

SWISS⁺ assessment

CERTIFICATION CHECKLIST

COMPANY:						
PREVIOUS CERTIFICATIONS:						
CURRENT CERTIFICATION:						

Definitions of terms:

Assessment Center

An assessment center (AC) is a series of diagnostic procedures, largely based on systematic behavioural observations, carried out for groups or individuals.

AC services

AC services refers to the development, implementation and evaluation of an AC.

AC provider

An AC provider is a company or business unit offering AC services. The provider is the organisation responsible for the development and quality assurance of an AC.

- **Internal** AC providers offer their services to clients who are part of the same group of companies as the AC provider.
- **External** AC providers are all non-internal AC providers, i.e. they offer AC services (development, implementation, evaluation etc.) from outside the company.

Client

Client refers to the individual or to the group of individuals who approach the AC provider requesting their AC services.

Assessor

Assessors are individuals who carry out the AC method. There are usually two functions:

- The **moderator** guides the participants through the individual exercises; they ensure both the correct implementation of the requirements and compliance with the structured assessment process.
- The **observers** observe and evaluate the behaviour and performance of the participants during the individual exercises.

Participants

Participants or candidates are individuals who go through the exercises of an AC.

Swiss Assessment

Swiss Assessment is the organisation that defines the certification criteria, designates the certification body, controls the certification processes and administers the quality label.

Certification Body

The certification body is the company commissioned by Swiss Assessment to carry out the certification of AC providers. A list of the approved certification bodies can be found on the Swiss Assessment website.

Preliminary remarks

The following checkpoints are based on the quality standards defined by the Swiss Assessment Association - Working Group Assessment Center Switzerland AKAC (hereinafter Swiss Assessment), for the development, implementation and evaluation of assessment centers (<http://www.swissassessment.ch>). Members of Swiss Assessment follow those standards, in accordance with their self-declaration and in recognition of the association's statutes. Certified members undergo a quality audit carried out by the Swiss Association for Quality and Management Systems SQS and by the University of Zurich, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology.

Depending on the certification period, the audits are either carried out by attending an ongoing assessment center or are exclusively based on the documentation submitted. Initial certification requires the audit to be carried out by attending an ongoing assessment center. A second certification takes place only as an audit based on documentation submitted in advance. A third certification again requires the attendance of an ongoing assessment center. Subsequent certifications alternate between those two models.

Starting from the second certification, all changes made compared to the previous certifications must be documented. It is also important to capture the specific measures taken based on the feedback from the previous certification.

If not explicitly stated, the following requirements refer to group and individual AC.

1 Order clarification and integration

Checkpoint 1: Clarified order relationship

? Are the goals and framework conditions of the AC contract, as well as the consequences for the participants, clarified and communicated ahead of the design and delivery of the AC?

! Minimum requirements:
A written contract has been signed.

☑ Verification:
e.g. offer, order confirmation, contract or project plan

📄 Documents to be submitted:
Client contract and, if relevant, verifiable documentation of any changes relating to the previous certification.

⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?

Remarks:

1 Order clarification and integration

Checkpoint 2: Independence of AC providers (internal or external)

? Are the internal or external AC providers in a position to make recommendations free of conflicts of interest?

! Minimum requirements:
Internal or external AC providers are viewed as service providers who are able and required to make independent recommendations.

☑ Verification:
Organisation chart, written contract or detailed specification sheet

📄 Documents to be submitted:
For internal providers: organisation chart
For external providers: written contract / organisation chart
and, if relevant, verifiable documentation of any changes relating to the previous certification.

⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

1 Order clarification and integration

Checkpoint 3a: Basic scientific models - behavioural simulations and assessments

? Is the AC provider able to disclose the scientific standards or basic models on which their behavioural simulations and assessments are based?

! Minimum requirements:
The AC provider must be able to provide information to clients about the principles according to which each AC is developed, which competences are being tested and why, and which behavioural simulations and/or assessments are available to this end. In particular, the AC provider should demonstrate the scientific standards used in the selection and design of the behavioural simulations/assessments for the AC (i.e. AC exercises, interviews, role-play exercises, case analyses, etc.). This means that there has to be a documented and structured procedure for planning, developing, conducting and evaluating AC exercises (e.g. AC exercises with a connection to the relevant requirements and competences, sufficient and multiple observation of the competences; clear written exercise instructions such as written role-play instructions, systematically structured questions in interviews).

