

AIFD-STD-REV-001

Independent Review, Complaints & Appeals

EXAMEN INDÉPENDANT, RÉCLAMATIONS ET RECOURS

STANDARD EDITION	3.2
FIRST PUBLISHED	1 August 2024
EDITION ADOPTED	30 May 2026

English text authoritative. French titles support international navigation.

© 2024-2026 International Federation of AI Film Producers' Associations. Reproduction for conformity, review and public accountability requires attribution and preservation of the requirements. "Shall" expresses a requirement; "should" expresses a recommendation.

Contents

— Foreword	3
0 Introduction	3
1 Scope	3
2 Normative references	3
3 Terms and definitions	3
4 Reviewers	4
5 Conduct of review	5
6 Findings	5
7 Decisions	5
8 Non-conformities and corrective action	6
9 Certificates and register	6
10 Complaints	6
11 Appeals	7
12 Records	7
Annex A (normative) — Procedural clocks	8
Annex R Revision history	8
Bibliography (informative)	9

— Foreword

The International Federation of AI Film Producers' Associations (IFAIFPA) publishes the AIFD catalogue of standards for the disclosure, identity and accountability of AI film production, and operates the accreditation schemes that assess conformity with them. Standards are drafted by the federation's standards function, exposed to public consultation, and adopted by resolution of the governing body. Requirements use the verb shall; recommendations use should; permissions use may. Notes and informative annexes do not contain requirements.

This document, AIFD-STD-REV-001 Independent Review, Complaints & Appeals, was first published on 1 August 2024. The present edition was adopted on 30 May 2026. The revision history in the final annex records every edition and its principal changes. The English text is authoritative; le texte anglais fait foi.

Nothing in this document grants any right to use a federation mark, and no conformity claim may be made except through the assessment and decision process defined in AIFD-STD-REV-001 and recorded in the federation's public register.

0 Introduction

Every credible certification system runs on the same separation: the person who reviews does not decide; the people who decide are two, not one; the person appealed to was not involved the first time. This standard writes that separation down for every IFAIFPA scheme, together with the clocks — because a right that has no deadline attached to it is a courtesy, not a right. It binds the federation itself as much as any applicant: complaints about the federation's own process are handled under the same clauses, and refusal rates are published.

1 Scope

This standard governs assessments, decisions, non-conformity handling, complaints and appeals for all IFAIFPA schemes, including surveillance and lifecycle decisions. It applies to reviewers, decision-makers, appeal panels, the secretariat and, where they participate in these processes, applicants and accredited parties.

2 Normative references

AIFD-STD-DEF-001; AIFD-STD-PRO-001; AIFD-STD-RGT-001; AIFD-STD-FES-001

3 Terms and definitions

3.1 reviewer

Person appointed to assess evidence and record findings; a reviewer advises and never decides alone.

3.2 decision-maker

Person authorised to approve substantive decisions; decisions require two (clause 7).

3.3 finding

Recorded conclusion on a requirement: conforming; observation; minor, major or critical non-conformity.

3.4 appeal panel

Persons hearing an appeal, none of whom took part in the decision appealed.

3.5 conflict of interest

Any interest or relationship capable of influencing, or reasonably appearing to influence, a review or decision.

4 Reviewers

4.1 Competence

Reviewers shall be appointed against published competence criteria for the scheme concerned, covering: the applicable standards; assessment method; and the domain (festival operations, production practice, rights, as relevant). The federation maintains a register of reviewers with their scheme scopes.

4.2 Independence

A reviewer shall have: no financial interest in the applicant; no engagement by the applicant within the previous 24 months; no close personal relationship with the applicant's principals; and no role in preparing the application. The independence test is applied per assignment, in writing, before work begins; undeclared conflicts void the review and engage clause 4.4.

4.3 Confidentiality and rotation

Reviewers keep application material confidential, use it for no other purpose, and return or destroy it per the records rules (clause 12). The same lead reviewer should not assess the same party in more than two consecutive cycles.

4.4 Misconduct

Reviewer misconduct — concealment of conflict, fabrication, breach of confidence — removes the reviewer from the register, voids affected reviews for reassessment, and is recorded.

5 Conduct of review

5.1 Planning

Each review has a written plan: requirements in scope, evidence expected, sampling approach, and access needed (records, systems, premises or platforms). The applicant is told the plan's scope and its duties of access; surprise is reserved for surveillance where the matter warrants it.

5.2 Evidence

Findings rest on records and documented observations. Interviews inform interpretation of records; hearsay may prompt inquiry but cannot ground a finding. For festival schemes, awarded-work verification (AIFD-STD-FES-001, G5) is part of every post-edition review.

