

Q&A Equalitas

Q&A Equalitas is a periodically updated document containing interpretations or amendments to the SOPD Equalitas Standard and the Implementing Regulation contained therein. It is a normative document which is updated following reports from Certification Bodies or other stakeholders, or on the basis of reviews by the Technical-Scientific-Ethical Committee or by the Board of Directors of Equalitas. All the updates introduced with Q&A Equalitas constitute official additions and revisions of the Standard and of the Implementing Regulation and will form an integral part thereof when they are subjected to a formal revision.

The implementation of the new and/or updated rules comes into force two months after each new publication of the Q&A Equalitas unless specific indications are provided (for example "from the date of publication"). Mere interpretations must instead be considered applicable immediately.



Revision	Date	File Name	Reason	Edited by
000	03/02/2022	Q&A_EQ_000_20220203	Clarifications on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Classification of findings- Scope of application of the Standard- Management of audits and certificates- Commercial organisations and use of the Equalitas logo- CFP and WFP calculation	Technical office
001	17/06/2022	Q&A_EQ_001_20220617	Clarifications on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- DfS Module- SP Module- Use the Equalitas logo	Technical office
002	09/11/2022	Q&A_EQ_002_20221109	Clarifications on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- WFP calculation	Technical office
003	12/05/2023	Q&A_EQ_003_20230412	Clarifications on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Management of audits and certificates- CFP and WFP in case of outsourced processes- WFP and CFP reporting period	Technical office
004	19/07/2023	Q&A_EQ_004_20230719	Clarifications on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- BIODIVERSITY indicator- CFP and WFP	Technical office
005	24/10/2025	Q&A_EQ_005_20251024	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Elimination of questions integrated into the SOPD Equalitas REV. 5- Reorganization of the document into macro-topics	Technical office
006	22/06/2026	Q&A_EQ_006_20260622	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Reclassification of CFP and WFP requirements of the SP "Sustainable Product" module	Technical office



Table of Contents

1) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 3 REGULATORY REFERENCES	3
2) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 8 CERTIFICATION OF SUSTAINABLE ORGANISATION	6
3) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 9 CERTIFICATION OF SUSTAINABLE PRODUCT	7
4) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 10 CERTIFICATION OF DESIGNATION FOR SUSTAINABILITY	7
5) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 14.4 AUDIT PROCESS	8
6) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 14.6 NON-COMPLIANCE	9
7) CLARIFICATIONS CONCERNING ANNEXES I (CARBON FOOTPRINT) AND II (WATER FOOTPRINT)	13



1) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 3 REGULATORY REFERENCES

I. ONGOING PROCEEDINGS

Must certified Organisations also notify the CB of proceedings initiated in relation to non-certified operating units that belong to the same company name?

In addition to what is stated in the Equalitas SOPD Standard Rev. 5 (Ref. SOPD_005_20240801, chap. 3.3, paragraphs I and II), it is specified that the Organisation is required to promptly notify the CB of any proceedings initiated, including those relating to non-certified operating units that belong to the same Company name.

II. NON-COMPLIANCES RELATED TO MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

How should non-compliances related to major requirements concerning mandatory regulations and involving high risks be managed?

