



Textile  
Exchange

# LIA Standards Management Criteria 1.0



LIA-112-V1.0-2023.08.08

©2023 Textile Exchange. This publication is protected by copyright. All rights are reserved. Written permission by Textile Exchange is required for reproduction in entirety or portion.

The *LIA Standards Management Criteria 1.0* replaces the *LIA Standards Management Criteria 0.1* and is effective as of August 08, 2023.

English is the official language of the *LIA Standards Management Criteria 1.0*. In any case of inconsistency between versions, reference shall be made to the English version.

## Disclaimer

Although reasonable care was taken in the preparation of this document, Textile Exchange and any other party involved in the creation of the document HEREBY STATE that the document is provided without warranty, either expressed or implied, of accuracy or fitness for purpose, AND HEREBY DISCLAIM any liability, direct or indirect, for damages or loss relating to the use of this document.

This is a voluntary procedures document and is not intended to replace the legal or regulatory requirements of any country.

## Copyright

This publication is protected by copyright. Information or material from this publication may be reproduced in unaltered form for personal, non-commercial use. All other rights are reserved. Information or material from this publication may be used for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, or review permitted under the Copyright Act 1976.

Any reproduction permitted in accordance with the Copyright Act 1976 shall acknowledge the *LIA Standards Management Criteria 1.0* as the source of any selected passage, extract, diagram, or other information.

## Document Revision

The *LIA Standards Management Criteria 1.0* will undergo a revision process at least every five years. The next revision is tentatively scheduled to begin in 2027, for completion in 2028. Please note that Textile Exchange may decide to revise earlier at our discretion. You may submit feedback to Textile Exchange at any time; send to [LIA@TextileExchange.org](mailto:LIA@TextileExchange.org). Points of clarification may be incorporated into supplementary and guidance documents prior to 2025. More substantive feedback or suggested changes will be collected and reviewed as part of the next revision of the document.

## Revision History

LIA Standards Management Criteria 0.1, released 2021.05.26

# Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
About the Standards Management Criteria .....	4
About the Leather Impact Accelerator (LIA).....	4
About Textile Exchange .....	4
About Climate+.....	5
The Standard Benchmark Approach.....	5
How to Use this Document .....	6
Criteria Structure and levels .....	7
<b>Section A – Standard Management Criteria.....</b>	<b>9</b>
A1. Governance.....	9
A2. Standard Setting.....	13
A3. Assurance .....	15
A4. Accreditation and Oversight.....	18
A5. Personnel Competences .....	19
Appendix A: Definitions.....	21
Appendix B: References .....	23

# Introduction

## About the Standards Management Criteria

The objective of this document is to ensure that all approved standards under the Leather Impact Accelerator (LIA) not only conform to the relevant standard benchmark scope (Animal Welfare, Leather Production Environmental, and Leather Production Social) but are also credible standards that are developed, audited, and maintained in a transparent and robust fashion according to ISEAL Alliance credibility principles. The aim of this document is that the standards criteria are clear and auditable.

For any standard to be approved by LIA, it shall meet one of the LIA standard benchmarks as well as the Standards Management Criteria.

## About the Leather Impact Accelerator (LIA)

The Leather Impact Accelerator (LIA) is a set of tools that help the industry address the core challenges it faces around leather production. LIA establishes minimum social, environmental, and animal welfare requirements in the leather supply chain, incentivizes farmers and leather producers to meet them, gives brands a way to reward those that do, and encourages transparency along the way. Learn more at [www.textileexchange.org/leather-impact-accelerator](http://www.textileexchange.org/leather-impact-accelerator)

## About Textile Exchange

LIA is owned and managed by Textile Exchange. Textile Exchange is a global non-profit driving positive impact on climate change across the fashion and textile industry. It guides a growing community of brands, manufacturers, and farmers towards more purposeful production from the very start of the supply chain.