5.3 Sampling

Where full inspection is disproportionate, sampling is permitted with the rule recorded (what population, what selection method, what size). A sample that finds a critical issue is widened, not explained away.

5.4 The review file

The file shows, for each requirement in scope: the evidence relied on, the finding, and the reviewer's reasoning in enough detail for the decision-makers and any appeal panel to retrace it without the reviewer present.

6 Findings

Findings are classified: conforming; observation (no breach, worth recording); minor (isolated breach not undermining the requirement's purpose); major (breach undermining the requirement's purpose); critical (breach destroying the basis of trust — dishonesty, gate failure in AIFD-STD-FES-001, misrepresented consent under AIFD-STD-RGT-001, false declaration under AIFD-STD-PRO-001). The applicant receives the findings and may respond on facts before decision; the response joins the file.

7 Decisions

7.1 The two-person rule

Every decision granting, refusing, suspending, revoking or renewing a status shall be approved by two authorised decision-makers, each free of conflict and neither the reviewer. Automated systems never make substantive decisions; automation is confined to completeness checks, deadlines, reminders, document generation and lifecycle execution of decisions already made.

7.2 Form

Decisions are written, dated, reasoned by reference to the requirements and findings, and notified to the party with the applicable appeal window. Refusals state the failed requirements plainly.

7.3 Issuance and publication

Certificates issue only from conforming decisions, are sealed and numbered by the federation's published procedure, and enter the public register through the registry function's separate publication step. The decision, the certificate and the register entry are three acts by three roles — deliberately.

8 Non-conformities and corrective action

CLASS	CLOCK	EFFECT
Observation	—	Recorded; no action required
Minor	60 days	Corrective action, verified
Major	30 days	Corrective action, verified; renewal blocked until closed
Critical	immediate	Status suspended pending verified correction; register updated

Corrective action is demonstrated, not promised: the file records the evidence of correction. A repeat of a closed finding within 24 months escalates one class.

9 Certificates and register

Lifecycle events — issue, suspension, lift of suspension, revocation, expiry, renewal, withdrawal — are recorded in the public register as they occur and remain permanently visible. The register is the authoritative public statement of status; certificates evidence the decision only (see the federation's terms of use).

10 Complaints

Anyone may complain about a scheme participant or about the federation's own process. Complaints are acknowledged within 7 days; assigned to a person free of conflict; investigated on evidence with the subject heard; and answered in writing with reasons. Where a complaint discloses a possible gate failure or critical non-conformity, surveillance under the relevant scheme begins at once. The federation publishes annually, in aggregate: complaint volumes and outcomes, refusal rates per scheme, and suspensions and revocations.

11 Appeals

11.1 Standing and window

A party affected by a decision may appeal within 30 days of notification. The appeal states the grounds: procedural failure, error of fact, or misapplication of requirements.

11.2 Panel

Appeals are heard by at least two persons, none involved in the decision appealed, at least one not involved in the scheme's operations at all. The panel has the file and may receive new evidence that could not reasonably have been produced earlier.

11.3 Procedure and outcome

The appellant is heard in writing and, where requested, orally. The appeal concludes within 60 days of filing with a written, reasoned outcome: uphold, vary, or remit for reassessment. The register reflects appeal outcomes. Filing an appeal does not by itself stay a suspension imposed for a critical non-conformity; the panel may order a stay where the balance of harm warrants it.

12 Records

Review files, decisions, complaint and appeal records are retained for seven years. Personal data within them is handled under the federation's privacy policy and is not published; the public register carries only the published fields of its contract.

Annex A (normative) — Procedural clocks

STEP	CLOCK
Complaint acknowledgement	7 days
Applicant response to findings	14 days
Minor non-conformity correction	60 days
Major non-conformity correction	30 days
Critical non-conformity	Immediate suspension pending verified correction
Appeal window	30 days from notification
Appeal conclusion	60 days from filing
Change notification (accredited parties)	21 days (per scheme standard)

Annex R Revision history

EDITIO N	ADOPTED	PRINCIPAL CHANGES
1.0	2024-08-01	First edition.
2.0	2025-04-04	Two-person decision rule made universal; finding classes defined.
3.0	2025-10-17	Procedural clocks fixed (60/30/immediate); annual aggregate publication incl. refusal rates.
3.1	2026-01-23	Editorial revision.
3.2	2026-05-30	Appeal-stay discretion defined; reviewer rotation rule added.

Bibliography (informative)

ISO/IEC 17065 and ISO/IEC 17021-1 — impartiality and decision separation (methodological inspiration; no conformity claimed).

EUTMR (EU) 2017/1001, Article 85 — use regulations.

Bibliographic entries situate this standard in its regulatory and technical landscape. They are informative only and create no requirement.