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The GLOBALG.A.P. Integrity Program, the first of its kind in food certification, is active around the world to build confidence and trust.

Its aim is to ensure consistent delivery and implementation of the standard by over 1,800 trained inspectors and auditors working for more than 154 accredited certification bodies certifying over 530 products and more than 180,000 producers, spread across more than 125 countries in 5 continents.

It also acts as a feedback mechanism that serves the ongoing improvement of all aspects of the GLOBALG.A.P. System.

The Integrity Program is based on different activities that are interconnected and include the explanation of the system and harmonization of the standard criteria through different kinds of certification body (CB) trainings, the administration of CB approval, monitoring of CB performance through CB office and producer assessments, the protection of the GLOBALG.A.P. Brand, controlling the completeness and accuracy of database information, and the investigation of complaints, including those related to residues in certified products.

Andras Fekete
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Every certification body (CB) working in the GLOBALG.A.P. System has to appoint a scheme manager, who has to attend an annual update workshop (SMU – scheme managers update workshops), and an in-house trainer, who is responsible for the training of auditors and inspectors, who is scope specific, and has to attend a face-to-face training (IHT – in house-trainer trainings) and pass an exam on the content of the entire standard he is responsible for (IFA - Integrated Farm Assurance, CoC – Chain of Custody, GRASP – Social Practice, etc.), for every standard version.

All GLOBALG.A.P. approved auditors, who are the ones auditing the quality management systems (QMS) of producer groups and multisite producers, have to attend a face-to-face training and pass an exam on how to audit the GLOBALG.A.P. QMS (QMS trainings). At the same time, all GLOBALG.A.P. approved auditors and inspectors have to pass an online exam on the content of the normative documents of the standards, scopes and versions they are allowed to audit.

In 2016, 1341 auditors and inspectors passed the online exam for IFA Version 5, 571 auditors and inspectors passed the online exam for GRASP (GLOBALG.A.P. Risk Assessment on Social Practice) and 157 auditors and inspectors passed the online exam for Chain of Custody (CoC) Standard Version 5. Exams were available in the following languages: Arabic, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Spanish, Turkish and Vietnamese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Nº of Trainings</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IHT GRASP (GLOBALG.A.P. Risk Assessment on Social Practices)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHT Aquaculture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHT Compound Feed Manufacturers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHT Crops</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>English, Spanish, German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHT Livestock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>English, Spanish, French, Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHT CoC (Chain of Custody)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>English, Italian, German, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRIBUTION OF CB TRAININGS WORLDWIDE IN 2016
The GLOBALG.A.P. Secretariat manages a certification body approval process that is described in the normative documents and on the GLOBALG.A.P. website.

Certification bodies that want to become GLOBALG.A.P. approved must be accredited for ISO/IEC 17065 for the relevant scope (e.g. Crops, Aquaculture, Livestock) and sub-scope (e.g. Fruits and Vegetables, Pigs, etc.) by an accreditation body (AB) that shall be a member of the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) and signatory of the Multilateral Agreement (MLA) on Product Certification. This means that the accreditation body (AB) has been subject to a peer evaluation in the product certification field and has received a positive recommendation in its report.

GLOBALG.A.P. signs license and certification agreements (LCA) with the certification bodies that have successfully passed the GLOBALG.A.P. internal approval process. The agreements and the accreditation ensure a standardized high level of quality and integrity of certification bodies’ procedures.

By the end of 2016 the number of GLOBALG.A.P. approved CBs was 154.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Scopes</th>
<th>Nº of Approved CBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFA – Integrated Farm Assurance</td>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM – Compound Feed Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC - Chain of Custody</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRASP</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Heijn</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add-on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOBALG.A.P. approved certification bodies (CBs) are monitored annually by their own accreditation bodies according to the international rules for product certification (ISO 17065).

In addition, GLOBALG.A.P. has its own team of expert assessors that perform assessments of the CB offices and of a sample of their GLOBALG.A.P. certified clients (producer assessments).

The aim of CB office and producer assessments is to verify that certification activities carried out by CBs are carried out in accordance with the scheme’s normative documents and the signed license agreement.

Integrity Assessments Performed in 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>CBs</th>
<th>Nº of Assessors</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB Office</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All scopes CBs are approved for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Producers (Op. 1)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FV, GRASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Groups (Op.2)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this number of assessments, the Integrity Program covered one third of the approved certification bodies during 2016, as it usually does every year.

The selection of office and producers to be assessed is based mainly on risk assessment and follow-up of sanctions, but there is always at least one third of the assessments where the sample is selected randomly.

This year assessments have been performed in 21 countries located in America, Europe, Asia and Africa.
INTEGRITY ASSESSMENTS WORLDWIDE IN 2016:

Countries covered by integrity assessments in 2016.