Its goal is to help the industry to achieve a 45% reduction in the emissions that come from producing fibers and raw materials by 2030. To get there, it is keeping its focus holistic and interconnected, accelerating the adoption of practices that improve the state of our water, soil health, and biodiversity.

For real change to happen, everyone needs a clear path to positive impact. That's why Textile Exchange believes that approachable, step-by-step instruction paired with collective action can change the system to make preferred materials and fibers an accessible default, mobilizing leaders through attainable strategies, proven solutions, and a driven community.

**At Textile Exchange, materials matter.** To learn more, visit [TextileExchange.org](http://TextileExchange.org)

## About Climate+

At Textile Exchange, our goal is to help the fashion and textile industry achieve a 45% reduction in the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that come from producing fibers and raw materials by 2030. This is known as Tier 4 of the supply chain, and it accounts for 24% of the industry's GHG impacts.

This goal underpins our Climate+ strategy. We call it Climate+, because it goes beyond accounting for GHG emissions. Instead, it is an interconnected approach that swaps siloed solutions for interdependent impact areas like soil health, water, and biodiversity.

The + is also an acknowledgment that Textile Exchange cannot achieve this goal alone.

The Leather Impact Accelerator contributes directly to the Climate+ goal by addressing:

- Deforestation and conversion at the farming tiers of the bovine leather supply chain, which contribute to GHG emissions, impact soil health, water, biodiversity, and people.
- Animal welfare at the farming and slaughter tiers of the bovine leather supply chain.

## The Standard Benchmark Approach

A standard benchmark approach has been adopted to leverage and add value to the standards and programs that are already in use by the industry.

Benchmarks set a minimum threshold for practices and give recognition to those who meet or exceed them.

The intent of this process is to help brands and retailers navigate the landscape of standards used in the bovine leather supply chain, by identifying and recognizing standards that meet the threshold set in the LIA standard benchmarks. Hence a brand/retailer will know what challenges and practices, at a minimum, will be covered by LIA-approved standards and thereby what can be expected from a facility certified to one of these standards.

The standard benchmark approach is also expected to generate the following outcomes:

- An efficient way for brands/retailers to communicate their expectations clearly and consistently to their supply networks, which may reduce the need for brand-specific requirements and audits;
- The alignment of expectations among standards,
- Improved transparency relative to the operation and performance of standards,
- Greater visibility and uptake of the recognized standards.

The Leather Impact Accelerator (LIA) uses a standard benchmark approach to assess:

- Animal welfare standards used throughout cattle production and slaughter;

- Social standards used from slaughter and throughout the leather production supply chain,
- Environmental standards used throughout the leather production supply chain.

A Standard Owner can apply for a benchmark assessment through the LIA Standard Benchmark Approval Process. Under this process, the standard will be assessed against the relevant scope specific requirements. In practice this means that the Standard Owner will need to provide evidence that the practices addressed in the LIA standard benchmark are covered in its standard.

Additionally, all standards will be required to comply with the Standards Management Criteria, which ensures the standard is developed, audited, and maintained in a robust and credible fashion.

Any standard that meets one of the LIA standard benchmarks and the Standards Management Criteria shall be listed on the LIA website as a LIA-approved standard.

The ISEAL Good Practices for Credible Benchmarking guide was used as reference in the development of the LIA standard benchmarks to ensure more consistent, accurate, transparent, and robust benchmarking.

## How to Use this Document

This document sets forth the overall criteria for assessment against the LIA standard benchmark.

The following terms are used to indicate requirements, recommendations, permissions, and possibilities or capabilities:

- “Shall” indicates a requirement;
- “Should” indicates a recommendation (non-binding),
- “May” indicates a permission (non-binding), and
- “Can” indicates a possibility or a capability.

The abbreviation “e.g.” is used to indicate an example, while the abbreviation “i.e.” is used to provide clarification of meaning.

## Criteria Structure and levels

The Standard Management Criteria intends to assess that the standard has been developed and is maintained following a credible and robust process.