REQUIREMENT	CRITICAL ISSUES	MINIMUM EVIDENCE TO AVOID SUSPENSION	CB SURVEILLANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE PERIOD PRECEDING SUBSEQUENT AUDIT
5.3.1.1	HEALTH AUTHORIZATION NOT UPDATED OR ABSENT	- EVIDENCE OF THE SENDING OF THE HEALTH TRAIL FOR INITIATION/MODIFICATION OF THE ACTIVITY	- FOLLOW-UP ON THE PROGRESS OF THE AUTHORIZATION PROCESS
5.3.4.1 – 5.5.3.3	ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS (E.G. IN ITALY AUA OR EQUIVALENT DECLARATION) ABSENT OR EXPIRED	- EVIDENCE OF THE REQUEST TO START THE AUTHORIZATION / UPDATE PROCESS - EVIDENCE OF MANAGEMENT IN THE TRANSITIONAL PHASE UNTIL THE ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS ARE OBTAINED	- FOLLOW-UP ON THE PROGRESS OF THE AUTHORIZATION PROCESS
5.3.4.1 – 5.5.3.3	LACK OF EVIDENCE WASTE WATER/MUD/ OTHER WASTE DISPOSAL	- Case 1: FORMULARIES TRANSPORT AND PROPER DISPOSAL - Case 2 (IF THE COMPANY DOES NOT NEED IMMEDIATE DISPOSAL): DISPOSAL PLANNING	- Case 1: NOT NECESSARY IF FORMULATIONS ARE AVAILABLE WITHIN THE TIMEFRAME FOR THE CLOSURE OF THE NC; - Case 2: FOLLOW-UP BASED ON DISPOSAL TIMES
5.5.1.1	ABSENCE OF EVIDENCE OF REGULAR CONTRIBUTION (E.G. IN ITALY	- Case 1: REGULAR EVIDENCE OF REGULAR CONTRIBUTION - Case 2: RETURN PLAN	- Case 1: NON-NECESSARY - Case 2: FOLLOW-UP



	DURC) DUE TO DEFAULTS		
5.5.5.5	ABSENCE OF TH EVIDENCE OF REGULAR CONTRIBUTION (E.G. IN ITALY DURC) OF THE OPERA PROVIDER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Case 1: REGULAR EVIDENCE OF REGULAR CONTRIBUTION - Case 2: RETURN PLAN - Case 3: TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT WITH THE OPERA PROVIDER 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Case 1: NON-NECESSARY - Case 2: FOLLOW-UP - Caso 3: NON-NECESSARY
5.5.1.10	CERTIFIED NOTIFICATION OF THE START OF FIRE-FIGHTING ACTIVITIES AND FIRE PREVENTION CERTIFICATE ABSENT OR EXPIRED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REQUEST FOR PRIOR OPINION ON THE PROJECT - PROGRAMMING ADJUSTMENT ACTIONS UNTIL THE CERTIFIED NOTIFICATION OF THE START OF FIRE-FIGHTING ACTIVITIES IS SENT - EVIDENCE OF RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE TRANSITIONAL PHASE UNTIL THE CERTIFIED NOTIFICATION OF THE START OF FIRE-FIGHTING ACTIVITIES IS SENT OR THE FIRE PREVENTION CERTIFICATE IS OBTAINED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FOLLOW-UP ON THE STATUS OF PROGRESS AND PLANNING OF THE FIRE PREVENTION PROCEDURE
5.5.1.10	GENERAL RISK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT (DVR – ITALIAN ACRONYM) ABSENT	DRAFTING OF GENERAL RISK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT	NON-NECESSARY
5.5.1.10	SINGLE HAZARD APPLICABLE BUT NOT ASSESSED AMONG THE FOLLOWING: MECHANICAL, CHEMICAL, ELECTRICAL, MANUAL LIFTING OF LOADS, CONFINED SPACES, RISK OF WORK AT HEIGHT, FIRE	GENERAL RISK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT REVIEW/ SPECIFIC EVALUATION DOCUMENT	NON-NECESSARY
5.5.1.10	TOTAL ABSENCE HEALTH SURVEILLANCE REPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POSSIBLE UPDATING OF THE APPOINTMENT OF THE COMPETENT DOCTOR AND THE HEALTH PROTOCOL, SITE INSPECTION REPORT 	NON-NECESSARY



		- EVIDENCE OF PROTOCOL ACTIVATION: CONDUCT OF VISITS	
--	--	--	--

2) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 8 CERTIFICATION OF SUSTAINABLE ORGANISATION

I. OUTSOURCED PROCESSES

As part of outsourced processes, when is it legitimate/necessary to apply requirement 5.1.7 (module OS), and when is it legitimate/necessary to apply requirement 5.5.5.5 (module OS)?

