Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
5. Management and organisation	**Application**		
5.3 Management of Riskplaza documents	Introduction of the Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme 5.0	A transition period of 1 year applies to the Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme version 5.0. Any non-conformity with regard to the changed criteria in version 5 (compared to version 4.1), identified during the audit, will be classified as a minor (and not as a major) non-conformity, as long as the relevant food safety hazards are demonstrably controlled.	2
Chapter 1	**Introduction**		
1.1 What is Riskplaza en what is Riskplaza-audit+?	1. The Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme	Textual changes.	1
1.2 Acceptance and accreditation NEN-EN-ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 standard	1. The Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme	Riskplaza declares the ISO TS/22003 not applicable. The ISO / TS 22003: 2014 is already used in the certification of the underlying food safety standards that are accepted by Riskplaza. Furthermore, the Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme criteria do not include a full food safety management system. Text merging.	3
1.3 Target group and structure of audit scheme	6. Documentation of the Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme	Layout of text revised.	1
1.4 Legal framework and background Riskplaza	2. Legal framework	Textual changes.	1
1.5 Aim and benefits Riskplaza	1. The Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme	Text merging.	1
1.6 The Riskplaza-audit+	1. The Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme	Text merging.	1

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
1.7 Organizational structure parties involved and role NVWA *(Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority)*	3. Riskplaza organisation	Textual changes.	1
1.8 Scope / range	7. Scope of the Riskplaza-audit+ certification scheme	Textual changes, exclusion of 'finished products delivered to third channel' has lapsed. In 1.1.1.: Finished products can be included in the scope if delivered to B2B (not B2C).	2
	8. Acceptance of food safety management standards	Riskplaza only accepts food safety management systems with criteria for developing and implementing a company specific HACCP system, assured by a management system, and systems where an integrity program is used to assure the correct application of the certification criteria. Riskplaza selects and assesses food safety management certification standards for acceptance. An overview is listed in Appendix 1 of the certification scheme.	3
	9. Scope of Riskplaza-audit+	New: -possibility of certification with limited scope. -distinction should be made between manufactured and traded products (also on the certificate)	3
1.9 Concepts, abbreviations and definitions	Definitions	List has been shortened. Severity categories were changed in wording. The definitions food safety management system and management system were introduced, where the food safety management system refers to the underlying standard accepted by Riskplaza (mostly	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
		GFSI standards), and the management system to the Riskplaza management system.	
1.10 Acknowledgements	Acknowledgements	In final version.	1
Chapter 2	**Part A**		
2.1 Introduction		Has lapsed.	
	1.1 Scope	New: determine the certification scope. Also limited scope is possible.	3
2.2 Action plan participants	Flowchart	New: schematic overview of interpretation document.	2
2.3 Purchased ingredients	1.2 Raw materials and ingredients	Textual changes.	1
2.4 Conduct a hazard analysis Identify harmful hazards	1.3 Riskplaza ingredient groups & hazards	Textual changes. 1.3.4: Also hazards announced through public media should be included in the risk analysis and appropriate control measures must be taken.	2
2.5 Inspection list ingredients and hazards	1.4 Updates from Riskplaza food safety database	1.4.1: Textual changes. Processing the updates of the database within 13 weeks (previously 3 months).	2
2.6 Establish relevant hazards by the application of a risk analysis	2. HACCP analysis	In general: Textual changes. Divided into 4 paragraphs. Visually explained by appendix 6. Analysis without the influence of control measures. Substantiation of a very low risk of a hazard has been revised and should be better justified. The following (examples of) justifications have lapsed: - The ingredient comes from a different region of origin than where the hazard occurs. - The hazard is completely eliminated in a process step of the supplier. These justifications are related to control measures of hazards.	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
	2.1.2 Risk analysis	New: introduction of the term: preconditions. The company can determine and implement preconditions (e.g., a limited region of raw material origin) which can be taken into account in the risk analysis.	2
	2.2 Severity	2.2.1: Severity categories are changed.	2
	2.3 Probability	New: 2.3.2: Implemented preconditions, the raw material-specific recipe and the information from the Riskplaza food safety database can be used to determine the probability of the hazard. New: 2.3.3: If internal/external information is used to lower the probability, information should be relevant and reliable and added by an impact analysis of published relevant incidents in the past 5 years.	2
2.7 Control relevant hazards	3. Control measures	Textual changes. A clear distinction is made between measures taken by the supplier, measures taken by the company itself, and measures taken by the buyer, including guidelines for proof. Clear distinction in type of certification of supplier: Riskplaza, GFSI or non-GFSI determines the verification method. -New: Method of verification of control measure is dependent on certification status (Riskplaza, but also GFSI) and type of hazard (chemical or other). -New: For chemical hazards (due to a strong dilution of the raw material in the final product), it is sufficient to monitor the GFSI certification status of the supplier.	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
		-For other cases (GFSI supplier, nonchemical hazard, and non-GFSI supplier, chemical hazard), verification can take place using a method/frequency based on a risk analysis.	
