISEAL/GSSI requirements for ToR)	Expand the Terms of Reference to include standard scope, geographic application, standard justification, objectives/outcomes of the new standard.
Public comment period(s)	1			40 to 60 days - normally 2 rounds. See current example: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/	
Publicly available consultation documentation (e.g. rationale for proposed, relevant data, studies and information)	1			Rationale and explanations could be found at the beginning on the Data Driven approach draft https://www.globalgap.org/.content/IFA_Documents/200527_GG_Data-Driven_Approach_V0_6-1_DRAFT_protected_en.docx	
Outcome Transparency					
Public standard	1			Found at: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/190201_GG_IFA_CPCC_AQ_V5_2_en.pdf	
Public documentation of received comments			1	None could be found for previous consultations, however, GG state they will in the future publish a spreadsheet including all comments received and their rational/response for the Version 6 IFS currently undergoing consultation.	Ensure stakeholders comments are made public with a response. Stakeholders should be able to see how consideration was given, or not, to comments submitted. This enables a transparent decision-making process with rationale for how input influenced the outcome.
Public documentation of the response to comments received, or of the consideration given to comments received			1	None could be found for previous consultations, however, comments and explanations have been provided for the Aquaculture standard revision under the Integrated Farm Assurance Standard v6 second consultation (currently in-progress). Tracked changes between standard versions are also available.	
1.2 Standard revisions *NB: To ensure this review reflects the recent efforts of the standard-holder, the most recently completed standard revision created was used - IFA Aquaculture Standard V6*					
Procedural Transparency					
Civil society stakeholder representation in revision development (e.g. St. Comm, round tables, working groups, etc)			1	Aquaculture Technical Committee – consisting of six retail/food service members and six producer/supplier members. No civil society members hold a representative seat within standard revision itself. Civil society, however, are invited to technical meetings on specific topics and targeted consultation. Example collaborations outside of representation include IUCN, OXFAM for example.	Increase civil society representation at the governance level, as well as at standard creation and revision. Currently civil society participation is limited to consultation. Board and Committee members should be representative of economic, social and environmental interests.
Public information on how revisions are triggered (e.g. scheduled vs responsive).			1	Although GLOBALGAP state that revisions for the GLOBALG.A.P. IFA Standard for Aquaculture are scheduled every 4-5 years (direct comms), no public information on the website aside from "reviewed on a periodic basis and revised in a timely manner" could be found. Outside of scheduled revisions, no information on possible triggers for initiating a responsive revision (e.g., new science or data) was found.	Incorporate how revisions are triggered (scheduled and responsive) into the standard setting document.
Public timeline of current and upcoming revisions	1			Found at: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/	

