

# Calibration Log

The following is a list of calibration items issued by Textile Exchange. This list is provided publicly on the [Textile Exchange website](#).

Calibration items shown apply to current normative documents, or to documents which are currently being phased out (Status: “Retirement Pending”). These represent supplemental guidance which Textile Exchange will integrate into guidance documents such as User Manuals where possible. Calibration only applies to the applicable version of a document, where it is specified.

Each calibration item has been assigned a unique number for easy reference. This can be found at the top left corner, before the calibration title (e.g. “Calibration 150”). Please note that not all numbers will be listed nor listed sequentially due to some calibration items having been rejected, retired, or are still pending review/approval.

All calibration items will be retired with the release of the next major revision of the applicable Textile Exchange standard and/or policy. Any calibration items that still apply will then be reissued as applicable.

An automatic 14-day consultation period applies for each calibration item after the first time it is published for certification bodies, during which Textile Exchange will accept feedback to [Assurance@TextileExchange.org](mailto:Assurance@TextileExchange.org). Certification bodies shall apply the calibration as applicable during this time.

<b>Calibration 154</b>	<b>Maps vs GIS Data</b>	<b>RAF-101a-V2.1/RAF-101b-V1.1/RAF-101c-V1.0 F2.6.2</b>
<b>Situation:</b>	RAF farm group criteria require the ICS to maintain maps or sketches of each farm showing where animals are located. Textile Exchange is moving to require that GIS data be submitted by each farm. How does this affect the criterion relating to maps?	
<b>Interpretation:</b>	An RAF farm group or communal farmer group ICS is not required to maintain maps or sketches of each farm showing where animals are located provided that the ICS maintains the following, which can be clearly linked per farm: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A list of farms which can be linked back to the scope certificate;</li> <li>2. A copy of the Farm Questions for each farm, as required by Textile Exchange's system; and</li> <li>3. Polygon data (i.e. GIS shapefiles) for each farm showing the location and amount of farmland.</li> </ol>	

<b>Calibration 154</b>	<b>Maps vs GIS Data</b>			<b>RAF-101a-V2.1/RAF-101b-V1.1/RAF-101c-V1.0 F2.6.2</b>	
	<p>Note: Textile Exchange's system will not automatically give the ICS access to the GIS data for each member farm collected by Textile Exchange, but will provide a mechanism for the ICS to access the information in the future. Additional fees may apply for this access.</p> <p>UPDATED: 2023.02.28</p> <p>ORIGINALLY ISSUED: 2021.08.20</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 189</b>	<b>Certificate Authentication</b>			<b>ASR-103-V3.0, ASR-104-V3.0 A4</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Scope certificates and Transaction certificates are fundamental pieces in the integrity system of Textile Exchange standards. Certification bodies must consistently authenticate input transaction certificates to safeguard the continuous flow of goods in the supply chain (see CCS-102-V3.0 E2.1.4).</p> <p>Some CBs are not fulfilling in a timely manner their obligation to provide evidence of scope and transaction certificate authenticity. Textile Exchange has created a transaction certificate authentication portal which presently allows for the authentication of some transaction certificates.</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>In order to authenticate a transaction certificate, the certification body shall use one of the following options:</p> <p>1. Authentication via the portal at <a href="https://textileexchange.org/authenticate-transaction/">https://textileexchange.org/authenticate-transaction/</a>. This should be used as the preferred option where possible. This method will become the only accepted method in the future.</p>				

Calibration 189	Certificate Authentication			ASR-103-V3.0, ASR-104-V3.0 A4	
	<p>2. Authentication via the certification body's own database system, if the transaction certificate was issued by the same certification body. OR</p> <p>3. Authentication via the method specified by the issuing certification body at <a href="https://textileexchange.org/certificates">https://textileexchange.org/certificates</a>.</p> <p>If an input transaction certificate cannot be authenticated, the certification body shall not accept it. See CCS-102-V3.0 E2.1.4.</p> <p>Each certification body is required to update Textile Exchange with how their certificates can be authenticated (see ASR-103-V3.0 A4.2).</p> <p>4. If a different method of authentication is used for some of a certification body's scope certificates (e.g. for specific standards or countries), this information shall be included.</p> <p>5. If all of the certification body's transaction certificates are available via Textile Exchange's transaction certificate portal, reference to this portal is sufficient to meet ASR-103-V3.0 A4.2.</p> <p>6. If transaction certificate authentication is conducted manually, a maximum of two business days is allowed for the verification to be completed when the certification body receives a request (see ASR-103-V3.0 A4.2.1).</p> <p>7. In the case of automated methods of transaction certificate authentication such as a single webpage with verification capabilities, accessed by using a URL or QR code, the certification body shall provide instructions to users in case the system is not returning valid evidence of verification.</p> <p>UPDATED: 2023.02.28</p> <p>ORIGINALLY ISSUED: 2022.08.01</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 209	Clarifications for Processing Categories	ASR-213-V1.1 Table 3.2
<b>Situation:</b>	It is unclear how specific processing categories shall be used.	
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The following clarifications are provided for processing categories:</p> <p>Processing - A facility shall be considered to be a processor when any process category other than PR0000 (no processing), PR0035 (brand), PR0025 (retail sales), PR0030 (trading), PR0031 (warehousing, distribution), and PR0041 (Buying house) applies to the site. A processor site may also qualify for any of these process codes except for PR0000 (see below).</p> <p>No processing (PR0000) - This processing category shall apply when no other processing category is suitable. It is typically used for sites without physical possession within the same scope certificate as processing sites.</p> <p>Brand (PR0035) - This process category is only to be used for a site that controls the design and development of final products. The supply chain for any certified final product sold to a consumer includes exactly one brand. Note that the correct use of this processing category is essential to ensure that brands are given correct access to dTrackit. This process code does not apply to subcontractors.</p> <p>Example: A site produces a branded fabric (an intermediate labeled product), which is sold to garment factories to be made into jackets. The fabric is not sold as a final product. The site shall not have PC0035 listed.</p> <p>Example: A spinner produces and sells yarn primarily to fabric mills. However, the spinner also sells some yarns direct to consumers in a retail shop and online for craft purposes. The spinner is the brand for the yarns which are sold directly to consumers.</p> <p>Packing (PR0020) - This process category is considered to be processing, and shall only be used when the packing carries a risk of product contamination or a change in labels relating to the Standard. It is not intended for facilities which are distributing discrete products and not applying labels.</p> <p>Examples of packing: Bagging of bulk down; Applying hang tags with an OCS logo to garments; Packing individual socks into 10-packs for retail sale</p>	