2.8 Completing proof of control measures	3.5 Analyses	The requirements for analysis as evidence of hazard control are more clarified. New: 3.5.4: In case of using only test results from supplier, reliability (fraud risk) of certificates should be checked, and, if necessary, verify these by means of own testing. New: 3.5.5: Results of sectoral monitoring programs are regarded as verification of control measures, not as control measure itself.	2
	4. Additional requirements for certification with limited scope	New: additional requirements to apply when a company opts for a certification with a limited scope. These requirements include a risk assessment on integrity issues with regard to the Riskplaza-audit^{+} certification claim and the limited certification scope (misleading/incorrect sale with claim).	3
3.7 Initial Riskplaza audit, phase 2 audit	5. Management system	New: specific chapter for requirements on the management system. Content is in general comparable to the relevant requirements in version 4.1, chapter 3.7., but some new requirements were introduced to the Management system requirements, and the explanation of requirements is more extensive per theme.	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
3.18 Notification duty and communication with the CB and NVWA	5.2. Communication	New: added to Management system criteria, and maximum period was introduced to report changes: The company shall report significant changes that affect the certified food safety management system, recalls and governmental sanctions to the certification body issuing the Riskplaza-audit+ certificate **within 3 working days.**	2
3.16 Requirements to handling of changes	5.3 Amendments	New: added to management system criteria, and the certified food safety management system shall be updated no later than 13 weeks (or earlier when required) after changes in products, raw materials, suppliers and control measures are implemented. Previously 3 months (see also 1.4.1 in version 5.0)	2
3.16 Requirements to handling of changes	5.4 Supplier evaluation	New: The company shall apply a suitable supplier assessment and approval procedure and can use the procedure of the certified food safety management system for this. This was in 4.1: Riskplaza requirements are included in the review of raw material suppliers.	2
3.7 Initial Riskplaza audit, phase 2 audit	5.6 Verification	Verification of HACCP plan and related results of the certified food safety management system, instead of validation in version 4.1	
Chapter 3	**Part B**		
3.1 Introduction	1. Introduction	Textual changes.	1
3.2 Conditions for participation Riskplaza-audit+	2.1 General	Textual changes. New requirements for the description of the certification scope (on the certificate)	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
	2.1.3 Conditions	This certificate shall be issued under accreditation by an accreditation body which has signed the EA-MLA.	2
3.3 Self-assessment and registration Riskplaza		Has lapsed.	1
3.4 Selection of certification body, registration Riskplaza-audit+ and contract	2.2 Certification procedure	Textual changes. Changing a CB is only possible if any NC (non-conformity) has been closed by the existing certification bodies.	2
3.7 Audit programme	2.3 Types of audits 2.4 Audit cycle 2.6 Audit programme	Textual changes. -Date of birth of the certificate is the basis for planning. 2.3: New audit types: - Unannounced audits (1 x per 5 years) by the CB are lapsed. This is replaced by an unexpected audit (annually at ½ √n of the sites) on behalf of Riskplaza in the context of the integrity programme. - Scope extension audit - Additional monitoring audits	2
3.5 Scheduling Riskplaza-audit+	2.5 Audit planning	Textual changes. New: The second phase of the certification audit is planned at a later stage. The system must be in operation for 4-13 weeks before phase 2 of the initial audit can be carried out, to be assessed by the CB (was 3 months).	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