The Standard Management Criteria includes two different types of criteria:

### **1. Required criteria**

Required criteria are mandatory and assessed according to a pass/fail score. These criteria represent the standard management baseline, which must be met as a minimum for a standard to be LIA-approved.

### **2. Recommended criteria**

These are good practices that may not be covered by many standards at the assessment time, but which could improve the standard management of the standard. These criteria will be assessed for inclusion in the baseline following future reviews.

The desired outcome and suggested sources of evidence are provided in addition to the required and recommended criteria.

#### ***Desired outcome***

This corresponds to the assurance desired outcomes which are the results that a sustainability system should seek to achieve with its assurance program. The ISEAL Assurance Code v2 is structured around desired outcomes where each criterion is assigned to and supports a desired outcome. Complying with each criterion should lead an organization to achieve the related desired outcomes.

#### ***Suggested sources of evidence***

This provides guidance to help a Standard Owner identify the type of evidence expected to justify its alignment with the given criteria.

## **Levels**

Recommended criteria are subject to a scoring system. All recommended criteria are weighed equally, and the total score will define if the standard will be allocated a standard management level (as defined below) in addition to its LIA-approval.

Reaching one of the three levels of the Standard Management Criteria indicates that the Standard Owner goes beyond the basic assurance management performance expected by a standard.

There are three standards management levels:

- Level 1: score 1- 40%
- Level 2: score 41-80%
- Level 3: score 80-100%

### **Continuous Improvement**

Standards assessed against the Standard Management Criteria are encouraged to commit to continuous improvement by progressing along the standards management levels over time to demonstrate improved assurance management performance. Additional guidelines for continuous improvement will be developed as part of a future version of these requirements.

This continuous improvement requirement may become mandatory in the future.



## Section A – Standard Management Criteria

### A1. Governance

#### Required Criteria

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A1.1</b>	<p>The scheme owner has documented information on the goals and governance of the standard.</p> <p><i>Making this information publicly available is recommended.</i></p>	<p>Information about how the system operates is easily available.</p>	<p>Document on information about the goals and governance of the standard.</p> <p><i>Recommended: public website links to information on the goals and governance of the standard.</i></p>
<b>A1.2</b>	<p>On a regular basis, the scheme owner monitors and evaluates progress towards its sustainability impacts.</p>	<p>The scheme owner monitors and evaluates the standards system’s ability to achieve its intended social, environmental, and economic effects.</p> <p>The ISEAL Impacts Code provides guidance on the steps to document these areas (see specifically ISEAL Impacts Code v2 clauses 5.2 and 5.3).</p>	<p>A current description of the scope and boundaries of the organization’s standards and relevant monitoring system. This description may identify the standard system’s strategies, standards, and/or programs that will be monitored and evaluated.</p>
<b>A1.3</b>	<p>Highest decision-making forum procedures are required to ensure that no interest group can dominate governance decision-making.</p> <p><i>Ensure sufficient division of responsibilities and decision making between the standard-setting team and the certification team.</i></p>	<p>Ensure that no one stakeholder group or type can control decision-making.</p>	<p>List of decision-making body members and affiliations; Reference to relevant clause(s) and page number(s) in Terms of Reference for standard-setting governance board/committee.</p>

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A1.4</b>	There is a mechanism for handling disputes or complaints applicable to governance.	Stakeholders have access to a transparent mechanism for raising concerns about the standard setting process and having those concerns considered.	Complaints procedure and weblink to complaints resolution mechanism.
<b>A1.5</b>	The scheme has a Secretariat with defined staff and functions to manage the standard.	Competent staff with clear responsibilities and capacity for implementing and monitoring the standard's implementation are in place.	Description of the roles and responsibilities of staff. If other departments collaborate to fulfill key functions, consider outlining the objectives of these departments and respective staff.