Calibration 209	Clarifications for Processing Categories		ASR-213-V1.1 Table 3.2		
	<p>Examples that are not considered packing: Picking finished garments (style, size, color) and boxing them together for shipment to an individual retail store; Adding or removing polybags on garments, unless the polybags carry the Standard's logo; Putting non-certified products into GRS-certified packaging</p> <p>Trading (PR0030) - This process category shall only apply to organizations that are purchasing and selling claimed materials without processing them, i.e. inputs and outputs are identical for some products across all sites within the same scope certificate. The organization or site may also have other products which they process. An office-only site for a manufacturer shall not list trading as a process category unless the organization purchases and sells claimed materials that are not processed at any of their sites.</p> <p>Warehousing, distribution (PR0031) - This process category shall only apply to facilities that are physically handling products without processing them, i.e. inputs and outputs from the facility are identical. The site may also have other products which they process.</p> <p>Buying House (PR0041) - A buying house does not take physical possession of claimed materials, but takes legal ownership and has them processed by one or more subcontractors. This process code does not apply to subcontractors. If a scope certificate includes PR0041, a minimum of one processing subcontractor and corresponding processing category shall be included on the scope certificate.</p> <p>NOTE: The process code PR0041 is new and will be included in the next update of ASR-213.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 220</b>	<b>Mixed Fibers and Proportion of Fibers</b>			<b>CCS-101-V3.1 D4</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Pre- and post-consumer waste such as yarn or non-woven textiles are recycled into various textile materials. CCS D4.2 calls for a material composition test report of the output claimed material, but this requirement has proven to be unpractical due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The high cost and duration of testing,</li> <li>-The impossibility of finding the exact proportion of each fiber in the output material, and</li> <li>-The error factor introduced by the big amount of different input materials, along with their size and weight.</li> </ul> <p>For example, 1000 garments will have 1000 varieties of blends or materials, and each garment's weight will be slightly different.</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>When mixed fibers are used in raw materials, there is no need to do a material composition test to know the percentage of each fiber present. The raw material codes for mixed fibers (RM0258, RM0259, RM0260, RM0261) shall only be used by the material recycler. No other operator in the supply chain, after the recycler, is allowed to change the mixed fiber codes in the output transaction certificate or when they are used in the material composition on the input transaction certificate.</p> <p>A blend of virgin material shall not be defined as “mixed fibers” in any case. The mixed-fiber codes are only allowed to be used by recyclers for pre-consumer and post-consumer waste.</p> <p>When an input transaction certificate specifies that a product contains mixed fibers, this same designation shall be used in the output transaction certificate. Even when the detailed results of a material composition test are available, the transaction certificate shall list "mixed fibers" with the corresponding raw material code rather than separating out individual fibers.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.02.28	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 148	Ineligible Reclaimed Inputs		GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1		
<b>Situation:</b>	Textile Exchange has become aware of several situations where certification bodies have issued scope certificates to material recyclers for material which has been accepted by the certification body as pre-consumer, but which does not match Textile Exchange's definition of pre-consumer material. Textile Exchange acknowledges that this may have related to a lack of clarity in past guidance.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Any scope certificates with ineligible inputs (i.e. which do not qualify as reclaimed) shall have the scope reduced to exclude ineligible inputs or shall be withdrawn immediately. No recertification (with the same certification body or a new certification body) is possible in these cases.</p> <p>If the certification body is not sure if a reclaimed input is eligible or has not certified that reclaimed input before, they should reach out to Textile Exchange for clarification prior to including it in the scope of GRS or RCS certification. If Textile Exchange or the AB finds errors in this area where the certification body did not request guidance from Textile Exchange, the scope certificate shall have the scope reduced to exclude ineligible inputs or shall be withdrawn immediately.</p> <p>NOTE: A previous exception was included in this calibration for scope certificates issued on or before April 15, 2021. All such scope certificates have now expired so that exception has been removed.</p> <p>UPDATED: 2023.01.31</p> <p>ORIGINALLY ISSUED: 2021.04.15</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 178	Criteria for the product category PC0029 Dyed Yarn for reclaimed dyed inputs		ASR-213-V1.1 Table 3.3		
<b>Situation:</b>	Under GRS/RCS, certain products are made from dyed reclaimed inputs (pre-consumer or post-consumer), and additional dyeing is not done on such products. Can we call such yarn 'undyed' or 'greige' yarn instead of 'dyed yarn'?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>When product inputs used by a certified site have been previously dyed but only identified as dyed products as a result of a previous recycling process, they shall be identified with the 'Dyed yarn' (PC0029) category to avoid confusion with 'Undyed Yarn' (PC0031), which shall not be used on any dyed material.</p> <p>A supplier may request the certification body to include a statement such as "Product's color was maintained from its life cycle previous to entering the certified supply chain." or "Product is made from inputs which were previously dyed and the resulting product color is not a result of an additional dyeing process.". This information can be included in box 12 of the Transaction Certificate template (ASR-205-V3.0).</p> <p>NOTE: Post-consumer or pre-consumer reclaimed products could have already been dyed in a previous life cycle and recycled (a process based on color sorting). In such a process, dyeing might not be performed by a certified site, but washing or finishing could be done on reclaimed product, yarn, or fabric. In such a case, the output will also be 'Dyed yarn' (PC0029) since the input is dyed reclaimed product (pre-consumer / post-consumer). When reclaimed products that have been previously dyed are certified, the 'Dyed yarn' (PC0029) category shall be used to avoid confusion with 'Undyed Yarn' (PC0031), which shall not be used on any dyed material.</p> <p>UPDATED: 2022.01.31</p> <p>ORIGINALLY ISSUED: 2022.06.08</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued



<b>Calibration 213</b>	<b>Invalidating or amending a transaction certificate to use volume for another standard</b>		<b>CCS-102-V3.0 E2.2.2</b>		
<b>Situation:</b>	May a transaction certificate be invalidated in order for the volume to be used on a transaction certificate for another standard (e.g. RCS to GRS)?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>1. The issuing certification body may amend an RCS transaction certificate to upgrade the claim to GRS, provided that the following criteria have been met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The order was eligible to be sold as GRS (including but not limited to the seller having GRS certification in place and all processing criteria being met); and</li> <li>b. The issuing certification body confirms that the transaction certificate has not been used as the input to any other transaction certificates (with confirmation from the buyer's certification body if needed).</li> </ul> <p>2. CCS-102-V3.0 E2.2.1.c allows for a transaction certificate to be amended to downgrade the claim from GRS to RCS, so this is not necessary in that case.</p> <p>3. Volume which was previously included on a transaction certificate for a standard not owned by Textile Exchange (e.g. GOTS or a certification body-owned recycling standard) shall not be used on a transaction certificate for a Textile Exchange standard.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 216</b>	<b>GRS Modules for Sites without Physical Possession</b>			<b>GRS-101-V4.0 A3.2c</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	Do the GRS social, environmental, and chemical criteria apply to sites without physical possession of GRS materials?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The GRS social, environmental, and chemical criteria do not apply to sites without physical possession of GRS materials such as traders and buying houses. These criteria still apply to facilities with physical possession of claimed materials, including subcontractors.</p> <p>Chain of custody criteria from the CCS do apply to these sites when they are certified.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 217</b>	<b>Listing Brand Names on Scope Certificate</b>			<b>ASR-104-V3.0 B3</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	When a certified brand sells certified products under a brand name which is not listed as a site on the scope certificate, should that brand name be somehow listed on the scope certificate?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>When a certified brand sells certified products under a brand name which is not listed as a site on the scope certificate, the certification body should add a list of all applicable brand names to the Facilities Page of the scope certificate, above the site appendix. Note that the buyer on the incoming transaction certificate shall be listed as a site on the brand's scope certificate (rather than just as a brand name).</p> <p>A format for doing this will be provided with ASR-204 Scope Certificate Template when it is next updated.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 222</b>	<b>Water deprivation for ewes in late pregnancy or lactating period.</b>			<b>RWS-101a-V2.2 AW1.7.3</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>The requirement in the RWS, for ewes in late pregnancy or lactating period, to not be deprived of water for more than 8 hours, doesn't conform to industry best practice recommendations for preparation time for shearing. These guidelines propose a longer withdrawal from water to allow animals to empty out to protect their health and comfort when they are sheared. These industry guidelines are also taking account of worker health and safety, as empty sheep are lighter and so cause less strain on the shearer. Australian and New Zealand guidelines suggest a minimum of 8 hours and maximum of 20 hours off water for ewes that are in late pregnancy or lactating.</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Ewes in late pregnancy or lactating period shall not be deprived of water for more than 20 hours.</p> <p>This requirement supersedes the criterion AW1.7.3 in the standard since this directly contradicts it and is based on further information which is now available to Textile Exchange.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 224</b>	<b>Change of Accreditation Bodies</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D1.1.8.a</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>What needs to be considered for a certification body to change accreditation bodies?</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>An accredited certification body may change accreditation body for either voluntary or involuntary reasons.</p> <p>An involuntary change in accreditation body occurs when the accreditation body is no longer able and willing to offer accreditation for the certification body's scope (e.g. is no longer a Textile Exchange accreditation body, or is no longer accepting certification bodies in a specific country). A change for any other reason is a voluntary change in accreditation body.</p>				