☑ Verification:
Description of the AC design, including (1) the principles according to which each AC has been designed (e.g. the procedure used to develop the AC exercises), (2) the procedure-competence matrix with a list of all behavioural simulations/assessments typically used in an AC (e.g. role play exercise, presentation, computer simulation, structured interview, etc.).

📄 Documents to be submitted:
Documentation containing the complete description of the AC design (see "Verification" above), which can be presented to the clients if required; if applicable, comprehensible documentation of any changes made compared to the previous certification process.

⇒ Evaluation
Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

1 Order clarification and integration

Checkpoint 3b: Basic scientific models – (Psychometric) test procedures

? Is the AC provider able to disclose the soundness of the measurement theories applied to the test procedures?

! Minimum requirements:
On request, the client must be informed about the soundness of the measurement theories applied to all test procedures used within the AC. Examples of these test procedures are personality questionnaires, intelligence and performance tests or new procedures based on computer-based algorithms (app-based games, speech and face analysis, evaluation of social media data, etc.). The information on the theoretical soundness of measurement must include information on the theoretical background of the test procedures as well as information about the test quality criteria (see "Verification" below).

☑ Verification:
Submission of a list of all psychometric testing procedures used by the AC provider as part of its AC services. The list of test procedures should include the following information: (1) reliability (accuracy of measurement), (2) internal/external construct validity (internal data structure, factor analyses and/or correlations with related and/or distinct test procedures) and (3) criterion validity (correlations with indicators of job performance), as well as (4) the underlying theoretical model for the measurements.

📄 Documents to be submitted:
Complete list of all methods and test procedures used within the AC; documentation containing information on reliability and validity for all test procedures (including the sources for all information provided; names of the constructs and criteria examined; submission of test manuals); if applicable, comprehensible documentation of any changes compared to the previous certification process.

⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?

Remarks:

2 Work and requirements analysis

Checkpoint 4: Analysis of the specific requirements

? Does the AC in question follow a work and requirements analysis, which has been carried out systematically?

! Minimum requirements:

The reference point for the analysis is the concrete, relevant activity in the specific company. Representative roles and reference groups have been systematically involved for the collection of the relevant information.

☑ Verification:

Requirement profile of a representative AC; documentation of the derived requirement profile OR surveys created by the AC provider or by the AC developer

📄 Documents to be submitted:

A requirement profile based on the exercises and the assessment dimensions, as well as a description of the method used to create the profile; if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.

⇒ Evaluation:

Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

3 Variety of exercises

Checkpoint 5: variety of methods and multiple coverage of the dimensions of the requirements

? How many methods ¹ are being used in the AC? Is a dimension typically assessed more than once?

! Minimum requirements:
A group or an individual AC includes at least four different methods and each behavioural dimension is captured at least twice. At least two exercises are defined by explicit behavioural observation.

☑ Verification:
Exercise files ²

📄 Documents to be submitted:
Exercise files of a representative AC and, if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.

⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?


Remarks:

¹“Methods” refers to the various types of exercises implemented for behavioural observation, but also for personality, performance and intelligence tests as well as for interviews and other processes used for aptitude diagnostics. A personality test or a performance test are each considered to be one exercise.

² The exercise files consist of a description of the assessment dimensions, the exercises aimed at eliciting the relevant behaviour and the procedure to observe and assess participants.

4 Observation and evaluation

Checkpoint 6: Systematic behavioural observation

- ? Is the AC largely based on systematic behavioural observation?
- ! Minimum requirements:
In two exercises of the relevant AC, the behaviour relevant to the function in question is systematically and comprehensibly observed and assessed.
- Verification:
Exercise files; instructions for assessors to observe and evaluate the participants
-  Documents to be submitted:
Exercise files and written instructions for assessors and, if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?
- Remarks:

4 Observation and evaluation

Checkpoint 7: Structured assessment template

- ? Do the observers receive a structured assessment template?
- ! Minimum requirements:
The behaviour and performance of the participants are assessed based on a structured assessment template.
- ☑ Verification:
Assessment documents (e.g. assessment forms) from a representative AC.
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
Structured assessment templates of a representative AC and, if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?