3.7 Audit programme	2.6 Audit program	During the surveillance and recertification audit, the audit programme is based on a product trail and a random sample of the hazards, in such a way that all hazards have been assessed at least once during the certification period. The sample shall be chosen in such a way that: - All hazards and all ingredient groups are assessed during an initial audit. - All not significant hazard-ingredient group combinations and at least 1/3 of the significant hazards and 1/3 of the ingredient groups during a recertification audit. - At least 1/3 of the significant hazards and 1/3 of the ingredient groups are assessed during a surveillance audit. In this way the control of all hazards and all ingredient groups are assessed at least once during the certification cycle.	3
3.6 Scope Riskplaza-audit+	2.14 Certification head office & production site	Textual changes.	1
3.6 Scope of the Riskplaza audit	2.15 Multi-site certification	Rules for multi-site certification changed: The subsequent surveillance audits are based on a sample in a manner that all sites are visited in a 3-year period (2 surveillance audits and 1 recertification audit). This was: the surveillance audit could be performed on √n of the number of production locations.	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
3.8 Duration	2.16 Audit time allocation	Textual changes. New guidelines for minimum duration of an audit. This is matched to the 3 annual certification cycle.	3
3.9 Audit on site	2.7 Audit on site	Textual changes	1
3.10 Explanation classification major and minor non-conformities	2.8 Audit findings	Textual changes. Table 3.1 has been deleted. Classification of NC's is now more in line with underlying food safety management systems. Changed definitions of non-conformities	3
3.10 Explanation classification major and minor non-conformities 3.12 Procedure non-conformities and additional evidence	2.9 Eliminate non-conformities	Textual changes. New: -A non-conformity with regard to the fact that a **specific hazard** is not controlled demonstrably, can only be eliminated when the company provides evidence of improvement showing that the hazard concerned is actually controlled demonstrably - For critical, major and minor non-conformities an improvement plan is required. -The company shall report the improvement plan to the certification body within 4 weeks after the audit. - The improvement plan shall contain a correction (= action(s) to eliminate the observed deviation and associated risks) as well as a corrective action (= action(s) to eliminate the cause of the deviation and to prevent the deviation and similar deviations from re-occurring). -Critical non-conformity: The auditor assesses the implementation of the improvement plan during a follow-up audit on site which is carried out within the	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
		planning window between 6 to 12 weeks after the audit	
3.11 Audit reporting	2.10 Reporting 2.17 Report	Textual changes. CB can use its own report model.	1
3.13 Decision Riskplaza-audit+ certification	2.11 Certification	Textual changes.	1
3.14 Riskplaza-audit+ certificate	2.12 Validity of the certificate 2.18 Certificate	Textual changes. New format certificate.	2
3.15 Withdrawal Riskplaza-audit+ certificate	2.13 Suspension and withdrawal of a certificate		1
3.16 Requirements for processing of changes		Has lapsed. See part A: 1.5.	1
3.17 Conditions for use Riskplaza logo	5. Logo	Textual changes. Only right to use the logo when certifying the full range (full scope).	2
3.18 Reporting obligation and information exchange with Certification Body and NVWA *(Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority)*	3. Communication in relation to certification	Textual changes.	1
3.19 Objection procedure and complaints procedure	4. Complaint, appeal, malpractice	Textual changes. Whistle blower procedure added (4.3.2)	2
Chapter 4	**Part C**		
4.1 Recognition of certification body	3. Criteria for the certification body	Textual changes. CB's are no longer obliged to report recalls to Riskplaza.	2
	3.1 Accreditation	During a period of 1,5 years the certification body can issue unaccredited certificates under supervision of the Riskplaza expert. After accreditation, the CB can	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
		convert an already issued certificate into an accredited certificate at the next audit.	