Calibration 224	Change of Accreditation Bodies		ASR-101-V2.1 D1.1.8.a		
	<p>The following steps shall apply for a change in accreditation body:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The certification body shall notify Textile Exchange of their intention to change accreditation body and submit an updated copy of ASR-206 Certification Body Application Form naming the new accreditation body.</li> <li>2. If the succeeding accreditation body is not an authorized Textile Exchange accreditation body, the certification body shall pay the new accreditation body fee (see ASR-107 Certification Fee Structure) and the accreditation body shall complete the authorization process before the change is approved.</li> <li>3. In the case of a voluntary change in accreditation body, the certification body shall meet the following criteria :                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Any assessment which has been started by the preceding accreditation body has been completed and the accreditation decision has been made.</li> <li>b. The certification body shall have a positive accreditation decision from the last assessment with the preceding accreditation body (i.e. there is no suspension or withdrawal of part or all of the scope of accreditation).</li> <li>c. The certification body shall be up to date with all required submissions to Textile Exchange, including site fees and data submissions, and shall not be under sanction from Textile Exchange.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Once the above criteria have been satisfied, Textile Exchange will approve the change in accreditation body.</li> <li>5. The succeeding accreditation body shall consider all assessment reports from the preceding accreditation body for at least the previous two years in conducting their initial assessment.</li> </ol>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 15</b>	<b>Pre-Consumer Glass (Moil)</b>	<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1, definition of pre-consumer</b>			
<b>Situation:</b>	May glass moil be considered to be reclaimed material?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Moil (unwanted top that occurs with every glass-blown object) shall not be considered recycled under GRS. Waste from breakage and rejection may be considered pre-consumer recycled if it undergoes an additional reprocessing stage and is within industry norms for the percentage of breakage and rejection.</p> <p>For cases where the reclaimed status of a material is in question, refer to Calibration 148.</p> <p>Updated: 2023.01.19</p> <p>Originally issued: 2019.03.01</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2023.01.19	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2023.01.19	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 184</b>	<b>Inputs from Tanneries, Slaughterhouses, and Abattoirs</b>	<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1</b>			
<b>Situation:</b>	May animal hides/fibers and leather sourced from a tannery, slaughterhouse, or abattoir be accepted as reclaimed inputs?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Animal fibers (including wool), animal hides, and leather sourced from a tannery, slaughterhouse, abattoir, or similar operation shall not be accepted as reclaimed inputs for RCS or GRS.</p> <p>NOTE: Calibration 148 addresses steps for certification bodies when there is ambiguity about whether or not a material may be accepted as reclaimed.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.12.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.12.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 188	Independently Certified Subcontractor SC use for other Textile Exchange Standards		CCS-102-V3.0 D3.4		
<b>Situation:</b>	May independently certified GRS subcontractors be used to produce RCS products without an RCS scope certificate?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Independently certified GRS subcontractors may be used as independently certified RCS subcontractors even if they do not hold separate RCS certification. Independently certified RCS subcontractors shall not be used as GRS subcontractors unless they are also GRS certified or are treated as associated subcontractors.</p> <p>Other than with RCS/GRS, certification to another Textile Exchange standard does not allow for a subcontractor to qualify as independently certified, though this certification may be considered in the subcontractor's risk assessment (see CCS-102-V3.0 Appendix B2 o.). Certification to a non-Textile Exchange standard (including GOTS) does not factor into the risk assessment.</p> <p>Updated: 2022.12.31</p> <p>Originally issued: 2022.07.21</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.12.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.12.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 215	Approval for VR2 Certifications		CCS-105-V3.0 B1.2-3		
<b>Situation:</b>	It is unclear when approval from Textile Exchange is required to use VR2 material.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Approval from Textile Exchange is required before the certification body schedules an audit for any site which is implementing alternative volume reconciliation directly to produce VR2 materials. No special approval is needed for sites that purchase and sell VR2 materials based on the criteria of the CCS.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.12.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.12.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 207	Sale of Claimed Material at a Shared Subcontractor Location		ASR-104-V3.0 A8.3		
<b>Situation:</b>	What should the shipping date be for transaction certificate purposes if claimed material changes ownership from one certified organization to another while being stored at a third-party facility which is a subcontractor for both the seller and the buyer?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	If claimed material is sold and there is no physical shipment of the material associated with the sale (e.g. the same facility is acting as a storage subcontractor for both the buyer and the seller), the date of the change in legal ownership - typically the invoice date - shall be used as the "shipping date" for transaction certificate purposes.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.12.13	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.12.13	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 80	Accepting Organic Inputs for OCS		OCS-101-V3.0 C1.1		
<b>Situation:</b>	Are all national organic standards accepted for OCS inputs? May organic inputs which have been processed after the farm be accepted for OCS?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The OCS allows first processors to accept organically grown material inputs from farms which are certified under one of the three categories listed (USDA NOP, Regulation (EC) 834/2007 &amp; EU 2018/848, or IFOAM Family of Standards). A national organic standard which is not included in this list shall not be used to provide organically grown material inputs for OCS.</p> <p>Sites further along the supply chain (i.e. not the first processor) may only accept inputs which are OCS certified or certified to a standard listed as equivalent for OCS in ASR-106 Accepted Equivalent Standards.</p> <p>Updated: 2022.12.12</p> <p>Originally issued: 2020.07.10</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.12.12	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.12.12	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 192	Classification of a rented facility in the scope certificate?	CCS-101-V3.1 C5.2			
<b>Situation:</b>	A certified organization rents a facility for the washing process and pays all costs involved such as labor, utilities and materials. Is this facility a site or a subcontractor?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	When the certificate holder rents a facility to conduct a process and pays for labor, overhead, and materials used, the facility will be considered a part of the organization and shall be listed in the Site Appendix on the scope certificate as a site, not a subcontractor.  Updated: 2022.12.12  Originally issued: 2022.09.22				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.12.12	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.12.12	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 197	Certified Sites as Associated Subcontractors	CCS-101-V3.1 C5.2			
<b>Situation:</b>	May the scope certificate holder use a subcontractor who is independently certified to the same standard as an associated subcontractor?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	A subcontractor facility that is independently certified to the same Textile Exchange standard shall not be listed as an associated subcontractor since they hold an independent scope certificate.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.12.01	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.12.01	<b>Status:</b>	Issued



Calibration 193	Animal Fiber Sales Setups	ASR-104-V3.0 A8.3
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Various transportation and storage arrangements exist for unprocessed animal fibers prior to the spinning stage. These agreements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Ex-Works" arrangements where animal fiber is sold (change in legal ownership) but stored for some time at the seller's storage facility. The buyer subsequently arranges transportation for the fiber.</li> <li>2. Arrangements where the farm or farm group stores unprocessed fibers at a storage or processing facility (e.g., a scour) before selling the fibers. The fibers may be sold to the processor or to another party in processed or unprocessed form.</li> </ol> <p>In both of these scenarios, the animal fiber is being sold but is not physically shipped at the time of sale.</p>	
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>When animal fibers (before the spinning stage) are stored at a facility that does not belong to the owner of the fibers, that facility shall be considered to be a subcontractor for storage, even if that facility is also the seller on the incoming transaction certificate or buyer on the outgoing transaction certificate of the organization which owns the fibers. When animal fibers change ownership without physically moving between facilities, the date of the ownership change may be accepted as the "shipping date" for transaction certificate purposes. The change in legal ownership is based on the invoice date when there is no physical shipment of material.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After selling unprocessed wool to a buyer, the seller stores the wool for 87 days. The buyer then arranges for the wool to be picked up and transported to the buyer's facility. In this case, the "shipment date" for the transaction certificate would be the same as the sale date, and the seller would then act as the buyer's subcontractor for the wool storage (87 days).</li> <li>2. A farm group ships unprocessed mohair to a scouring facility, and the scouring facility stores the mohair for 56 days. At the end of the 56 days, the farm group sells the mohair to the scouring facility. The scouring facility acts as a subcontractor for the 56 days before the sale. The "shipping date" occurs at the end of the 56 days for transaction certificate purposes.</li> </ol>	

<b>Calibration 193</b>	<b>Animal Fiber Sales Setups</b>			<b>ASR-104-V3.0 A8.3</b>	
	<p>3. A broker ships unprocessed alpaca fiber to a processing facility and stores the fiber for 43 days. The broker then sells the fiber to a separate buyer (not the processing facility), pays for the processing facility to process the fiber then has the fiber shipped to the buyer. The processing facility acts as a storage and processing subcontractor, and the "shipping date" for transaction certificate purposes is the date when the fiber is shipped from the processing facility to the buyer.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.11.11	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.11.11	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 191</b>	<b>Transaction certificates without geographic origin information</b>			<b>ASR-104-V3.0 C3.5</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>The full implementation of ASR-104-v3.0 Policy for Transaction Certificates after July 1, 2022, mandates disclosure of the geographic origin of each raw material. The routine issuance of output transaction certificates has been interrupted because many input transaction certificates issued before July 1 are missing the origin information. Certification bodies request a guidance procedure to manage such transaction certificates whilst conforming to the transaction certificate policy.</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>1. For transaction certificates issued after May 1, 2021, and before July 1, 2022, the certification body shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Request the missing geographical origin information from either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The certification body who issued the input transaction certificate, or</li> <li>ii. The seller as listed on the input transaction certificate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Maintain records of collection efforts related to the inclusion of origin information in the output transaction certificate, whether these efforts are successful or not.</li> </ul>				

Calibration 191	Transaction certificates without geographic origin information		ASR-104-V3.0 C3.5		
	<p>2. If the certification body cannot gather the geographical origin information as outlined in item 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The output transaction certificate may be issued only if the input transaction certificate is correct and in conformity to the Policy for Transaction Certificates that was valid at the time of issuance.</li> <li>b. The certification body shall enter “Not available” in Box 11 of the output transaction certificate.</li> </ul> <p>3. The Textile Exchange Assurance team may perform its own sampling of transaction certificates to ensure conformity with this calibration. In case of identifying a non-conforming transaction certificate, they may notify the applicable accreditation body for further investigation.</p> <p>4. Transaction certificates missing geographic origin information and issued before May 1, 2021, are not subject to the due diligence in item 1, but the certification body shall comply with item 2.</p> <p>5. All transaction certificates issued by first processors after November 15, 2022, shall include the geographic origin information or otherwise, shall be considered invalid. All other transaction certificates in the supply chain shall include the geographic origin information in every transaction certificate after March 31, 2023. Any transaction certificate missing the geographic origin information after March 31, 2023, shall be considered invalid.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.10.13	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.10.13	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 195	Allowed language in place of using the term “virgin” when specifying RDS-certified down		TE-301-V1.2 B2.1.1		
<p><b>Situation:</b></p>	<p>Many retailers are now using exclusively RDS certified or non-certified down and claiming their “virgin down is RDS-certified”. Currently, in the allowed claims language we do not allow organizations to specify that all the down they use is “virgin” and we would like to avoid use of this term as we don’t verify this attribute, and it may be confusing to consumers. Organizations still need a way to clearly communicate to consumers that when the down is not recycled, it is RDS certified.</p>				
<p><b>Interpretation:</b></p>	<p>B2.1 Claims by certified organizations shall be limited to the following language only:</p> <p>B2.1.3 For certified raw materials sourced from farms:</p> <p>(At [company name]), [% of the/All] [organically grown material/down/wool/mohair/alpaca fiber] sourced from farms into our supply chain is [standard name or acronym]-certified.</p> <p>e.g. “At Brand ABC, all down sourced from farms into our supply chain is RDS certified.”</p>				
<p><b>Date Issued:</b></p>	<p>2022.10.03</p>	<p><b>Conformity Date:</b></p>	<p>2022.10.03</p>	<p><b>Status:</b></p>	<p>Issued</p>