### Recommended Criteria

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A1.6</b>	The scheme is a member of ISEAL.	The scheme is committed to continually improving their systems and impacts through learning and innovation. They are collaborative in their approach toward engaging with stakeholders, and they are transparent and truthful about how their systems work and how they measure their impacts.	Website link to ISEAL website, where scheme is identified as an ISEAL community member.
<b>A1.7</b>	Stakeholders have the possibility to participate in or provide formal input on the governance of the scheme.	Stakeholders see that their views are reflected in decision-making.	Reference to relevant clause(s) and page number(s) in the standard-setting procedures where the process for stakeholder input on governance processes is described. Other possible sources of evidence:

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
			Examples of stakeholder input such as interviews or completed stakeholder input forms; evidence of a <u>documented procedure or process</u> to receive stakeholder input on scheme governance on a periodic basis.
<b>A1.8</b>	Code of conduct requires legal compliance; adherence to International Labour Organization (ILO) core conventions, and free, prior and informed consent, and maintenance of High Conservation Values (HCVs), as applicable.	Requirements in the standard are set at a performance level that results in significant positive sustainability impacts.	References in Code of conduct or similar to relevant existing national and/or international laws and regulations.
<b>A1.9</b>	Procedures are in place to suspend or terminate certification for gross violations of the code of conduct.	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	Operating procedures relevant to the Code of Conduct (or similar).
<b>A1.10</b>	Stakeholders have an opportunity to provide input on the intended sustainability impacts and possible unintended effects of the standards system.	Stakeholders have sufficient time and opportunity to provide input on the standard and can see how their input has been taken into account.	Standard-setting procedure (identify the relevant clauses outlining how stakeholders can participate in providing inputs on the impacts of the standard).
<b>A1.11</b>	Highest decision-making forum procedures ensure that non-economic sector constituencies collectively have (at least) the same governance decision-making power as economic sector constituencies.	Stakeholders see that ensure that no one stakeholder group or type can control decision-making	List of decision-making body members and affiliations; Reference to relevant clause(s) and page number(s) in Terms of Reference for standard-setting governance body.

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A1.12</b>	Highest decision-making forum procedures ensure that constituencies representing economic, social, and environmental interests have equal governance decision-making power.	Stakeholders see that their views are reflected in decision-making.	List of decision-making body members and affiliations; Reference to relevant clause(s) and page number(s) in Terms of Reference for standard-setting governance body.
<b>A1.13</b>	Highest governance decision-making forum requires balanced participation of economic, social, and environmental representatives.	Stakeholders see that their views are reflected in decision-making .	List of decision-making body members and affiliations; Reference to relevant clause(s) and page number(s) in Terms of Reference for standard-setting governance body.
<b>A1.14</b>	Executive (secretariat) functions are overseen by a board of directors or trustees composed of individuals mandated by voting among scheme members/participants.	Stakeholders see that their views are reflected in decision-making.	List of board of directors or trustees; board of directors/trustees operating procedures indicating membership procedures for this body.
<b>A1.15</b>	The standard owner has developed and adheres to a time-bound plan towards certification and/or procurement of certified products and reports annually on progress.		

## A2. Standard Setting

### Required Criteria

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A2.1</b>	The structure of the standard or accompanying guidance ensures consistent interpretation (e.g., auditable indicators).	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	A central document or set of documents detailing the scheme's assurance requirements.  <i>Recommended: Link to website library where documents, policies, or normative requirements are available.</i>

### Recommended Criteria

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A2.2</b>	Decision-making on the content of the standard includes a balance of stakeholders and aims for consensus.	Stakeholders see that their views are reflected in decision-making	Decision-making procedures for the standard-setting body/governance board.
<b>A2.3</b>	Consultations on the development or revision of the standard are open to all stakeholders.	The standard-setting organization understands who its stakeholders are.	Standard-setting procedures indicating relevant clauses relating to consultations and accessibility to scheme stakeholders.
<b>A2.4</b>	Input received during consultations is documented, and there is a report back on how issues raised are addressed.	Stakeholders have sufficient time and opportunity to provide input on the standard and can see how their input has been taken into account.	Sample of the record of comments received during a consultation period; documented procedures for receiving and processing comments during standard consultations.
<b>A2.5</b>	The standard is reviewed and revised on a regular basis (not exceeding five years).	Standards remain relevant over time and reflect current	Standard-setting procedures indicating relevant clauses