Remarks:

4 Observation and evaluation

Checkpoint 8: Relationship between observers and participants

- ? Is the ratio of observers to participants appropriate for each exercise?
- ! Minimum requirements:
In each exercise, each AC participant is observed and assessed for the same dimensions by two observers (one of whom may be a moderator³), based on a behavioural observation method.
- ☑ Verification:
An implementation plan which illustrates the allocation of assessors to the participants, OR a sample drawn by the certification body of an AC carried out by the AC provider.
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
Detailed schedule and allocation plan of a representative AC and, if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?
- Remarks:
-
-
-
-
-

³ See qualifications of the participants under Checkpoint 9.

5 Selection and training of observers

Checkpoint 9: Training

- ? Are the participants in the AC (provider, assessors) adequately trained?
- ! Minimum requirements:
The employees of the AC provider responsible for the development of the AC and with overall responsibility for the implementation and evaluation of the AC have completed recognised studies in psychology at a university (i.e. bachelor and master's degree; MAS/DAS/CAS degrees are not sufficient).
The observers (assessors) must have completed an observer training.⁴
- ☑ Verification:
Proof of the study completion of the individuals involved in the AC; overview of the aims and content of the courses completed or of the induction for new observers (assessors).
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
List of assessors, including information about their highest level of education.
Attendance list of observer training carried out for a representative AC.
List of the employees of the AC provider responsible for the development of the AC and with overall responsibility for the implementation and evaluation of the AC; incl. information about their highest level of studies completed; documents illustrating the training and induction courses for new observers (assessors); if applicable, attendance list of the observer training course carried out for a representative AC; if applicable, relevant documentation of any changes implemented since the previous certification.
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?
- Remarks:
-
-
-
-
-

⁴ Internal assessors typically undergo full induction and training once, which is why specific training for a particular AC is not required.

5 Selection and training of Assessors

Checkpoint 10: Experience

- ? Do the assessors have sufficient experience?
- ! Minimum requirements:
The majority of assessors have attended 100 AC over the past three years.⁵
- ☑ Verification:
List of assessors with number of AC
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
List of assessors with number of AC in which they participated.
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?

Remarks:

⁵ A completed AC report counts as one AC; in other words, a single AC with one candidate counts as one AC, a group AC with 12 candidates counts as 12 AC.

5 Selection and training of Assessors

Checkpoint 11: Seniority

- ? Is the cooperation between the AC provider and the assessors a long-term relationship?
- ! Minimum requirements:
The majority of the assessors have been working for the AC provider for two or more years.
- ☑ Verification:
Attendance list of the assessors
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
Attendance list for the past three years of the assessors in AC run by the provider
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No
met?
- Remarks:

6 Pre-selection and information to participants

Checkpoint 12: Pre-selection of the participants

? Are the participants nominated on the basis of reasonable criteria and do they have realistic chances to succeed?

! Minimum requirements:
The nomination criteria are clearly defined. The connection to the career models and the requirement criteria is evident.

☑ Verification:
Career models and nomination criteria for the AC, which are used by line managers and HR managers.

📄 Documents to be submitted:
Career models and nomination criteria for the participants for the AC⁶ and, if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.

⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?

Remarks:

⁶ External AC providers must supply the relevant documentation to the company for which they carried out the representative AC. This means that the providers partially depend on their corporate clients. If the shortfall of documentation obtained is too big to enable the provider to get certified, the issue needs to be recorded in view of the next certification. The AC provider will then be required to take a pro-active stance towards their corporate clients.

6 Pre-selection and information to participants

Checkpoint 13: Information for the participants

? Are the participants informed about the purpose, the consequences and the process of the AC?

! Minimum requirements:

Participants are informed in advance of the purpose and consequences of the AC. All participants receive the same information from the AC provider about the process involved.



Verification:

Documents sent to participants, OR transcripts of telephone conversation informing participants, OR documents sent to participants to inform them before the start of the AC, OR samples drawn in the form of participant surveys.



Documents to be submitted:

Documents which have been sent to participants, OR transcripts of telephone conversations informing participants, OR documents sent to participants to inform them before the start of the AC, OR random samples drawn by the certification body in the form of participant surveys for an AC carried out by the AC provider and, if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.