Outsourced processes are defined in the SOPD Equalitas Standard as “*manufacturing process of raw materials or semi-finished products owned by the Organisation, included in the scope of application of this Standard, carried out at an operative unit other than the one subject to certification*”. Given the following definition of semi-finished product, processes that occur after labelling, such as the storage of labelled products, are not considered outsourcing according to this Standard (Ref. SOPD_005_20240801, Chapter 2, paragraph 2.7). This means that, during the outsourced process, the raw material or the semi-finished product is not present at the operating unit subject to certification for the completion of the production process; therefore, the requirement 5.1.7 of the Standard must be applied.

Any other production processes carried out by third parties within the certifying site are not considered outsourced processes; therefore, those production processes must be managed by the certifying company through the evaluation of the work suppliers (service providers company). In this case, requirement 5.5.5.5 of the Standard must be applied (including cases of works carried out at the certifying site with mobile unit).

It should be noted that, with reference to requirements 5.1.7 and 5.5.5.5, the discriminating element determining the applicability of one or the other requirement appears to be where the process (either the entire process or the intermediate process) is physically carried out.

In summary:

- Process or processing carried out outside the certifying site, requirement 5.1.7 must be applied;
- Process or processing carried out from third-party companies/work providers at the certifying site, requirement 5.5.5.5 must be applied;

II. DATA COLLECTION OF OUTSOURCED PROCESSES FOR THE CALCULATION OF CARBON AND WATER FOOTPRINTS

Whether the audited Organisation decides to exclude from its application scope the outsourced processes, is it possible to exclude the data related to those outsourced processes from the calculation of carbon and water footprint?

Yes, it is. In the case of corporate certification, for the calculation of carbon and water footprint, it is correct to exclude data related to outsourced processes if those processes have been excluded from the scope of application.

III. DEFENCE MANAGEMENT

Is the use of authorized active ingredients for managing the vineyard in the previous year allowed under the regional protocols for voluntary integrated production?

With reference to the requirements related to Defence Management 5.2.5.1 (SO module) and 1.5.1 (Annex III), considering that updates regarding authorized active ingredients issued by the regional plant protection services may be released after the Organisations have started field treatments, the use of authorized active ingredients for managing the vineyard of the previous year (X-1) will be considered compliant until the end of March of year X, even if the update has removed the authorization for that specific active ingredient.

3) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 9 SUSTAINABLE PRODUCT CERTIFICATION

I. CLARIFICATIONS FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE SUSTAINABLE PRODUCT MODULE

What are the methods to be adopted by cooperative wineries in the context of certification pursuant to the SP module?

The Standard requires the implementation of a traceability system for the Sustainable Product throughout all stages of the wine production chain, guaranteeing its separation from products not subject to certification at each production chain operator.

In the specific case of cooperative wineries, for which it is possible to trace the individual day of delivery, the following methods are possible:

- A. Keep the Sustainable Product subject to certification separate throughout the entire production cycle. In this case, only the adhering members whose grapes contribute to the production of the wines subject to certification will be involved in the certification; these wines will be kept separate from the other batches throughout the process up to bottling.
- B. Involve all the members who provide a certain variety in the certification of the Sustainable Product chain and certify all the products deriving from it. In this case, all products containing that, or those, varieties must be certified according to the Sustainable Product module.

How do these methods influence calculations of the carbon and water footprint of the product?

In case A, the carbon and water footprints will be assessed by collecting the primary data relating to each production chain operator involved, in the same way biodiversity will be analysed only at the vineyards whose grapes contribute to the production of the wine or wines subject to certification.

In case B, the water and carbon footprints will be calculated for the total mass of the wine, referring to the primary data of all the members, to then allocate the impacts to the percentage of wine which will make up the wine labels subject to certification for the cellar phase – bottling. As far as biodiversity is concerned, the vineyards of all the members shall be taken into account, defining the indicator for homogeneous areas.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTIANABILITY INDICATORS – CARBON FOOTPRINT E WATER FOOTPRINT

Do the requirements relating to the quantification and reporting of the product's carbon footprint (CFP) and water footprint (WFP) under PS – Sustainable Product certification (requirements 6.2.2.1, 6.2.2.2 and 6.2.3.1, currently classified as Major "M") remain mandatory for the purposes of product certification?