After the assessments, reports are reviewed centrally and CB assessments are classified according to their performance:

1. Unacceptable performance: GLOBALG.A.P. to take action immediately
2. Very poor performance: CB needs major improvement
3. Inadequate performance: CB needs some improvement
4. Acceptable performance
5. Performance well above average

Based on the results of one or more assessment reports and in case of failure to demonstrate improvement from previous assessments, the GLOBALG.A.P. Secretariat forwards the information to the Integrity Surveillance Committee (ISC), for it to decide on CB sanctions. Made up of industry experts with a local legal background, ISC members are appointed by the Board, but work independently and meet at least 3 times a year.

To guarantee an impartial evaluation, the integrity assessment reports are anonymized before sending them to the ISC (i.e. they don’t include information regarding the producer name, GGN, country, certification body name, etc.).

Current Integrity Surveillance Committee members are displayed on the GLOBALG.A.P. website.
The certification bodies are informed about their proposed performance classification and are given the opportunity to respond in a written statement within 14 days after notification.

**Certification Body Sanctions:**

1st Warning: The certification body and its accreditation body are informed.

2nd Warning: The certification body and its accreditation body are informed.

Yellow Card: The certification body and its accreditation body are informed. The sanction is published on the GLOBALG.A.P. website.

Red Card: The certification body and its accreditation body are informed. The sanction is published on the GLOBALG.A.P. website. The CB is not allowed to (re)issue new certificates.

Contract Cancellation: The certification body and its accreditation body are informed. The sanction is published on the GLOBALG.A.P. website. The license and certification agreement is cancelled.

Sanctioning steps 1 to 5 are not necessarily consecutive. In case of demonstrated fraud or severe breach of normative requirements, the highest sanctions can be applied immediately.

Through the years, the amount of offices with very low performances or critical incidences has diminished. Classification 1 has not been found since 2009. During 2016, no performances with classifications 1 or 2 were found at CB office level. Probably due to the change of standards version, most of the offices showed the need to implement some improvement, while one third of them showed a completely acceptable performance with no need for any correction.

### Evolution of Certification Body (CB) Performance during Integrity Assessments (2008-2016):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CB Office Assessment Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class. 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class. 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class. 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class. 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class. 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class. 5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class. 4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class. 3</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class. 2</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class. 1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even when most of the producers sampled are selected based on risk or as a follow-up of sanctions, in 2016 almost half of them (49% of the assessed producers) reached and exceeded the expected level of compliance (classifications #4 and #5) and only 4% showed very poor performance (classification #2). Please note that the assessment is classified as #3 in case any deviation has been detected in the CB performance, even if the producer has reached the certification level.

In 2016, the comparison between producers certified under Option 1 (individual producers) and under Option 2 (producer groups’ members) showed a similar level of proper implementation of Good Agricultural Practices. This result is similar to the ones obtained in previous years and reinforces the idea that group certification (Option 2) is a reliable and sound alternative for smallholders to be part of the GLOBALG.A.P. System.
The protection of the GLOBALG.A.P. Brand includes answering logo use requests or notifications from producers, packers, suppliers and certification bodies regarding the proper use of the logo and trademark. It also includes internal (by GLOBALG.A.P.) validation of GGN use on the end product. The correct use of certification claims is monitored in labels present in the market, press releases, information in the media, etc., and incidences are followed up.

In the case of fake certificates and serious fraud, besides the follow-up for corrective actions, a black list of legal entities has been generated. It is frequently updated, and the information forwarded to the certification bodies, to avoid the inclusion of these legal entities in the GLOBALG.A.P. System.

85% of the issues regarding brand and logo misuse received during 2016 were solved by the end of the year.

The issues regarding fake certificates have been closed; even if further studies and follow-up are needed to really attack the root cause of their existence.

Issues Followed up during 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Issues</th>
<th>Fake Certificates</th>
<th>Brand/Logo Missuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPLAINTS MANAGEMENT

A complaint form is available on the GLOBALG.A.P. website. Complaints are also received through direct communication from different stakeholders or from the media.

The integrity team records, analyses and investigates complaints received regarding breach of standard requirements by certified system users.

In the case of information about a certified producer/producer group/company not complying with the standard requirements, GLOBALG.A.P. requires the corresponding certification body and certificate holder to refute the claim by verifying and providing evidence of compliance with the GLOBALG.A.P. Standard.

Certification bodies investigate the complaints through document review and unannounced assessments, if needed. Findings and actions taken are reported to GLOBALG.A.P. within a defined period of time.