<b>Calibration 190</b>	<b>Blending RDS/RAF material with recycled material of the same type</b>			<b>RDS-101-V3.0/RAF-101a-V2.2/RAF-101b-V1.2/RAF-101c-V1.0 B2.1.1.b</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	RDS and RAF fibers may be blended with recycled RDS or recycled RAF fibers for a labeled claimed product.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	An RWS product that contains recycled wool may only qualify for labeling to the RWS if the product contains at least 5% RWS wool and 100% of the wool in the product is certified to either RWS or mixed with RCS or GRS certified wool. The same guidance may be applied for other RAF standards (e.g., blend of RMS and recycled mohair) and for RDS (blend of RDS and recycled down).				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.09.23	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.09.23	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 172</b>	<b>Scope Certificate Number and Scope Certificate Version Number</b>		<b>ASR-103-V3.0 B1.3</b>		
<b>Situation:</b>	If a scope certificate number changes (e.g. as a result of the addition or removal of a product, site, and/or process, or due to a correction made on the scope certificate), how should the certification body report the change to the scope certificate number?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>As per ASR-103-V3.0 Policy for Scope Certificates, section B1.3, “Each scope certificate shall have a unique alphanumeric scope certificate number generated by the certification body.” Although it is not specifically stated what happens to a scope certificate number if there is an update, the intention is that each issuance of a scope certificate will have a unique number.</p> <p>To maintain traceability, if a scope certificate is amended after its original issuance, an association between the original scope certificate number and revised scope certificate number should be maintained (e.g. original scope certificate number is 12345, and then later revised to 12345-1 due to a site addition).</p>				

Calibration 172	Scope Certificate Number and Scope Certificate Version Number		ASR-103-V3.0 B1.3		
	<p>For a certification body reporting data via dTrackit, the original (first issuance) scope certificate number shall be included in the "SC No" field. If a scope certificate is later amended (e.g. due to site inclusion), in addition to the original scope number in the "SC No" field, the revised/new scope certificate number shall be included in the "SC Version No" field.</p> <p>For a certification body reporting data manually via an excel data template (i.e. the certification body is not yet onboarded to dTrackit), only the original scope certificate number shall be listed.</p> <p>For a certification body reporting data manually via an excel data template for website listings, only the current (valid) scope certificate number shall be listed.</p> <p>NOTE: Textile Exchange will be phasing out all excel data templates once all certification bodies are onboarded to dTrackit and therefore, the excel data templates will not be amended to include an additional field for "scope certificate version number" ("SC Version No") that exists within dTrackit.</p> <p>Updated: 2022.09.22</p> <p>Originally issued: 2022.01.31</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.09.22	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.09.22	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 185	Independently Certified Subcontractor facility number		ASR-103-V3.0 B3.4		
<b>Situation:</b>	There is confusion on the use of the Facility_number and Subcontractor_number in the Facilities page of the scope certificate template because it doesn't match the text in B3.4 of the Policy for Scope Certificates.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>B3.2 Site Appendix</p> <p>B3.4 Independently Certified Subcontractor (ICS) Appendix</p> <p>Each independently certified subcontractor shall be specified in the Independently Certified Subcontractor Appendix along with its ICS facility number and address. The facility number of an independently certified subcontractor (ICS_Facility_Number) should not be obtained from the current certification body, but from the certification body that initially certified the independently certified subcontractor. The ICS facility number refers to the original facility number provided by the certification body that carried out the facility's audit and certification, as listed in the site appendix of its primary scope certificate.</p> <p>NOTE: For scope certificates of independently certified subcontractors (ICS), the Site Appendix in the Facilities page will show the ICS_Facility_Number.</p> <p>(requirements B3.4.1 through B3.4.4 remain unchanged).</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.07.26	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.07.26	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 168	Ineligible Reclaimed inputs - Silk Spinning Waste		GRS-201-V4.2/RCS- 201-V2.2		
<b>Situation:</b>	Are "silk wastes" eligible for GRS/RCS certification as "pre-consumer material"?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Waste produced from a silk filament spinning process is regularly reused in the silk spun spinning process. Therefore, such waste does not qualify as reclaimed nor pre-consumer material, and the process does not qualify as recycling.</p> <p>Therefore, only yarn hard waste as silk filament or silk spun yarns shall be considered as pre-consumer and only if the next processing step is recycling (e.g. mechanical shredding). Follow the calibration log 148.</p> <p>If a certification body has previously issued a scope certificate for ineligible silk waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the scope certificate may be maintained by the certification body until its expiry, and</li> <li>b) the certification body shall notify the client that their scope certificate cannot be renewed for this product.</li> </ul> <p>No recertification is possible with material inputs which do not qualify as reclaimed, and any scope certificates with ineligible inputs issued after April 15, 2021 shall have the scope reduced to exclude ineligible inputs or shall be withdrawn immediately.</p> <p>If the certification body is not sure if a reclaimed input is eligible or has not certified that reclaimed input before, they shall reach out to Textile Exchange for clarification prior to including it in the scope of GRS or RCS certification. If Textile Exchange or the AB finds errors in this area where the certification body did not request guidance from Textile Exchange, the scope certificate shall have the scope reduced to exclude ineligible inputs or shall be withdrawn immediately.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.06.09	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.06.09	<b>Status:</b>	Issued



<b>Calibration 176</b>	<b>Clarity on CB reporting and invoicing for RAF farms</b>		<b>ASR-107-V2022.0 B2.7</b>		
<b>Situation:</b>	Audit times vary with RAF so some CBs are not reporting the farm names within an SC until the audit occurs. Per the SC policy, farms that are part of an active SC are to be reported as if they were already audited and are continuing certification to the RAF standard on the anniversary date.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	The certification body shall report all active sites on a RAF scope certificate on the anniversary date, regardless of whether the audit has occurred. Textile Exchange will assume the farm will continue to be certified and invoice the certification body accordingly. If the certification body knows the site will not continue to be certified, they shall not report that site in the annual report for that scope certificate.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 179</b>	<b>Waiting period for certification body re-accreditation</b>		<b>ASR-112-V1.1 A3</b>		
<b>Situation:</b>	In light of recent involuntary withdrawals of certification body accreditations, some CBs have inquired about the desire for re-accreditation by changing their accreditation body once withdrawn or suspended by the previous AB.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>A certification body whose accreditation has been involuntarily withdrawn by their accreditation body shall not reapply for accreditation to any Textile Exchange standard with any accreditation body for at least a 24-month period following the date of withdrawal by their previous accreditation body.</p> <p>NOTE: An application must be submitted to and subsequently accepted by Textile Exchange prior to submitting an application to the accreditation body (see ASR-101-V2.1 ACP, section D1.1.8).</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Status:</b>	Retirement Pending

<b>Calibration 180</b>	<b>Assessment of Textile Exchange logo use by CBs</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 C4.6</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	It is not clear in the ACP what ABs shall check in their assessment of CBs regarding CB use of the Textile Exchange logo and CB adherence to the Claims Policy.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>A certification body becomes authorized to use of the Textile Exchange standard logo(s) when the certification body licensing contract for the applicable standard has been signed with Textile Exchange (see TE-301-V1.2 Standards Claims Policy, section C2.5). The certification body may use a placeholder for the Textile Exchange standard logo (e.g. "logo goes here") to demonstrate conformity of logo use for assessment by their accreditation body prior to the certification body licensing contract being signed.</p> <p>The accreditation body shall evaluate certification body conformance with C2.3, C2.4, and C2.5 of TE-301-V1.2 Standards Claims Policy during their assessments of the certification body.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 182</b>	<b>Certified organization becomes ineligible</b>			<b>CCS-101-V3.1 B4</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	A company becomes either banned by Textile Exchange or the United States government sanctions a company, product, or input which results in the company becoming ineligible for certification.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>In the event that a previously certified component, product, shipment, or site is identified as restricted, and therefore ineligible for certification, the certification body:</p> <p>a) Shall immediately notify Textile Exchange and withdraw the related scope certificate(s) of such ineligible entity(ies);</p> <p>b) Shall cease all related certification activities within the prescribed timeline provided by Textile Exchange;</p>				