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
		stakeholder understanding of good sustainability practices.	about standard revision timelines.
<b>A2.6</b>	There are provisions or mechanisms to ensure that the standard is locally applicable in the regions where it is applied.	The standard is consistently interpreted and applied across its full geographic scope.	Procedure for developing national or regional standards, where applicable; Standards interpretation guidance document (may be normative or non-normative) which is available to all stakeholders.
<b>A2.7</b>	The standard-setting procedures include a process for stakeholder consultation on standard revisions.	Standards remain relevant over time and reflect current stakeholder understanding of good sustainability practices.	Standard-setting procedures indicating relevant sections about the process for stakeholder consultation on standard revisions.  <i>Recommended: Publicly available standard-setting procedures (listed on organization website).</i>
<b>A2.8</b>	Schemes are (or were) developed in accordance with formally defined scheme procedures.	The standard setting organization follows transparent procedures that are improved over time.	Standard-setting procedures.
<b>A2.9</b>	Certification standards have separate requirements for small and/or medium-sized management units and/or are formulated so as to take account of the scale and intensity of operations.	The assurance model is fit for purpose.	Description of assurance structure and activities including the rationale for assurance structure and activities.
<b>A2.10</b>	Certification standards are developed and revised in full compliance with the ISEAL Standard-Setting Code of Good Practice.	Develop standards that are relevant and transparent and that reflect a balance of stakeholder interests.	Website link to ISEAL website, where scheme is identified as an ISEAL Code-compliant member.

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A2.11</b>	Information is made publicly available on standards development and revision processes and on decision-making.	The standard-setting organization has clearly articulated what the standard aims to achieve and why the standard is needed.	Website link to information about the standard-setting procedures including standards development, revision processes, and decision-making

### A3. Assurance

#### Required Criteria

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A3.1</b>	There are procedures describing the process for clients to address non-compliances, including conditions and procedures for suspension or revocation.	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	A central document that provides guidance to clients and auditors on how to address non-compliances, including conditions for suspension and revocation (e.g., 30 days for clients to submit and be assessed on corrective actions).
<b>A3.2</b>	Full audits of at least a sample of clients are carried out regularly (from every year to every five years).	Good auditing practices.	A central document with the scheme's assurance requirements; similar procedures indicating audit frequency, intensity, and sampling methodology.
<b>A3.3</b>	There is a publicly accessible complaints and appeals process for certification decisions.	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	Complaints and appeals procedure, or similar, which is relevant to certification decisions.
<b>A3.4</b>	Assurance bodies are required to implement a management system that supports consistency, competence, and impartiality (e.g., ISO 17065, 17021 or equivalent).	Effective management systems are developed and maintained to ensure consistency, competence, and impartiality.	A central document with the scheme's assurance requirements and indication of how these support consistency, competence, and impartiality; similar

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
			procedures indicating these characteristics of the assurance process.
<b>A3.5</b>	A documented auditing approach or strategy guides consistent compliance.	Good auditing practices.	Assurance procedures outlining the auditing/assessment methodology and audit types (e.g., full audits include office visits and on-site assessments of at least a sample of operations); Recommended: descriptions of risk-based auditing methods, definition of audit types including remote and hybrid audits (audits with desktop review and on-site assessment), description of alternative auditing methods in the case of force majeure conditions such as civil conflict, pandemics, etc.
<b>A3.6</b>	Decision-making on compliance is impartial.	The assurance system is implemented impartially.	Decision-making procedures document that includes impartial oversight for verifiers or certifiers to ensure impartiality is maintained (e.g., verifiers or certifiers are required to have a conflict-of-interest policy or documented approach to address conflicts of interest).
<b>A3.7</b>	The certificate or license defines the scope of certification and duration of validity.	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	Sample certificate indicating information on certification scope and validity period.
<b>A3.8</b>	The scheme owner carries out regular reviews of its assurance program and notifies assurance bodies and	Effectiveness and efficiency of the assurance system are	Sample report, notes, or agenda from a management review or similar management meeting to assess the



Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
	clients of any changes in requirements.	maintained and improved over time.	assurance program's performance and effectiveness.