Criteria				Notes	Recommendation
Public Terms of Reference inc. timeline; the revision goals; outline of stakeholder opportunities; the decision-making process.			1	The public consultation webpage outlines the process of the Version 6 Integrated Farm Standard https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/ However, no public Terms of Reference could be found or provided that details the following: standard scope, geographic application, standard justification, objectives/outcomes the standard revision sets to achieve (ISEAL/GSSI requirements for ToR)	Expand the Terms of Reference to include standard scope, geographic application, standard justification, objectives/outcomes of the standard revision.
Public comment period(s)	1			40 to 60 days - normally 2 rounds. See current example: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/	
Publicly available consultation documentation (e.g. rationale for proposed, relevant data, studies and information)			1	Standard criteria with tracked edits within the draft. No rationale, data, studies, etc., (i.e., consultation documentation) found publicly.	Provide further consultation documentation such as rationale, studies and relevant data.
Outcome Transparency					
Public revised standard	1			Found at: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/190201_GG_IFA_CPCC_AQ_V5_2_en.pdf	
Public documentation of received comments			1	Comments and explanations have been provided for the Aquaculture standard revision under the Integrated Farm Assurance Standard v6 second consultation (currently in-progress). Tracked changes between standard versions are also available. https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/ refer to document name "Aquaculture - Finfish, Crustaceans, Molluscs, Seaweed"	Ensure stakeholders comments are made public with a response. Stakeholders should be able to see how consideration was given, or not, to comments submitted. This enables a transparent decision-making process with rationale for how input influenced the outcome.
Public documentation of the response to comments received, or of the consideration given to comments received			1	Comments and explanations have been provided for the Aquaculture standard revision under the Integrated Farm Assurance Standard v6 second consultation (currently in-progress). Tracked changes between standard versions are also available. https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/ refer to document name "Aquaculture - Finfish, Crustaceans, Molluscs, Seaweed"	
1.3 Interpretations / variances					
Procedural Transparency					
Civil society stakeholder representation in interpretation development (e.g. St. Comm, round tables, working groups, etc)				NA. GG states they do not implement amendments, variances or interpretations that alter standard or program rule criteria. There are National Interpretations Guidelines (NIG) where necessary. A NIG is a document for certification bodies that provides country-level guidance on how to implement and audit against the standard at a national level. It does not change the standard's control points or compliance criteria (see: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/who-we-are/ntwgs/nig/).	
Public outline of process					
Public comment period(s)					
Publicly available consultation documentation (e.g. rationale for proposed, relevant data, studies and information)					
Outcome Transparency					
Public interpretations / variances					
Public documentation of received comments					
Public documentation of the response to comments received, or of the consideration given to comments received					
1.4 Program rules (e.g. auditing, non-compliance, suspension, etc.)					
Procedural Transparency					
Civil society stakeholder representation in program rules development (e.g. St. Comm, round tables, working groups, etc)			1	Certification body committee and integrity committee.	Increase civil society representation at the governance level, as well as at standard creation and revision. Currently civil society participation is limited to consultation. Board and Committee members should be representative of economic, social and environmental interests.

	1	2	3	Evidence	Recommendation
Public outline of process	1			Found at: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/	
Public comment period(s)	1			Found at: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/public-consultation/	
Publicly available consultation documentation (e.g. rationale for proposed, relevant data, studies and information)	1			See example: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/IFA_Documents/200605_GG_GR-IP_V0_6-1_DRAFT_protected_en.docx	
Outcome Transparency					
Public program rules	1			Available at:General Regulations: Part I https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/190201_GG_GR_Part-I_V5_2_en.pdf Part II https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/190201_GG_GR_Part-II_V5_2_en.pdf Part III https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/190201_GG_GR_Part-III_V5_2_en.pdf	
Public documentation of received comments			1	None could be found for previous consultations	Ensure stakeholders comments are made public with a response. Stakeholders should be able to see how consideration was given, or not, to comments submitted. This enables a transparent decision-making process with rationale for how input influenced the outcome.
Public documentation of the response to comments received, or of the consideration given to comments received			1	None could be found for previous consultations	
2. Governance (Decision-making)					
2.1 Governance structure					
Procedural Transparency					
Public information on structure	1			See: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/who-we-are/governance/board/ The Board is made up of an equal number of elected producer and retailer representatives and is chaired by one of its members. 7 producer / 7 retailer/food service. Of the supplier seats, one seat for each scope (i.e., one aquaculture) and at least three of four regions represented on the board.	
Public outline of nomination and selection process.	1			Available at: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/170530-GLOBALG.A.P.-Board-Terms-of-Reference.pdf	
Published conflict of interest policy; published annual report on application of conflict of interest policy	1			Eligibility Criteria of the ToR. Annual report: https://globalgapsolutions.org/annual-report/	
Public outline of decision-making protocols	1			Consensus; Voting 2nd where consensus not reached.	
Publicly available contact information for unsolicited input		1		No direct board contact email available. However, board members are listed: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/who-we-are/governance/board/ GAA GlobalGAP Unsolicited input can be submitted to GlobalGAP at anytime.	Provide a general contact to the board and/or board chair.
Outcome Transparency					
Inclusive NGO/Civil society representation			1	7 producer; 7 retailer/food service. No civil society.	Increase civil society representation at the governance level, as well as at standard creation and revision. Currently civil society participation is limited to consultation. Board and Committee members should be representative of economic, social and environmental interests.
Publicly available meeting notes			1	Public information is available when meeting take place. However, meeting notes are not publicly available.	Publish meeting notes / summaries.
Publicly available performance review of governance body			1	There is a general annual report: https://globalgapsolutions.org/annual-report/ but no specific performance review of the governance body.	
3. Verification (Auditing)					
3.1 Farm audits					
Procedural Transparency					
Public information on auditing process	1			Available at: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/five-steps-to-get-certified/index.html	
Stakeholder notification and invitation to consult on audits			1	None.	Include stakeholder consultation in the auditing process, including make audits available. Civil society stakeholders are given the opportunity to provide local expertise and knowledge. Publishing audit reports with conformance results will provide assurance to stakeholders.
Public reporting of upcoming audits			1	None.	
Publicly available draft audit reports			1	The confidentiality aspect of the IFA standard is based on ISO/IEC 17065:2012(E). Audit/Inspection summaries can be made publicly available based on the explicit permission of all participants involved.	