Calibration 182	Certified organization becomes ineligible			CCS-101-V3.1 B4	
	<p>c) Shall notify the certification body of any buyer of the identified ineligibility and any resulting withdrawal if any related transaction certificate(s) has been issued during the validity period of the scope certificate;</p> <p>d) Shall not issue transaction certificates for products at the first processor that have become ineligible for certification immediately upon becoming ineligible. For products already certified prior to becoming ineligible, the certification body may consider them to be certified unless specifically identified by Textile Exchange to be considered ineligible immediately; And</p> <p>e) Shall not issue transaction certificates for ineligible products after six months of becoming ineligible.</p> <p>NOTE: This applies only to outputs of any process that is not the first processor (see item D).</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 186	Merging of SC anniversary dates			ASR-103-V3.0 B1.10	
<b>Situation:</b>	B1.10 of SC policy establishes the anniversary date but isn't clear/explicit on how to address the merging of anniversary dates for different standards.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	B1.10.7 If an organization wants to merge the anniversary dates of different scope certificates, the certification body shall first identify (as reference) the scope certificate that is closer to expiration. The other scope certificates to be merged shall use this reference (earliest) anniversary date. The certification body shall only merge dates by shortening the validity period in the calendar and shall not extend validity periods. The certification body shall withdraw the scope certificates with the previous anniversary date and issue all new scope certificates with the same anniversary date using the earliest anniversary date. All applicable fees as per ASR-107 remain unchanged.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 187</b>	<b>Mulesing using the ring method</b>			<b>RWS-101a-V2.2 AW3.11</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Wool producers in Victoria, Australia, are using rubber rings (the kind used for castration) to remove excess skin from the breech area of sheep and give the same effect as standard mulesing. The skin will be pulled tight and the ring applied to stop the flow of blood and the skin dies and drops off. It will give chronic rather than acute pain to the sheep.</p> <p>This technique falls into the definition of mulesing in the RWS, so it is prohibited.</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	AW3.11.1 Freeze mulesing (steining) and any other form of breech modification is prohibited.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.06.08	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 181</b>	<b>Clarity of organic status for OCS certified materials/products</b>			<b>TE-301-V1.2 B4.2.1 and B4.2.2</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>When the allowed language in TE-301-V1.2 Standards Claims Policy in B4.2.1-B4.2.2 is applied to the OCS, it may mislead consumers to believe that the organically grown material was certified by the OCS, when in fact, it comes from farms certified under one of IFOAM's Family of Standards.</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>A claim maker may use the allowed language below to put the emphasis on the product being certified and not the raw input material:</p> <p>a) (This product/This component) contains [x%] organically grown [material], certified OCS by [CB name] [License Number].</p> <p>b) Contains [x%] organically grown [material], certified OCS by [CB name] [License Number].</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.05.02	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.05.02	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 177</b>	<b>Minimum months of records for Initial audit</b>	<b>CCS-201-V3.0 &amp; V2.0 C4 of CCS V3.0 &amp; B1.2 of CCS V20</b>			
<b>Situation:</b>	How many months of records (such as production, attendance, payroll, etc.) should the facility have before a GRS audit can be conducted if a facility was just established?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	If a brand new facility is being certified, at least three months of operation records are needed to ensure a proper CCS and/or GRS audit.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.04.28	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.04.28	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 161</b>	<b>Collectors and Concentrators Outside of CB's Geographic Scope</b>	<b>GRS-201-V4.2/RCS-201-V2.2 A4 Guidance</b>			
<b>Situation:</b>	If a certification body has a limited geographic scope of operations, may the certification body's material recycler clients source from collectors or concentrators which are located outside of the geographic scope?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>All collectors and concentrators shall be located within the geographic scope of the material recycler's certification body, unless one of the following options applies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The collector or concentrator is independently certified to the RCS or GRS; or</li> <li>2. The certification body outsources all required evaluation of the collector or concentrator to a certification body who is accredited for the RCS and/or GRS with a geographic scope which includes the collector or concentrator's location.</li> </ol>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 165</b>	<b>Organization naming guidance for Scope Certificates and Transaction Certificates</b>		<b>ASR-103-V3.0, ASR-104-V3.0 B1.4 of SC, B2.2 of TC</b>		
<b>Situation:</b>	Some of the Chinese customers have the same English names but different Chinese names. It would be a good practice to have both the Chinese and English names listed under the Name_of_Certified_Organization. It was noticed that some companies would have their English name the same as another organization, but their Chinese name is the unique identifier and cannot be mixed up with another organization. It will create an issue in deduplication.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Due to the complexity and in order to have an effective deduplication of sites in the Textile Exchange database, the certification body should mention English name and native language name in scope and transaction certificates as two separate field line items when the native language has non-English characters (e.g. Chinese). Only English characters are permitted in the English name field.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>Name_of_Certified_Organisation</p> <p>Native_Name_of_Certified_Organisation</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 166	Submission of Claim Approval Application		TE-301-V1.1 B5		
<b>Situation:</b>	Often, the brand is responsible for the generation of artwork, and their license number will be used on the label. Sometimes there can be confusion between who should submit the label release/approval to their certification body (i.e. the manufacturer, or the brand).				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Claim approval applications may be submitted by either the certified brand or the certified final processor of certified goods to the relevant certification body for review (i.e. the certification body who issued the scope certificate to the certified organization) and the artwork shall include the license number of the organization submitting the claim approval application.</p> <p>If the certified brand and the final processor are each certified by a different certification body:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the review of the claim approval application shall be submitted to (and subsequently approved or rejected) by one certification body only; and</li> <li>b) the certification body shall accept the claim approval issued by the certification body of the organization submitting the claim approval application.</li> </ul> <p>If a certification body subsequently identifies an error within the artwork after the approval has been issued, they shall notify the certification body that issued the claim approval of the error directly so it can be remedied. If the artwork is not remedied, the certification body who discovered the error should submit a formal complaint to Textile Exchange.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 169	Raw Material Composition - Decimal Points		ASR-104-V3.0 B2.10		
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Can we accept or issue a transaction certificate where the raw material composition is mentioned with decimal points?</p> <p>e.g. 50.40% Recycled Pre-Consumer Cotton + 49.60% Polyester</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>For all Textile Exchange standards, raw material composition in each scope and transaction certificate shall be expressed using only whole number(s) and shall not include decimal points (i.e. shall be rounded to the closest whole number).</p> <p>e.g. 50% Recycled Pre-Consumer Cotton + 49% Polyester</p> <p>NOTE: Common testing methods can usually verify material composition within a tolerance limit of +/- 3% variation only. Therefore, it may be technically impossible to verify a material composition in decimal points (e.g. 50.40%).</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.01.31	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 173	RAF GIS Farm Questions: Elimination of Excel submission option.		RAF-102-V2.1 D1.2.1.b		
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>RAF-102-v2.01, D1.2.1b requires data submission of Farm Questions using an online survey form or an Excel file. This requirement is mandatory as of January 1st, 2022. Textile Exchange made both options available as it was unknown whether the ArcGIS system would be ready by then.</p> <p>As the system was made ready by January 1st, 2022, the Excel file option will no longer be an alternative because it cannot be linked to the automated features of dTrackit, thus requiring manual processing and delays. The system will no longer accommodate manual submission of this information via Excel after March 31st, 2022, so the focus will be on implementing only automated data collection methods.</p>				



<b>Calibration 173</b>	<b>RAF GIS Farm Questions: Elimination of Excel submission option.</b>			<b>RAF-102-V2.1 D1.2.1.b</b>	
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The certification body shall report a set of Farm Questions for each certified farm (including each member in the case of Farm Group Certification and Communal Farmer Group Certification). The certification body shall ensure all questions are complete and accurate prior to submission.</p> <p>The options available for submission and with mandatory implementation date no later than April 1st, 2022 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The online survey form, using the custom link provided to the certification body.</li> <li>2. A mobile app with a convenient offline feature which allows entering data and submitting it later if there are internet connectivity issues.</li> </ol>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2022.01.26	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2022.01.26	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 170</b>	<b>Removal of sheep from natural pasture</b>			<b>RWS-101a-V2.2 AW5.7, AW2.14, AW2.11, AW3.2, LM1.1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Australian dry weather conditions affect the pasture ground cover in farms, forcing the farmer to practice continuous confinement feeding as a regular farming practice.</p> <p>Each year, sheep are held off pasture in a confinement yard for a period of time, usually summer or autumn seasons. The animals cannot demonstrate natural behaviors and have welfare conditions (5 freedoms), and the farmer feeds them with supplementary hay, anipro, and barley.</p> <p>Challenges can arise when the farm uses confinement yards as a management tool rather than as a contingency plan, as the RWS standard specifies.</p> <p>The auditors are signaling confinement feeding as a major non-conformity, but the farmers find it very difficult to stop this practice under the current weather conditions in Australia.</p>				