### Recommended Criteria

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A3.9</b>	Producers are certified by independent third-party certification bodies operating in compliance with ISO requirements.	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	ISO accreditation certificates.
<b>A3.10</b>	Certification bodies are required to have a risk-based audit strategy for certificate holders.	Barriers to access are minimized.	Risk-based auditing procedures.
<b>A3.11</b>	A list of all certified enterprises is made publicly available.	Information about how the system operates is easily available.	Website link to list of certified organizations.
<b>A3.12</b>	Stakeholders have an opportunity to provide input to the audit.	Information about how the system operates is easily available.	Assurance procedures document or relevant clauses indicating how stakeholders can provide input to the audit.
<b>A3.13</b>	Summaries of certification assessment reports are made publicly available.	Information about how the system operates is easily available.	Public website link to an example of a certification assessment report; evidence of other procedure indicating public availability of assessment reports.
<b>A3.14</b>	Certification and surveillance complaints procedures have clear deadlines.	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	Complaints procedure, or similar, indicating required timelines.
<b>A3.15</b>	Certification and surveillance complaints procedures include	Operating procedures support consistent implementation of the assurance system.	Complaints and appeals procedure, or similar.

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
	appeal mechanisms open to use by any affected party.		
<b>A3.16</b>	The overall assurance methodology and structure for the scheme are publicly available.	Information about how the system operates is easily available.	Website links to information about the assurance process and related decision-making.

## A4. Accreditation and Oversight

### Required Criteria

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A4.1</b>	There is a system of performance oversight of verifiers or certification bodies that ensures these bodies have the systems and competencies necessary to audit compliance with the standard's requirements.	There is independent oversight of implementation.	Accreditation requirements for certification bodies. Accreditation can be carried out by a third-party accreditation body or other competence body (preferred). In-house oversight can also be carried out providing there is a documented procedure to ensure oversight consistency and rigor.
<b>A4.2</b>	Oversight includes a review of the performance of assurance providers and auditors in the field.	The assurance system is implemented competently.	Oversight procedures and requirements for accreditation bodies in the evaluation of certification bodies.

**Recommended Criteria**

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A4.3</b>	The certification bodies being used by the scheme must be accredited by a recognized, independent accreditation organization.	There is independent oversight of implementation.	Oversight procedures and requirements for accreditation bodies.

A5. Personnel Competences

**Required Criteria**

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A5.1</b>	Specific qualifications and competencies are defined for auditors and assurance body personnel.	The assurance system is implemented competently.	Requirements and procedures for auditors and assurance body staff.
<b>A5.2</b>	Auditors and assurance body personnel are required to have an in-depth understanding of the standard and its interpretation.	The assurance system is implemented competently.	Assurance body and auditor competence requirements.
<b>A5.3</b>	Auditors and assurance body personnel are required to participate in regular training and professional development.	The assurance system is implemented competently.	Auditor requirements and competence evaluation procedure indicating a professional development and ongoing training requirement.
<b>A5.4</b>	The competence of auditors and assurance body personnel is demonstrated through regular evaluation.	The assurance system is implemented competently.	Auditor requirements and competence evaluation procedure indicating evaluation mechanism and timeline.
<b>A5.5</b>	There are repercussions such as probation or suspension for misconduct or poor	The assurance system is implemented competently.	Auditor requirements and competence evaluation procedure indicating auditor sanctions or consequences as

Number	Required criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
	performance of auditors or assurance body personnel.		a result of poor performance or misconduct.