Evaluation:

Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

7 Preparation and implementation

Checkpoint 14: Schedule and premises

? Is there a differentiated and clear schedule for all participants (assessors and participants) and do the premises guarantee an undisturbed and confidential process?

! Minimum requirements:

The current schedules are clearly structured and understandable for outsiders too. The implementation is spatially separated from other events (e.g. in a convention centre). The premises have an adequate infrastructure.

☑ Verification:

Schedules and overview of rooms



Documents to be submitted:

Timetables, schedules, overview of rooms including images of the rooms, of a representative AC and, if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.



Evaluation:

Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

8 Feedback and follow-up

Checkpoint 15: Feedback

? Do the participants receive meaningful feedback, delivered during a face-to-face meeting in a confidential setting?

! Minimum requirements:

Participants must be explicitly informed that they are entitled to receive feedback, at the latest when the AC is taking place. It is up to each participant to decide whether they want to receive feedback or not. Those who agree to it will receive their feedback either verbally or in writing no later than two months after completion of the AC. The feedback shall always be based on written and structured documentation (e.g. mark matrix with the scores of all AC dimensions in all AC exercises).

☑ Verification:

Written documentation forming the basis for oral or written feedback; if applicable, feedback reports and timetable for their preparation and delivery; if applicable, an explicit waiver by the participant to receive feedback.



Documents to be submitted:

Templates for feedback documentation, forming the basis for oral or written feedback; if applicable, example of a feedback report (AC final report); written documentation confirming when feedback sessions took place or when reports were delivered; if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.

⇒ Evaluation:

Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

8 Feedback and follow-up

Checkpoint 16: Confidentiality

- ? Does the AC provider guarantee confidentiality regarding the information gathered from the client and the participants?
- ! Minimum requirements:
The AC provider is obviously committed to confidentiality.
- ☑ Verification:
Mission statement OR Code of Conduct, assessors' statement of confidentiality.
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
Mission statement OR Code of Conduct and an example of a confidentiality statement signed by the relevant manager; if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?
- Remarks:
-
-
-
-
-

8 Feedback and follow-up

Checkpoint 17: Data Protection

- ? Does the AC provider adequately handle confidential data?
- ! Minimum requirements:
The AC provider follows the rules concerning data protection.
- ☑ Verification:
Data protection statement available in writing as well as information regarding storage of AC documents
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
Written data protection statement and information on where, how and for how long the individual AC documents (exercise documents, final reports, etc.) are being stored; if applicable, a comprehensible documentation of any changes applied to previous certifications.
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?
- Remarks:
-
-
-
-
-

9 Evaluation

Checkpoint 18: Cooperation with academic institutions

? Does the AC provider show willingness to work with academic institutions?

! Minimum requirements:

Yearly participation of an assessor in a further training event run by Swiss Assessment, active participation in a Swiss Assessment working group, contribution to a journal, active support of student projects, teaching assignment on the subject of AC at a recognised training institution.

☑ Verification:

Proof that two of the activities listed under the minimum requirements have been carried out within the past three years.



Documents to be submitted:

Two supporting documents for the following activities over the past three years: participation in a Swiss Assessment event, participation in a Swiss Assessment working group, participation or presentation in academic conferences (e.g. EA-WOP, SGP, etc.), copy of an article from a specialist journal, support/supervision of a student project (copy of the project, confirmation from the university), teaching assignment (contract with training institution, curriculum extract)



Evaluation:

Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

9 Evaluation

Checkpoint 19: Evaluation

- ? Does the AC provider regularly review the AC for prognostic and social validity?
- ! Minimum requirements:
The AC provider evaluates their AC with regard to criterion validity⁷ and social validity.⁸ Reference to the underlying academic theories are clearly visible.
- ☑ Verification:
Evaluation report according to specified requirements⁹
- 📄 Documents to be submitted:
An internal evaluation report, which is not older than three years and which contains the relevant key figures, OR a publication regarding the AC in question, which contains information on the validity of the procedure and a list of the main findings and the resulting outcomes. An overview must be submitted in any case along the evaluation report, showing which particular iteration the certificate represents and what type of evaluation report was submitted for previous certifications (social validity or criterion validity).
- ⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?
- Remarks:
-
-
-
-
-

⁷ Please refer to the document 'Specifications for evaluation'.