<p><b>Calibration</b> 170</p>	<p><b>Removal of sheep from natural pasture</b></p>		<p>RWS-101a-V2.2 AW5.7, AW2.14, AW2.11, AW3.2, LM1.1</p>		
<p><b>Interpretation:</b></p>	<p>The RWS-101a -v2.2 Responsible Wool Standard recognizes in Section C Animal Welfare the need to provide the flock with access to natural graze as an integral part of their living environment (AW2.11) and establishes the requirement to have a pasture-based system for sheep. The only exception is when an emergency or severe weather conditions such as droughts, floods, fires, heavy snowfall, etc., would otherwise negatively impact sheep welfare and affect the amount of pasture available for sheep or keeping a healthy soil base for it.</p> <p>The CB shall use the following criteria to assess if the farmer complies with the RWS principles when removing sheep from natural pasture. The farmer needs to meet ALL clauses to be considered compliant with AW2.11:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The farmer has a written document that explains the type of emergency or severe weather affecting the farm and forcing the removal of sheep from natural pasture, including a detailed management plan that guarantees sheep welfare, as per AW5.7. This clause also covers situations like weather conditions resulting from the change of seasons, which can affect soil and animal health. Thus, it requires the written plan to have actions on land management (LM1.1) and animal health (AW3.2).</li> <li>2. The farm establishes a correct and effective stocking rate and follows it, as per AW2.14. The proper management of this rate can provide, for the most part, enough in-farm produced hay/forage to feed the flock during periods when removed from natural pasture.</li> <li>3. The farm keeps records of the duration and justification of each emergency or severe weather occurrence that led to removing sheep from natural pasture. Justification may involve information such as weather data, soil moisture deficits, pasture vegetation cover measurement, predator monitoring etc.</li> </ol>				
<p><b>Date Issued:</b></p>	<p>2022.01.11</p>	<p><b>Conformity Date:</b></p>	<p>2022.01.11</p>	<p><b>Status:</b></p>	<p>Issued</p>

Calibration 164	Collectors and Concentrators - Additional verification & physical inspection			GRS-201-V4.2/RCS-201-V2.2 A4 Guidance	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>The GRS Implementation Manual V4.2 A4 states that “Certification bodies shall keep a list of all collectors and concentrators that supply to recycling clients. 10% of this total shall be chosen for additional verification, with 2% chosen for physical inspection.”</p> <p>It is not clear that if the percentages selected for additional verification should be determined per certification body, per certified organization, or on another basis.</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The sampling of collectors and concentrators (10% additional verification and 2% physical inspection) shall be determined per certification body and is always rounded up. The 2% sample for physical inspection may be counted towards the 10% sample for additional verification.</p> <p>Example: A certification body has certified 50 GRS material recyclers (mechanical, chemical, and/or biological) in total. Each recycler has one collector and one concentrator. As a result, the certification body will have 50x1 + 50x1 = 100 collectors/concentrators. The certification body therefore needs to select 10% of 100 = 10 collectors/concentrators for additional verification and 2% of 100 = 2 collectors/concentrators for physical inspection.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.09.22	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.09.22	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 162	Sale of Mixed Down and Feather from a Slaughter Site			ASR-213-V1.1 Table 3.1	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Some RDS slaughter sites sell mixed down and feather to sites which are not included in the same scope certificate. The slaughter sites are not able to determine the exact percentage of down and of feather from the total quantity, since these two raw materials are separated at the down processing stage. How should this material be reflected on scope and transaction certificates?</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The raw material codes RM0330 and RM0331 (PFC) may be used for mixed down and feather on transaction certificates only if the seller named on the transaction certificate is a slaughter site. These codes may also be used on the corresponding scope certificates. These codes shall not be used on scope or</p>				

<b>Calibration 162</b>	<b>Sale of Mixed Down and Feather from a Slaughter Site</b>			<b>ASR-213-V1.1 Table 3.1</b>	
	transaction certificates where the percentage of down and of feather in the product can be identified.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.09.16	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.09.16	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 159</b>	<b>Physical Possession</b>			<b>CCS-101-V3.0 B1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	In the CCS we say that traders without physical possession of product do not have to be certified. We occasionally get questions about what ‘physical possession’ means. Can you draft a calibration for that and let us know what it is so we can add that as a future update to the User Manual as well?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Physical possession of goods is the physical custody or control of goods in material form. It is different from ownership of goods, where an entity acquires the proprietary rights over the goods.</p> <p>For example, when a processor sends materials to a subcontractor, they merely transfer the physical possession and not the ownership of materials. Here, the processor is the owner of the materials but does not have physical possession of materials, and the subcontractor has physical possession of materials but is not the owner.</p> <p>Different actors in the supply chain such as processors, wholesalers, distributors, and retailers usually take physical possession of materials and products. Others, such as traders, do not take physical possession due to their intermediary function. Brands sometimes take physical possession depending on their commercial operations setup. Textile Exchange standards intend to cover the different arrangements among supply chain participants while guaranteeing the integrity of the verified materials and products.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.09.03	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.09.03	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 155</b>	<b>CNCA Registration and Freelancers</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D1.1.3 &amp; D3.2.6.f</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	May a certification body contract with auditors who work for an entity registered with CNCA but which is not accredited to ISO 17065 as a way to meet the Chinese legal requirement for CNCA registration?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Any independently owned entity which holds registration with CNCA for the purpose of a certification body operating legally in China is considered to be a subcontractor of the certification body and is therefore required to hold ISO 17065 accreditation. Freelancers in China may be hired by a certification body or certification body subcontractor which holds CNCA registration.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.07.26	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.07.26	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 151</b>	<b>Organizations Between Farm and First Processor for RAF</b>			<b>RAF-101a-V2.1/RAF-101b-V1.1/RAF-101c-V1.0 B1.3</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	In some countries, "brokers" take possession of animal fiber in between the farm and the first processor, often to facilitate a sale at auction. It is unclear if these brokers require certification.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Organizations which take legal ownership of animal fiber in between the farm and the first processor are required to be certified to the standard, except where the applicable version of the CCS allows for an exception to certification. If an organization takes physical possession of the animal fiber (i.e. for storage) but not legal ownership, the organization shall be treated as a subcontractor by whoever owns the animal fiber while it is being stored (typically the farm or ICS).</p> <p>If the organization arranges for the sale of wool (e.g. at auction) and charges a service fee to the farm, they are not considered to take legal ownership even if they receive payment for the animal fiber and remit it to the farm. In this case the organization would be considered to be a broker. If the organization purchases the animal fiber from the farm for a set price, they are considered to take legal ownership.</p>				

<b>Calibration 151</b>	<b>Organizations Between Farm and First Processor for RAF</b>			<b>RAF-101a-V2.1/RAF-101b-V1.1/RAF-101c-V1.0 B1.3</b>	
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.06.04	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.06.04	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 153</b>	<b>Extended Timeline For Invoicing</b>			<b>ASR-104-V3.0 A6.3</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	In some cases, shipping of animal fiber is carried out from the farm to the buyer's warehouse in an extended time prior to invoicing for the fiber (3 months or more, and potentially more than a year). This creates a conflict with the requirement that transaction certificates be issued within 180 calendar days of the shipment date.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	If a farm ships animal fiber to the buyer's warehouse but does not invoice or transfer legal ownership to the buyer for an extended time, the farm may treat the buyer's warehouse as a subcontracted warehouse, and subsequently apply for a transaction certificate when legal ownership of the animal fiber is transferred to the buyer.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.06.04	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.06.04	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 149	Restricted Chemicals in Fiber Production		GRS-101-V4.0 D2.2		
<b>Situation:</b>	Textile Exchange has identified that a number of chip, fiber, and filament producers have been certified to the GRS while using restricted chemicals. Textile Exchange has further identified that in many cases there might be no alternative chemical available, and that the requirements of GRS Section D might be so strict as to effectively exclude particular fibers from the GRS system unintentionally.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>If the site uses any of the listed restricted chemicals in a chip, fiber, or filament production process, the scope certificate shall be withdrawn or downgraded to RCS immediately. This includes but is not limited to the following chemicals and fibers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DMAC (N N Dimethylacetamide/ Dimethylacetamide) in elastane/spandex; and</li> <li>2. Antimony trioxide and Cobalt (II) Acetate Tetrahydrate in polyester.</li> </ol> <p>The details of how these chemicals may be used in certified products in the future will be considered in the unified standard development process.</p> <p>NOTE: A previous exception was included in this calibration for scope certificates issued on or before April 15, 2021. All such scope certificates have now expired so that exception has been removed.</p> <p>UPDATED: 2022.01.31</p> <p>ORIGINALLY ISSUED: 2021.04.15</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.04.15	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.04.15	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 145</b>	<b>CB Translations of Documents</b>		<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D1.8.1</b>		
<b>Situation:</b>	May certification bodies prepare translations of Textile Exchange standards or other Textile Exchange documents to share with their non-English speaking clients?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Certification bodies may publish their own translations of Textile Exchange Standards and other documents, provided the following conditions are met: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Textile Exchange has not published an official translation of the document in the target language. Any certification body translations shall be discontinued if Textile Exchange publishes an official translation.</li> <li>2. A copy of the translated document shall be provided to Textile Exchange by email to Assurance@TextileExchange.org.</li> <li>3. For documents in Chinese or Spanish, the certification body shall wait for approval from Textile Exchange before publishing the document.</li> <li>4. Documents shall not copy any photos used in the original Textile Exchange document. Explanatory graphics may be copied.</li> <li>5. Documents shall include the text “Unofficial translation prepared by &lt;CB NAME(S)&gt;”. This text shall appear in English on the first page and in the target language on every page.</li> <li>6. Certification bodies working in the same region or language are encouraged to collaborate on translations to improve consistency.</li> <li>7. Where Textile Exchange provides a glossary of translated terms in the target language, the provided terms shall be used.</li> </ol>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.03.22	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.03.22	<b>Status:</b>	Issued