If needed, target integrity assessments are performed for onsite investigation and follow up. In 2016, 12 days of onsite integrity assessments were performed by GLOBALG.A.P. directly to investigate 6 complaints.
GLOBALG.A.P. has a dedicated team of experts to investigate MRL (Maximum Residue Level) complaints. The process followed by the MRL complaint management team is as follows:

5. Additional GLOBALG.A.P. investigations:
   a. In some cases GLOBALG.A.P. has commissioned an independent expert to check traceability and take a sample at origin. Samples are tested in accredited laboratories.
   b. Chain of custody. In some cases GLOBALG.A.P. experts have contacted several agents in the supply chain to verify or complement the investigation carried out by the certification body with the producer.

6. The investigation is summarized in a report that is sent to the plaintiff.

7. If the technical review identifies that there could be a potential risk, the information is used as input for the onsite integrity assessments programming.

A total of 134 complaints from 27 different countries and 59 different crops were received in 2016.

---

**Number of Cases Investigated by Country**

- Spain
- Italy
- Germany
- Peru
- Egypt
- Colombia
- Brasil
- China
- Turkey
- Netherlands
- Israel
- Chile
- Kenya
- Ecuador
- Poland
- South Africa
- Belgium
- Dominican Rep.
- France
- Vietnam
- USA
- Mexico
- Costa Rica
- Madagascar
- Greece
- Austria
- Hungary
In 2016, the most frequent sources of complaint were exotics (23 cases), citrus (16 cases), stone fruits and aromatics (12 cases) and pomegranates (11 cases).

Complaints received for exotics included mangoes, avocados and passion fruits. Production of these crops is very limited in the EU. As ”minor crops”, very few pesticides are approved and EU MRLs are in most cases set at the limit of detection, which makes it harder for exporters from third countries to comply.

80% of complaints were closed by the end of the year.

**Root Causes Found for MRL Incidences:**

- **Cross/drift contamination:**
  Normally drift from an adjacent field. In most cases adjacent fields are not GLOBALG.A.P. certified. In Version 5 a new control point has been included regarding prevention of drift contamination.

- **No reason found:**
  A plausible reason was found but it could not be 100% demonstrated that it was the origin of the exceedance. In these cases, the producer is requested to take appropriate measures in order to sort out the detected weak points. If the situation is considered risky, the case is forwarded to the integrity team for onsite investigation.

- **Pesticide miss-use:**
  The most common issue is using pesticides with very low MRL in the EU and not increasing the label Pre Harvest Interval (PHI) or not complying with the PHI. Application of not-authorized actives and other similar causes are also included in this category.

- **GGN miss-use by a certificate holder:**
  Producers/producer groups labelling non-certified products with a GGN, non-authorized use of the GGN, poor segregation in parallel production/ownership.

- **Metabolite from a different application:**
  Phosphonic acid residues not coming from a fosetyl-Al application but from another product containing phosphonates.
• **Unexpected behavior of the active ingredients:**
  The most frequent cause in this category is the low degradation-rate of pesticides.

• **Traceability/incidence at the supply chain:**
  Investigation could not be completed since the traceability information throughout the supply chain was lost. Re-packer/agent/intermediaries were not Chain of Custody (CoC) certified.

• **Lab error:**
  In these cases, the lab reported having a mistake in the report.

• **Not investigated:**
  The affected certificate holders suspended their contracts before starting the investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Incidences</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reason found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide miss-use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGN miss-use by certificate holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolite comes from a different application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS Investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected behavior from active ingredient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traceability/incidence at the supply chain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab mistake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not investigated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The customer support team, as part of the GLOBALG.A.P. Integrity Program, supports stakeholders worldwide to use the GLOBALG.A.P. Database as a certificate validation tool.

Languages spoken by the Customer Service Team:

- Arabic
- Portuguese
- English
- Russian
- French
- Spanish
- German
- Ukrainian

At established time periods, the customer support team monitors the information uploaded by certification bodies in the GLOBALG.A.P. Database, in order to ensure completeness and accuracy of data. The result of these monitoring activities are also used as input for the onsite integrity assessment program.
THE FUTURE

The Integrity Program is a very dynamic tool that monitors reality and uses the information provided by it to improve the program as such and also as improvement input for the GLOBALG.A.P. System.

Current Developments for 2017 Include:
✓ Implementation of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to show certification bodies’ performance to the public.
✓ Strengthening the residues monitoring system of certified products.
✓ Improving response time in complaint management: creation of a dedicated complaint manager officer position and improved recording and follow up through IT.
✓ Development of frequently asked questions (FAQ) on logos and brand use rules to be published on the GLOBALG.A.P. website.
✓ Inclusion of newly developed standards into the integrity monitoring and assessments.