The requirements relating to the calculation of the carbon footprint (6.2.2.1 and 6.2.2.2) and the water footprint (6.2.3.1) for Sustainable Product certification (PS module) are being reclassified from Major requirements ("M"), and therefore mandatory, to minor requirements ("m") and therefore optional.

This reclassification is to be considered applicable from the date of publication of Q&A_006.

It remains understood that:

- the obligation to quantify and report CFP and WFP at Organisation level (OS module – Sustainable Organisation) is unchanged;
- Organisations that nonetheless wish to calculate the product's environmental footprints may continue to do so on a voluntary basis, applying the methodology and the minimum elements set out respectively in Annex I (ISO 14067, cradle-to-grave approach) and Annex II (ISO 14046) of the Standard and, where useful, the related Operating Instructions (IOP009 and IOP010 on the systematic approach);
- should the Organisation voluntarily decide to meet the requirements relating to the product's carbon footprint, it must satisfy both requirements 6.2.2.1 and 6.2.2.2, as they are closely interlinked: requirement 6.2.2.2 (*cradle-to-grave* approach) defines the methodology by which the quantification referred to in requirement 6.2.2.1 must be carried out. The two requirements cannot therefore be applied separately, nor can one exclude the other.

4) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 10 DESIGNATION FOR SUSTAINABILITY CERTIFICATION

I. DATA COLLECTION FOR ESTIMATING CARBON AND WATER FOOTPRINTS

If Organisations that are already certified according to the SO or SP module are involved in the DfS certification project, do they still have to provide their data for the calculation of the Footprints?

Yes, the quantitative data for calculating the Footprints must be provided by all farms participating in the DfS project.

II. CLAIMED OR CLAIMABLE VINEYARD AREA

To ensure compliance with the DfS module, must the Supervisory Syndacate involve at least 60% of the CLAIMED or CLAIMABLE vineyard area?

The following is given in the Standard SOPD Equalitas REV. 5, Chapter 10, points 10.3 and 10.4

*10.3 The Supervisory Syndacate ensures compliance with the DfS module by involving at least 60% of the **claimed vineyard area** of the DO.*

*10.4 The **claimed vineyard area** of the DO is calculated as the average of the available data of the last two harvests.*

Therefore, the need for the Supervisory Syndacate to involve at least 60% of the claimed vineyard area is confirmed.

However, the issue of 'claimed vineyard area' versus 'claimable vineyard area' may conflict with the requirement to list all farms participating in the DfS certification project on the certificate of conformity. This is because a farm with X claimable hectares for one or more DOs might, over the years, claim only the 'Goofy' DO in the first year, switch to 'Pluto' DO in the second year, divide the claim between the two DOs in the third



year, and then decide not to claim any area at all in the fourth year. This variability would lead to discrepancies in the DfS module certificate of conformity; therefore, for the purpose of issuing the certificate, it is necessary to consider the claimable hectares.

Then, point 10.8 of chapter 10 of the Standard SOPD Equalitas REV.5, updates as follows:

10.8 The certificate of conformity to the DfS module of the Supervisory Syndicate must indicate:

- I. Designation of Origin subject to certification
- II. Company name and registered office of the Supervisory Syndicate
- III. List of member farms (Company name, registered office, ~~claimed~~ claimable vineyard area)
- IV. Reference to the DfS module of the Standard
- V. Calculated environmental sustainability indicators and the given reference period

5) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 14.4 AUDIT PROCESS

I. ALTERNATING AUDITORS AT THE SAME FACILITY

The CB must ensure that the same Audit Team does not carry out more than 3 consecutive audits at the same site. By 3 audits do we mean 3 certifications (9 years to be clear) or 3 audits, including the surveillance phases? Is it therefore necessary to change the audit team every three years?

The lead auditor is required to change every three audits, also taking into account the surveillance phases (extensions or supplementary audits are not counted). For any exceptions to the rotation, a reasoned request must be made to Equalitas.

II. CHANGE OF CERTIFICATION BODY

Should a company already possess the certification and wishes to change the CB, are there any obligations to follow?