<b>Calibration 140</b>	<b>What is the earliest a recertification audit may be conducted?</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D4.4.20, D4.6.8</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>The ACP D4.4.20 recommends ('should' language) that recertification audits be conducted 60 days before the expiry of the previous scope certificate, and D4.6.8 requires that the certification decision be made within 60 days of the audit.</p> <p>How far in advance may a recertification audit be conducted? Is it allowable to finalize a certification decision within 60 days of the audit and issue a scope certificate upon expiry of the previous scope certificate?</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Recertification audits may be conducted up to 90 days before the expiry of the previous scope certificate.</p> <p>If a certification decision is made prior to the expiry of the previous scope certificate, issuing the new scope certificate may then be delayed up to 90 days after the audit date (typically to the anniversary date).</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.01.28	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.04.01	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 131</b>	<b>Non-NPOP Seed Cotton in India</b>			<b>OCS-101-V3.0 C1.1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	<p>Can non-NPOP seed cotton from India be accepted in the OCS supply chain at the ginning stage, if it is certified to another standard that is approved under IFOAM Family of Standards?</p>				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Since organic fibres are covered under NPOP and to meet national regulations, any organic fibers originating from India must be certified to NPOP as a basic requirement, to be accepted as OCS Material. Other certifications such as NOP may also be in place for the fibers.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.01.18	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.01.18	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 134</b>	<b>USDA NOP Eligibility</b>			<b>OCS-205-V2.1 Box 15</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	How should the certification body of a supply chain organization (not a first processor) determine the answer to the question "Certification of the organic material used for the products listed complies with USDA NOP rules"?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>For supply chain companies after the first processor, OCS Material is considered to comply with USDA NOP rules if all of the incoming OCS Material complies with USDA NOP rules, as indicated on the incoming transaction certificate. If any of the incoming OCS Material cannot be confirmed to comply with USDA NOP rules (i.e. 'No' is checked for this box on the incoming TC), 'No' shall be selected.</p> <p>Checking 'Yes' on this box indicates that all listed products comply with USDA NOP rules. Products from the same shipment may be divided into separate TCs if necessary to allow for this.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.01.18	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.01.18	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 136</b>	<b>Definition of "Lot"</b>			<b>RAF-101a-V2.1/RAF-101b-V1.1 G1.7.3</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	What is referred to by the word "lot" for the purposes of G1.7.3 in the RAF standards? Is it acceptable for a farm group to outsource the storage of bales of wool which may be combined into lots for sale?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	The word "lot" in G1.7.3 of the RAF standards refers to any discrete, identifiable unit of fiber which cannot be accidentally mixed with other lots.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.01.15	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.01.15	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 74	Scope of Processes for GRS Chemical Requirements			GRS-101-V4.0 D2	
<b>Situation:</b>	Are processes that do not "add" to the product (e.g. spin finishes for yarn) included in the scope of evaluation for chemicals according to the GRS?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Spin finishers (and processing aids) are still considered to be part of the scope of the GRS. The GRS does not make a distinction between products that are "added to the product," but uses the phrase: "GRS criteria for the use of chemicals that may be used in the production of GRS products are based on the following main requirements..." GRS chemical rules are applicable to all certified material, as well as any non-certified materials once they are blended into a certified product and to any other inputs used during production.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.01.14	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.01.14	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 112	Sufficient Personnel	ASR-101-V2.1 D3.1.1
<b>Situation:</b>	What is a sufficient number of personnel based on the number of scope certificates?	
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The number of personnel needed for a certification body with a set number of scope certificates will vary depending on the circumstances. In determining the number of personnel needed, the certification body should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The time required to conduct each audit (including audit time, travel, planning, and reporting), as well as the review/certification decision;</li> <li>2. The time required for administrative functions (e.g. issuing SCs, TCs, and claims approvals; closing NCs) per scope certificate;</li> <li>3. The percentage of each person's time which is dedicated to Textile Exchange standards;</li> <li>4. Time spent on training and general administrative tasks; and</li> <li>5. Full time working hours after regular time off.</li> </ol> <p>The number of personnel should not be less than 1 full time equivalent person per 100 scope certificates, and this will typically not be sufficient.</p>	

<b>Calibration 112</b>	<b>Sufficient Personnel</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D3.1.1</b>	
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2021.01.14	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2021.01.14	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 128</b>	<b>RAF ICS in a Different Country</b>			<b>RAF-101a-V2.0/RAF-101b-V1.0 F1.3</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	May an RAF farm group ICS be located in a different country than the farms, provided that necessary management oversight is maintained?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	The ICS location for a farm group shall be in the same country as the farms. If the certified organization's main operation is in another country, it may be included as a subsequent site in the scope certificate and may be involved with the work of the ICS.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.12.15	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.12.15	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 129</b>	<b>Reclaimed Inputs for Buttons</b>			<b>GRS-301-V4.0/RCS-301-V2.0 A1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	A button maker punches buttons out of a sheet of resin. The remaining material from the sheet is reground to be used as an input for buttons. May this material be considered reclaimed/recycled? Is the answer different if the regrinding process occurs at a different site?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>The remaining material after buttons are punched out of a sheet of resin (or a similar material) shall not be considered to be reclaimed or recycled if it is used as a raw material input for button making. This includes situations where the regrinding is outsourced or is done at a different site.</p> <p>The previous version of this guidance (published 2020.12.14) allowed any affected scope certificates active at that time to remain valid until expiry.</p>				

<b>Calibration 129</b>	<b>Reclaimed Inputs for Buttons</b>			<b>GRS-301-V4.0/RCS-301-V2.0 A1</b>	
	Updated: 2022.12.12 Originally issued: 2020.12.14				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.12.14	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.02.01	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 130</b>	<b>Certification of Non-Textile Reclaimed Materials</b>			<b>GRS-301-V4.0/RCS-301-V2.0 A3.1b</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	What action should certification bodies take before accepting non-textile reclaimed or recycled inputs for RCS or GRS?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Due to the wide range of potential reclaimed or recycled materials available, and due to differing definitions of these terms in different countries or sectors, the certification body shall contact Textile Exchange for clarification prior to accepting an application from an organization who wishes to certify non-textile reclaimed or recycled materials which are not already RCS or GRS certified.  (Updated on 2022.07.19. Corrected "should" to "shall").				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.12.14	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.12.14	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 116</b>	<b>Reclaimed Fur</b>			<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A3.1b</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	May reclaimed fur be accepted as an input for GRS or RCS?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Post-consumer reclaimed fur may be accepted as an input for GRS or RCS. Pre-consumer reclaimed fur is outside the scope of the standards.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.11.09	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.11.09	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 103	Withdrawing SCs that were issued only as Electronic certificates			ASR-101-V2.1 D1.1.14a	
<b>Situation:</b>	A certification body uses only electronic certificates, which causes the certification body to lack provisions to comply with requirement D1.1.14a to have clients return all copies of certificates (as no physical certificates are issued).				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	In the case of suspension or withdrawal of a scope certificate, the organization’s obligations under D1.1.14a are considered to be met if the original scope certificate (if issued as a physical document) is returned to the certification body and all electronic or printed copies of the scope certificate are destroyed.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.10.29	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.10.29	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 110	Timing of Recertification Audits and SC Issuance			ASR-101-V2.1 D4.7.3	
<b>Situation:</b>	Recertification audits are sometimes conducted 2-3 months prior to the expiry of the existing scope certificate, meaning the deadline for the certification decision (60 days after the audit) may fall before the expiry of the previous scope certificate. How should scope certificate issuance and validity dates be handled in this case?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Textile Exchange's intention is that the anniversary date remain consistent for each scope certificate. In the case that the recertification audit is conducted more than 60 days prior to the expiry of a scope certificate, the certification decision shall still be made within 60 days, but the certification body may wait until the expiry of the previous scope certificate to issue the new scope certificate.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.10.29	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.10.29	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 65</b>	<b>Recycled Down and Feathers</b>			<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	A down recycler purchases reclaimed down which has been through a light "pre-wash" process. The recycler's washing process is considered to be the recycling process. Does the supplier require RCS/GRS certification?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	If the reclaimed down supplier is purchasing down from a collector, the supplier needs to be RCS/GRS certified. If the supplier is acting as a collector, the certification body may agree for the down recycler to accept a Reclaimed Material Declaration Form from the supplier.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.08.27	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.08.27	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 89</b>	<b>Use of Expired Organic Food</b>			<b>OCS-101-V3.0 C1.1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	May organic expired/non-saleable food products (e.g. collected from grocery stores) be accepted as inputs for OCS?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Food waste which is used as a feedstock for a non-food/feed manufacturing process may be accepted as an OCS input if the following apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The product was intended for use as food/feed and is a waste product from the supply chain or the end user;</li> <li>2. The organic status of the product shall verified through one of the following methods: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A supply chain transaction certificate from an accepted organic standard; or</li> <li>b. A packaged product which carries an organic label from an accepted organic standard, and where the scope certificate for the final processor (as identified on the packaging) is confirmed.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>In this case, the processor accepting the food waste shall be considered to be the first processor. Accepted organic standards are identified in OCS 3.0 C1.1.</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.08.27	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.08.27	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 67</b>	<b>Freedom of association and collective bargaining</b>	<b>GRS-101-V4.0 B2.3</b>			
<b>Situation:</b>	Is the client required to have some form of elected worker representation? E.g. union, collective bargaining agreement, or worker committee.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	The intent of this requirement is to ensure that unions and other forms of worker organization are not blocked/actively avoided. There is no requirement that one be in place if the workers have not chosen to do so.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 70</b>	<b>Clarification on Shadow Audit Requirements</b>	<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D3.1.5e, f; D3.1.6b, c</b>			
<b>Situation:</b>	May certification bodies perform one shadow audit to the more complex standard (e.g. GRS) and consider this to cover as a shadow audit for all other standards (e.g. CCS, RCS, OCS)?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Auditor qualification scopes are intended to mirror accreditation scopes. Any audit which includes the CCS (all except farms) may meet the shadow audit requirement for CCS auditor qualification. A GRS audit at a material recycler may meet the shadow audit requirement for RCS auditor qualification. GRS/RCS audits may not be used to complete OCS qualification, or vice versa.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Status:</b>	Issued