Indicator				Evidence	Recommendation
Public comment period(s)			1	None.	
Public draft audits provide conformance evidence			1	The confidentiality aspect of the IFA standard is based on ISO/IEC 17065:2012(E). Audit/Inspection summaries can be made publicly available based on the explicit permission of all participants involved.	Include stakeholder consultation in the auditing process, including make audits available. Civil society stakeholders are given the opportunity to provide local expertise and knowledge. Publishing audit reports with conformance results will provide assurance to stakeholders.
Publicly available contact information of certifying body	1			Database lists certification body contact alongside the certificate.	
Outcome Transparency					
Public list of certified farms	1			Farms supplying product for GGN label: https://aquaculture.ggn.org/en/meet-your-farm.html All certified farms can be found on the database: https://database.globalgap.org/globalgap/search/SearchMain.faces?init=1	
Public list of suspended, withdrawn farms			1	It is publicly available for market participants of the GLOBALG.A.P. database, using the bookmarking tool. Not civil society stakeholders	Publish suspensions and withdrawals as necessary.
Public list of farms in assessment			1	It is publicly available for market participants of the GLOBALG.A.P. database, using the bookmarking tool. Not civil society stakeholders	Publish farms in assessment.
Publicly available certificates	1			Available at: https://database.globalgap.org/globalgap/search/SearchMain.faces?searchQuery=4050373272111	
Publicly available finalized audits			1	The confidentiality aspect of the IFA standard is based on ISO/IEC 17065:2012(E). Audit/Inspection summaries can be made publicly available based on the explicit permission of all participants involved.	Include stakeholder consultation in the auditing process, including make audits available. Civil society stakeholders are given the opportunity to provide local expertise and knowledge. Publishing audit reports with conformance results will provide assurance to stakeholders.
Public final audits provide conformance evidence			1	The confidentiality aspect of the IFA standard is based on ISO/IEC 17065:2012(E). Audit/Inspection summaries can be made publicly available based on the explicit permission of all participants involved.	
Public documentation of received comments			1	No public comment period.	
Public documentation of the response to comments received, or of the consideration given to comments received			1	No public comment period.	
Retrospective Accountability					
4. Monitoring and Evaluation; Program Assurance					
4.1 Monitoring and Evaluation					
Procedural Transparency					
Public Theory of Change available			1	There currently is no Theory of Change.	Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation program. Define a Theory of Change. The M&E process should include stakeholder consultation. Results should help demonstrate to stakeholders the certification's impacts and effectiveness against the ToC.
Public Terms of Reference and outline of process			1	There is currently no M&E program that assess the impacts of the standard(s) against intended outcomes.	
Public comment period(s)			1	There is currently no M&E program that assess the impacts of the standard(s) against intended outcomes.	
Publicly available consultation documentation (e.g. rationale for proposed, relevant data, studies and information)			1	There is currently no M&E program that assess the impacts of the standard(s) against intended outcomes.	
Outcome Transparency					
Public M&E results			1	There is currently no M&E program that assess the impacts of the standard(s) against intended outcomes.	
Public documentation of received comments			1	There is currently no M&E program that assess the impacts of the standard(s) against intended outcomes.	
Public documentation of the response to comments received, or of the consideration given to comments received			1	There is currently no M&E program that assess the impacts of the standard(s) against intended outcomes.	
4.2 Program Assurance					
Procedural Transparency					
Public outline of auditor accreditation process	1			Information on the integrity programs: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/the-gg-system/integrity-program/ Available at: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/170630_GG_GR_Part-III_V5_1_en.pdf	
Public rules for label use	1			Available at: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/190201_GG_GR_Part-I_V5_2_en.pdf	
Outcome Transparency					

