

AIFD-GUIDE-REV-001

Complaints & Appeals — Public Overview

RÉCLAMATIONS ET RECOURS — APERÇU PUBLIC

GUIDE EDITION	3.0
FIRST PUBLISHED	1 August 2024
EDITION ADOPTED	17 October 2025

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. This guide explains the standards; the applicable standard prevails.

Contents

— Foreword3

1 Purpose3

2 Complaints3

3 Appeals4

4 Timeline at a glance5

5 Practical notes5

Annex R Revision history5

Bibliography (informative)5

— 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-GUIDE-REV-001 Complaints & Appeals — Public Overview, was first published on 1 August 2024. The present edition was adopted on 17 October 2025. 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.

1 Purpose

This overview explains, in plain language, how complaints and appeals work across IFAIFPA schemes. It paraphrases AIFD-STD-REV-001; where this overview and the standard differ, the standard prevails. Two channels exist and they are different instruments: a complaint says something is wrong with a participant or with the federation's process; an appeal says a decision about me was wrong.

2 Complaints

2.1 Who may complain, about what

Anyone — entrants, participants, members of the public — may complain about an accredited or certified party, an applicant, or the federation's own process. No fee attaches to a complaint.

2.2 How a complaint runs

Acknowledgement within 7 days of receipt.

Assignment to a person free of conflict with the matter.

Investigation on evidence; the subject of the complaint is heard.

Written outcome with reasons to the complainant and the subject.

Where a complaint discloses a possible gate failure or critical non-conformity, surveillance of the party concerned begins at once.

2.3 Publication

The federation publishes annually, in aggregate: complaint volumes and outcomes, refusal rates per scheme, and suspensions and revocations. Individual complainants are not identified.

3 Appeals

3.1 Who may appeal, against what

A party affected by a decision — refusal, suspension, revocation, non-renewal, or a classification ruling under an accredited scheme — may appeal. Grounds are: procedural failure; error of fact; or misapplication of the requirements. Disagreement with a requirement itself is not a ground of appeal; it belongs in public consultation on the standard.

3.2 Window and filing

An appeal is filed within 30 days of notification of the decision, in writing, to the appeals address published on the federation's contact pages. No fee attaches to an appeal. The filing states: the decision appealed (reference and date); the grounds relied on; the facts and documents supporting each ground; and the remedy sought.

3.3 The panel

Appeals are heard by at least two persons, none of whom took part in the decision appealed, at least one of whom is not involved in the scheme's operations at all. Panel members sign conflict declarations like any reviewer.

3.4 Procedure

The appellant is heard in writing and, on request, orally. The panel has the full decision file and may admit new evidence that could not reasonably have been produced earlier. The appeal concludes within 60 days of filing with a written, reasoned outcome.

3.5 Outcomes and effect

OUTCOME	MEANING
Uphold	The decision stands.
Vary	The decision is replaced by the panel's decision.
Remit	The matter returns for reassessment by fresh reviewers.

The public 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.

4 Timeline at a glance

STEP	CLOCK
Complaint acknowledged	7 days
Appeal window opens	On notification of decision
Appeal filing deadline	30 days from notification
Appeal concluded	60 days from filing

5 Practical notes

Write to the point: identify the decision, the ground, the evidence. Panels decide on the file.

Do not wait for the window's last day if a suspension is running; ask for a stay explicitly and say what harm the suspension causes.

Corrections of your own declarations (AIFD-STD-PRO-001 clause 8) are not appeals and do not need one — file the correction.

Appeal outcomes are recorded in the register with the decision they concern; history is never erased.

Annex R Revision history

EDITIO N	ADOPTED	PRINCIPAL CHANGES
1.0	2024-08-01	First edition.
2.0	2025-04-04	Aligned with universal two-person decision rule; grounds of appeal clarified.
3.0	2025-10-17	Clocks aligned with AIFD-STD-REV-001 Edition 3.0; stay-of-suspension note added.

Bibliography (informative)

AIFD-STD-REV-001, current edition — the controlling procedure.

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