**Recommended Criteria**

Number	Recommended criteria	Desired outcome	Suggested sources of evidence
<b>A5.6</b>	New auditors have a probationary period during which their competence in an audit is assessed or supervised.	Auditor competence is evaluated early to support auditing rigor and consistency.	Auditor requirements and competence evaluation procedure.

## Appendix A: Definitions

**Accreditation:** The formal recognition by an independent body, generally known as an accreditation body, that a certification body operates according to international standards. (iso.org)

**Assurance:** Demonstrable evidence that specified requirements relating to a product, process, system, person, or body are fulfilled. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018); adapted from ISO 17000)

**Assurance body (assurance provider):** A certification body or verification body that provides assurance to a standard.

**Assurance body personnel:** Personnel or team members such as auditors that support the work of a certification body or verification body.

**Assurance desired outcome:** The assurance desired outcomes are the results that a sustainability system should seek to achieve with its assurance program. The ISEAL Assurance Code v2 is structured around desired outcomes where each criterion is assigned to and supports a desired outcome. Complying with each criterion should lead an organization to achieve the related desired outcomes.

**Audit:** A component of an assessment. A systematic, documented process for obtaining records, statements of fact, or other relevant information and assessing them objectively to determine the extent to which specified requirements are fulfilled. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018); adapted from ISO 17000)

**Certificate:** Generic expression used to include all means of communicating that fulfilment of specified requirements has been demonstrated. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018); adapted from ISO 17000)

**Certification body:** An organization accredited for its competence to audit and issue certification confirming that an organization meets the requirements of a standard. (iso.org)

**Certification:** The provision by an independent body of written assurance (a certificate) that the product, service or system in question meets specific requirements. (iso.org)

**Client** (synonym: certified organization): The person or enterprise that is seeking assurance of their conformance with the requirements in a standard. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018)).

**Complaint:** Expression of dissatisfaction, other than an appeal, by any person or organization to a scheme owner, assurance provider, or oversight body relating to their respective activities, where a response is expected. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018); adapted from ISO 17000)

**LIA-approved standard/certification scheme:** A standard/certification scheme approved by the Leather Impact Accelerator (LIA) that has been assessed and confirmed (through Textile Exchange) to meet a set of established requirements.

**Non-conformity:** An identified occurrence of non-conformance with one requirement of a standard, identified as part of an assessment. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018))

**On-site assessment:** An assessment occurring on the physical site of a client’s operations. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018))

**Oversight:** Assessment of an assurance provider’s demonstration of competence to carry out specific assurance tasks. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018); adapted from ISO 17000)

**Publicly available:** Easily accessible online or otherwise to the public. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018))

**Risk:** The chance of something happening that will have an impact on objectives. It is measured in terms of a combination of the probability of an event and the severity of its consequences. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018))

**Scheme owner:** The organization that is responsible for the standards system and accountable for the performance of its assurance system. The scheme owner determines the objectives and scope of the standards system, as well as the rules for how the scheme will operate and the standards against which conformance will be assessed. NOTE: The scheme owner can be the standards owner, assurance provider, a governmental authority, trade association, group of assurance providers or other body. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018))

**Stakeholder:** Individual or group that has an interest in any decision or activity of an organization. (ISO 26000)

**Third-party assurance:** Assurance activity that is performed by a person or body that is independent of the person or organization that provides the object of assurance and of user interests in that object. (ISEAL Assurance Code v2 (2018); adapted from ISO 17000)

**Verification:** Confirmation, through the provision of objective evidence, that specified requirements have been fulfilled. (Adapted from ISO 9000)

**Verification body** (synonym: verifier): See “Assurance body”.

## Appendix B: References

The following references were used in the development of the LIA Standard Management Criteria:

- [ISEAL's Codes of Good Practice](#)
- [ISEAL Sustainability Benchmarking Good Practice Guide](#)
- ISO 17065: Conformity assessment — Requirements for bodies certifying products, processes and services