Criterion				Details	Recommendation
Public list of approved auditors	1			Available at: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/the-gg-system/certification/list-of-accreditation-bodies/index.html	
Public accreditation reports of auditors	1			Global GAP lists performance ratings and breaches (e.g., suspension) of certification bodies: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/the-gg-system/certification/Approved-CBs/index.html They also have a Certification Integrity Program and conduct annual program integrity reports: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/190607_Integrity_Report_2018_web.pdf	
Public list of breaches of label use			1	Global GAP has a The Brand Integrity Program for label misuse: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/the-gg-system/integrity-program/BIPRO/ However, label breaches are not named publicly. They do report 87 misuses in 2019: https://globalgapsolutions.org/services/integrity-program/integrity-report/complaints-management/	Publish any breaches of label misuse.

5. Dispute Settlement

5.1 Certification process disputes

Procedural Transparency

Criterion				Details	Recommendation
Public outline of certification objection procedure	1			Available at: https://globalgapsolutions.org/services/integrity-program/integrity-report/complaints-management/	
Publicly available contact for objections to certifications	1			Complaint form: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/who-we-are/about-us/incident-complaint-form/index.html	

Outcome Transparency

Criterion				Details	Recommendation
Procedurally fair independent third-party dispute resolution mechanism		1		The certification body investigates the compaint and sends the conclusions to the GLOBALG.A.P. technical team. Traceability checks may involve an independent expert. There is no independent accreditation body to submit a complaint regarding a certficiation body to.	Adopt a third-party dispute settlement mechanism. Internal and external stakeholders should be able dispute and submit complaints that are investigated through a fair independent third-party mechanism to ensure conflict of interest is removed.
Public reporting of complaints investigation and resolution		1		A general report out of the number of complaints per year / crop / country. No complaint investigation summaries.	
Public evidence of corrective actions (e.g. auditor NCs, withdrawing cert.)			1	Global GAP lists performance ratings and breaches (e.g., suspension) of certification bodies: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/the-gg-system/certification/Approved-CBs/index.html Suspension / withdraw of producer certificates are not made public.	

5.2 Standard holder disputes

Procedural Transparency

Criterion				Details	Recommendation
Public outline of complaint procedure	1			Available at: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/GG_Complaint_Management_General_Procedure_V2_en.pdf	
Publicly available contact for complaints regarding standard holder	1			Available at: https://www.globalgap.org/uk_en/what-we-do/globalg.a.p.-certification/complaint-management/index.html	

Outcome Transparency

Criterion				Details	Recommendation
Procedurally fair independent third-party dispute resolution mechanism		1		Internal between GLOBALG.A.P. Secretariat/Plaintiff See: https://www.globalgap.org/.content/.galleries/documents/171013_Complaint-Management_Process_Public_V2_en.pdf	Adopt a third-party dispute settlement mechanism. Internal and external stakeholders should be able dispute and submit complaints that are investigated through a fair independent third-party mechanism to ensure conflict of interest is removed.
Public reporting of complaints investigation and resolution		1		GlobalG.A.P states individual complaints cannot be published due to confidentiality reasons and GDPR requirements to keep personal data. A summary of complaint cases for each year published as part of their integrity report: https://globalgapsolutions.org/services/integrity-program/integrity-report/complaints-management/	
Public evidence of corrective actions (e.g. auditor NCs, withdrawing cert.)		1		GlobalG.A.P states individual complaints cannot be published due to confidentiality reasons and GDPR requirements to keep personal data. A summary of complaint cases for each year published as part of their integrity report: https://globalgapsolutions.org/services/integrity-program/integrity-report/complaints-management/	