<b>Calibration 73</b>	<b>Auditors conducting audits of the same organization in consecutive years</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D1.2.13c</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	If there are multiple auditors on an audit team, does the limit of three consecutive years apply to all auditors or only to the lead auditor?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	The requirement for an auditor to not audit the same organization in more than three consecutive years applies to all auditors.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 94</b>	<b>Combined Audit Checklists</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D4.4.19</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	May a certification body produce a combined checklist or report intended to address both a Textile Exchange standard and another standard? What approval for this is needed?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	A certification body may produce a combined checklist or report template intended to address both a Textile Exchange standard and another standard, provided that all required elements for the Textile Exchange standard are included. No special approval is needed, though the checklist or template shall be evaluated by the accreditation body during the next office assessment.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.07.16	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 88</b>	<b>Use of Expired Food as Recycled</b>			<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	May expired/non-saleable food products (e.g. collected from grocery stores) be accepted as recycled inputs?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Food waste which is used as feedstock for a (non-food) recycling process may be accepted as an input for GRS or RCS. If the food waste is collected in the supply chain (e.g. from grocery stores) it shall be considered to be pre-consumer.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.07.07	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.07.07	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 62</b>	<b>Oligomer Recycling</b>			<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	There is a lack of clarity regarding oligomer recycling. Previous guidance from Textile Exchange did not allow oligomers to be considered reclaimed/recycled.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Oligomers produced during processing may be accepted as a reclaimed input under GRS and RCS. If the oligomers are purchased by a recycler they may be considered to be pre-consumer.				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.07.02	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.07.02	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

Calibration 78	Certification of Ocean Waste		GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1		
<b>Situation:</b>	Some organizations wish to claim reclaimed ocean waste (waste collected from in or near oceans) specifically on GRS and RCS transaction certificates. Standard requirements do not validate that the plastic is in fact ocean plastic.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Reclaimed ocean waste is defined as material which has been reclaimed from oceans and/or from shorelines (within 0.2 km of the water level at low tide or the water level at high tide, whichever is higher). Materials from municipal recycling systems may not be included as reclaimed ocean waste.</p> <p>No claims relating to reclaimed ocean waste may be included on transaction certificates unless the following conditions are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The collector, concentrator, and all handlers are either RCS or GRS certified.</li> <li>2. In this case, the material recycler may accept an incoming RCS transaction certificate to produce a GRS product.</li> <li>3. All material is confirmed to be reclaimed ocean waste during audits of the collector and concentrator.</li> <li>4. "Reclaimed ocean waste" may be mentioned on Box 15 of the transaction certificate. It may not be mentioned on the scope certificate.</li> <li>5. For sites after the material recycler, reclaimed ocean waste is indicated on the incoming transaction certificate. And</li> <li>6. Public facing claims relating to reclaimed ocean waste are not associated with the RCS or GRS standard names or logos.</li> </ol> <p>Note: This issue has been identified for reconsideration by the International Working Group during the next RCS and GRS revision process.</p> <p>(Updated 2020.08.07)</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.07.02	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.07.02	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 64</b>	<b>Shadow Assessment Definition</b>		ASR-101-V2.0 C4.6.3b, C4.6.4b, C4.6.8		
<b>Situation:</b>	Clarity needed regarding definition of a Shadow Assessment - do these mean strictly witness audits or also include review audits?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>References to accreditation body shadow assessments refer to witness audits as defined in the situation. Review audits are a valuable tool, but Textile Exchange also believes that it is important to observe how the certification body auditor conducts the audit.</p> <p>The minimum frequency for shadow assessments is one per two years per standard, and we know that in many circumstances accreditation bodies are conducting more shadows than this. After the minimum number of shadow assessments is met, review audits as described may be used.</p> <p>IOAS definitions used in this calibration:</p> <p>Witness Audits - accreditation body assessor observes certification body’s auditor(s) at work; assessor and auditor(s) have an introductory meeting prior to the audit, and an exit meeting for feed-back and clarification of any questions after the audit, neither meeting involving the audited organization; assessor will not speak during the audit but may take notes. Witness audits should be full audits.</p> <p>Review Audits - accreditation body assessor visits the organization and verifies information from the certification body’s latest audit report and certification decision; it includes interviewing the operator or the person who was present for the last inspection, reviewing records and a physical visit to the premises. Duration may vary according to operation size and complexity but is not expected to be a full repeat audit.</p> <p>The auditor that conducted the reviewed audit is not required to be present; certification body is strongly encouraged to have a certification body representative accompanying the assessor during the Review Audit to witness it but shall not interfere with the assessor’s work in any sense.)</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2020.02.20	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2020.02.20	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 10</b>	<b>Generating Pre-Consumer Waste</b>			<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	Pre-consumer waste that is collected from a production stage and then used again in the same production stage may undergo processing steps that meet the definition of "recycled material ".				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Production wastes may only be considered to be pre-consumer reclaimed material if they are reprocessed through a recycling process at a site with 'recycling' included as a process in its scope. (Updated 2020.06.30)				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2019.05.01	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2019.05.01	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 23</b>	<b>Transition Between Standard Versions</b>			<b>ASR-101-V2.1 D4.4.2</b>	
<b>Situation:</b>	Transition from old standard version to new version.				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	<p>Certified organizations shall be in conformity with updated standards or requirements as of the mandatory implementation date (typically one year after publication in the case of a standard). The certification body shall check conformity to the updated standard or requirements as of the next regularly scheduled audit.</p> <p>Certification bodies shall inform their clients of the mandatory implementation date for applicable new standards or requirements. (Updated 2020.06.30)                      Organizations audited on or after the mandatory implementation date shall operate in conformance with and be subject to the criteria of both documents which will include any unannounced audits. (Updated 2022.03.14)</p>				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2018.08.01	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2018.08.01	<b>Status:</b>	Issued

<b>Calibration 45</b>	<b>Re-Recycling of Post-Consumer Materials</b>		<b>GRS-101-V4.0/RCS-101-V2.0 A1, definition of post-consumer</b>		
<b>Situation:</b>	Can waste from post-consumer recycling activities still be considered post-consumer waste?				
<b>Interpretation:</b>	Post-consumer recycled material which is put through an additional (pre-consumer) recycling process may continue to be considered post-consumer, provided that the percentage of post-consumer content can be accurately determined. If the percentage of material which is post-consumer prior to the final recycling process cannot be accurately determined, the material shall be considered to be pre-consumer. (Updated 2020.06.30)				
<b>Date Issued:</b>	2017.03.01	<b>Conformity Date:</b>	2017.03.01	<b>Status:</b>	Issued