4.2 Responsibilities and obligations of certification bodies	6. Acceptance	Textual changes.	1
4.3 Responsibilities and obligations of Foundation Riskplaza and Riskplaza LTD to certification bodies	8. Responsibilities	Textual changes.	1
4.4 Term and termination of contract	3.8 Agreement	Textual changes.	1
4.5 Confidentiality	3.6 Confidentiality	Textual changes.	1
4.6 Qualifications of a Riskplaza-audit+ auditor and coordinator	4. Criteria for the coordinator 5. Criteria for the auditor 5 Auditor requirements	Requirements auditor have changed, added requirements: -Food safety management training: at least 40 hours lead auditor training. -At least 2 years relevant professional experience in a production environment. - At least 2 years of professional experience as an auditor of food safety management systems.	2
	5.2 Riskplaza specific requirements	New: Conducting at least 3 Riskplaza-audits per year. - Successfully completing a witness audit at least once every 3 years by the certification body.	2
4.7 Participation in harmonisation consultations and examinations	7. Harmonisation	Textual changes. Harmonisation between CB's will take place within the coordinators' consultation. Harmonisation of auditors is carried out by the CB.	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
		Interim examinations of auditors are cancelled. Only training and examination of auditors in case of a new version by Riskplaza.	
4.8 Complaints and sanctions		Textual changes.	1
Chapter 5	**Part 1**		
5.1 Organisation	3. The Riskplaza organisation	Textual changes. Changed consultation structure. Working group consultation has been replaced by sector consultation.	2
5.2 Management of Riskplaza database	5. Management of the Riskplaza food safety database	Textual changes.	1
5.3 Management of Riskplaza documents	4. Management of the Riskplaza-audit^{+} certification scheme	Textual changes.	1
Chapter 6	**Part C**		
6.1 Preventive quality monitoring: the system expert	9. Integrity programme 10. System expert	Textual changes. More flexibility to respond to current events, more activities to choose from. The content of the integrity programme and the activities of the system expert are determined annually by Riskplaza and are risk-based. New: Risk-based unexpected audits of companies. (1/2*√n, n= # participating sites), performed by independent system expert.	2
6.2 Feedback about Riskplaza and the Riskplaza-audit^{+}		Has lapsed. See part B: 3. Communication in relation to certification, and 4. Complaint, appeal, malpractice.	2

Version 4.1	Version 5	Amendment	Type of change*
Chapter 7			
Intervention policies		Tables 7.1 7.2 and 7.3 have been deleted. The policy is situationally determined by Riskplaza LTD.	2
Appendices	**Appendices**		
Appendix 1: Manual use of Riskplaza database		Has lapsed.	1
Appendix 2: Table classification non-conformities (tool)		Has lapsed.	3
Appendix 3: Format Riskplaza-audit+ certificate	Appendix 3: Template certificate	Renewed to meet accreditation requirements.	1
Appendix 4: Rules for use Riskplaza logo	Appendix 5: Rules for use Riskplaza logo	Unchanged. Applies only to companies with a full certification scope.	1
Appendix 5: Schematic representation of the intervention policy		Has lapsed.	2
	Appendix 1: Riskplaza accepted food safety schemes	New appendix with standards accepted by Riskplaza.	2
	Appendix 2: Contents of the report	New appendix. Requirements to the report format.	1
	Appendix 4: Complaints & appeal procedure Riskplaza-audit+	New appendix.	1
	Appendix 6: Workflow Riskplaza HACCP plan	New appendix. A visual explanation of part A, chapters 1-3.	2

*** 1: Type of change**

- Category 1: changes only textual/editorial.
- Category 2: technical changes in the content but not significant, since these have no consequences for the way CB's have to perform its activities/audits, for required competencies or meeting accreditation requirements.
-Category 3: changes are significant, since these have consequences for the way CB's have to perform its activities/audits, for required competencies or meeting accreditation requirements.