If a certified Organisation intends to change its CB, in compliance with the ISO/IEC 17021-1 and ISO/IEC 17065 standards, a meeting must be held between the CBs during the transition phase (formal notice from the incoming CB to the outgoing CB). The incoming CB must also request the reports of the last three audits. The new certificate will indicate as the date of first issue the same of the previous three-year certification cycle. Therefore, the expiry of the certificate (end of the three-year certification period) will not undergo any changes (Ref. SOPD_005_20240801, chap. 11, para. 11.4).

6) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 14.6 NON-COMPLIANCE

I. CORRECT CLASSIFICATION OF THE FINDINGS

Is it permissible to include Suggestions for Improvement (SI) or Non-Compliances (NC) in the audit reports in relation to the "m" or "R" requirements when they are considered relevant to the specific situation of the audited organisation?

No, the Equalitas protocol does not provide for this eventuality. Only the findings against the "M" requirements should be formalised. The only NCs attributable to the "m" and "R" requirements could be formalised in the event of failure to meet the minimum 50% and 20% quotas respectively during the renewal audits. In this case too, the NC should not address the individual requirements, but the Implementing Regulation (paragraph 4.3).



However, it is possible to formalise an SI in response to the "M" requirements only, for example in the event that the lead auditor believes that the requirement is satisfied but as an end in itself and of little use to the company.

II. CORRECT CLASSIFICATION OF THE FINDINGS

Is it possible to relate an NC to two or more requirements of the Standard on the Audit Report?

No, it is not possible to group several requirements against a single NC. However, it is possible to use the same NC description for several requirements. Example CORRECT way: Use of the same NC description for several requirements

REF.	REQUIREMENT	CLASSIFICATION as it is stated on the Checklist	NC description
5.1.1	The Organisation adopts a sustainability management system for all points contained in this Standard.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.2	The Organisation periodically monitors the sustainability criteria defined by the Standard and records the results in order to evaluate the improvements.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.

Example **WRONG way**: Grouping of several requirements with the same NC description

REF.	REQUIREMENT	CLASSIFICATION as it is stated on the Checklist	NC description
5.1.1, 5.1.2	The Organisation adopts a sustainability management system for all points contained in this Standard.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.



Moreover, it is possible to group different findings against Major (M) requirements, attributing the NC to the main unfulfilled requirement. This methodology is not applicable in the case of minor (m) requirements and recommendations (R) since it would affect the calculation of the percentage of minor requirements and recommendations to be met over the three-year period of certification.

Example **CORRECT – alternative 1**: several M requirements classified as NC with the same description

RIF.	REQUIREMENT	CLASSIFICATION as it is stated on the Checklist	NC description
5.1.1	The Organisation adopts a sustainability management system for all points contained in this Standard.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.2	The Organisation periodically monitors the sustainability criteria defined by the Standard and records the results in order to evaluate the improvements.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.3	The Organisation defines a supplier qualification and management policy that also takes into consideration the sustainability requirements.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.4	The Organisation collects information regarding the adoption of sustainability requirements by suppliers.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.5	At least once a year, the Organisation conducts an assessment of the sustainability requirements with a	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement



	view to highlighting the areas of improvement.		objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.6	Based on the outcome of the self-monitoring and of the third-party audits, the Organisation defines and adopts corrective and improvement actions, when necessary, on the issues set out in this Standard.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.7	In cases where some activities falling within the scope of this Standard should be outsourced to third parties (outsourced processes), the Organisation guarantees the compliance of these operations with reference to this Standard.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.

Example **CORRECT – alternative 2**: several “M” requirements classified as NC with the same “root cause” – in this case it is possible to assign the NC to the main unfulfilled requirement of the section.

RIF.	REQUIREMENT	CLASSIFICATION as it is stated on the Checklist	NC description
5.1.1	The Organisation adopts a sustainability management system for all points contained in this Standard.	NC	The Organisation has not formalized a management system: no improvement objectives have been defined, no internal audits have been carried out, no suppliers and outsourcers evaluation procedures have been applied.
5.1.2	The Organisation periodically monitors the sustainability criteria defined by the Standard and records the results in order to evaluate the improvements.	NC	See 5.1.1
5.1.3	The Organisation defines a supplier qualification and management policy	NC	See 5.1.1



	that also takes into consideration the sustainability requirements.		
5.1.4	The Organisation collects information regarding the adoption of sustainability requirements by suppliers.	NC	See 5.1.1
5.1.5	At least once a year, the Organisation conducts an assessment of the sustainability requirements with a view to highlighting the areas of improvement.	NC	See 5.1.1
5.1.6	Based on the outcome of the self-monitoring and of the third-party audits, the Organisation defines and adopts corrective and improvement actions, when necessary, on the issues set out in this Standard.	NC	See 5.1.1
5.1.7	In cases where some activities falling within the scope of this Standard should be outsourced to third parties (outsourced processes), the Organisation guarantees the compliance of these operations with reference to this Standard.	NC	See 5.1.1

III. REPORTING SUMMARY OF MINOR REQUIREMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Following each audit, is it possible for Organisation to receive from the CB a summary of the minor requirements and the recommendations met?

Yes, it is. The CB must give to the Organisation a summary of the minor requirements and the recommendations that have been evaluated as compliant/non-compliant during the audit. This report may be given to the Organisation as an extract of the checklist or in other ways, sending it with or afterward the release of the certificate of conformity.

7) CLARIFICATIONS CONCERNING ANNEXES I (CARBON FOOTPRINT) AND II (WATER FOOTPRINT)

I. BIOGENIC EMISSIONS

In Annex I, when listing the emission sources to be taken into account, reference is made to biogenic emissions. Should the biogenic components therefore be separated out for each emission factor?

While acknowledging that ISO 14064 and ISO 14067 require the separation of biogenic emissions, retrieving a value-chain emission from Ecoinvent or other databases that could potentially be biogenic becomes an unnecessary assumption in a context where there is no certainty. For example, if an activity from Ecoinvent is selected as the emission factor for the production of an oenological product (with a more or less valid technological correlation), and within the cascade of activities that make up that factor there are some



biogenic components, how can we be sure that the factor is actually appropriate for the process being assessed? The uncertainty is very high.

Thus, for biogenic emissions the Standard is therefore limited to land-use change, fertilization, and disposal. Nothing prevents Organisations from further exploring this topic, of course.

II. MULTI-COMPANY CARBON AND WATER FOOTPRINT RELATIONS

In the case of subsidiaries, affiliated companies, or networks of enterprises, may the Organisation's carbon footprint and water footprint, and the related reporting in a GHG report / WFP report, refer to multiple legal entities?

In specific cases, for example in the case of subsidiaries, affiliated companies, or networks of enterprises, the Organisation's carbon footprint / water footprint and the related reporting in a GHG report / WFP report may refer to multiple legal entities.

This choice must be duly justified within the GHG / WFP Report, specifying how it affects the interpretation of the results and the achievement of the defined objectives and improvement actions.

In any case, within the GHG / WFP Report, the Organization must aggregate its GHG emissions and removals at installation level.

III. CARBON AND WATER FOOTPRINT CALCULATION FOR THE CERTIFICATIONS OF SUSTAINABLE PRODUCT

In the case of certification of multiple products under the SP – Sustainable Product module, is it possible to simplify the calculation of the carbon and water footprints?

Equalitas operational instructions are available for carrying out carbon footprint and water footprint assessments of products according to the so-called 'Systematic Approach', as defined in Annex C of ISO 14067:2018. The Systematic Approach essentially provides a tool to simplify the assessment of carbon and water footprints of products within the same Organisation, to which the same data set and the same allocation procedures apply. This generally makes the assessment simpler and eliminates the need to carry out third-party verification of the footprint assessments for all products.

Please refer to the following operational instructions:

- IOP009– Guidelines for the introduction of the Systematic Approach in the assessment of the carbon footprint of products in wineries
- IOP010– Guidelines for the introduction of the Systematic Approach in the assessment of the water footprint of products in wineries