⁸ An evaluation report must be submitted for each certification period (time span between two certification audits, usually 3 years). At least one evaluation report on criterion validity must be submitted over two certification periods (i.e. within six years).

10 Internal focus

Checkpoint 20: Quantitative aspects

? How many AC participants have been assessed over the past three calendar years?

! Minimum requirements:
100 candidates have been assessed over the past three years.

☑ Verification:
List of the AC and the participants over the past three years.

📄 Documents to be submitted:
Overview with details of location, date and clients as well as the list of candidates of the AC of the past three years.

⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?

Remarks:

10 Internal focus

Checkpoint 21: Share of turnover

? Does the share of turnover generated from AC services show that AC is a primary activity of the provider?

! Minimum requirements:

For external AC providers, the turnover generated from AC amounts to either 50% of the overall turnover or to CHF 1 Mio.⁹



Verification:

Annual report and accounting data



Documents to be submitted:

Annual report, sales figures based on annual reports¹⁰; if necessary, information from an independent trustee.



Evaluation:

Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Remarks:

⁹ Internal AC providers are not included in this criterion, since they are by definition a specialist unit for AC services.

¹⁰ This method enables to estimate the average price of an AC specifically for the AC provider being audited. The turnover generated through AC is divided by this average price to obtain the number of AC performed over the past three years. The estimate is based on the average price of the last 10 AC carried out by the AC provider being audited.

10 Internal focus

Checkpoint 22: Consistency and loyalty of clients

? Is the AC provider able to show long-term collaborations with clients?

! Minimum requirements:
External AC providers have years of cooperation with at least two clients.¹¹

☑ Verification:
Reference of the relevant clients.

📄 Documents to be submitted:
List of clients of the past two financial years who have commissioned more than five AC per year.

⇒ Evaluation:
Have the minimum requirements been Yes No met?

Remarks:

¹¹ Anyone ordering more than five AC a year and agreeing to be a point of reference is considered a key client.

Overview of the documents to be made available

Documents	Checkpoints
To be submitted by all in advance:	
Brief report on the specific measures taken based on the feedback from the previous certification.	according to feedback from previous certification
A list showing where changes have been made to the checkpoints in question. A comprehensible documentation of the changes made, arranged by checkpoints.	1 – 8, 12 – 17
Contract with the client	1
Organisation chart or exemplary mandate	2
Description of the AC design	3
A requirement profile at the basis of the exercises and assessment dimensions, as well as a description of the method used for the survey of the profile.	4
Exercise files and written instructions for assessors	5, 6
Structured assessment templates	7
A detailed schedule and allocation plan, as well as a list of assessors of a representative AC	8, 9, 14
List of assessors detailing their highest level of education completed and number of AC in which they participated.	9, 10
Attendance list of observer training delivered for these AC	9
Attendance list of assessors in AC delivered by the provider over the past three years	11
Career models and criteria for the nomination of participants for the AC ¹²	12
A comprehensible documentation about where, how and when the participants were informed about the AC.	13
Room overview of a representative AC, including representative images of the rooms	14
Example of a feedback report (AC final reports), as well as documentation of the procedure followed to provide feedback	15
Documentation of how the AC provider and the assessors commit to confidentiality.	16

¹² External AC providers submit the relevant documents for the companies for which they carried out their last five AC.

A written statement on data protection and information on where, how and for how long the individual AC documents are filed (exercise documents, final reports, etc.).	17
Two different types of evidence from the following activities over the past three years: participation in a Swiss Assessment event, participation in a Swiss Assessment working group, participation in academic conferences (e.g. EAWOP, SGP, etc.), copy of an article from a specialist journal, support/supervision of a student project (copy of the project, confirmation from the university), teaching assignment (contract with training institution, curriculum extract)	18
An evaluation report not older than three years illustrating relevant key figures, OR a publication regarding the AC in question, which contains information on the validity of the procedure. An overview must be submitted along the evaluation report, showing which particular iteration the certificate represents and what type of evaluation report was submitted for previous certifications (social validity or criterion validity). ¹³	19
An overview with details of location, date and client as well as the list of candidates of AC over the past three years	20
In addition, the following need to be submitted by external providers in advance :	
An annual report, sales figure based on annual reports ¹⁴ ; if necessary, information from an independent trustee	21
List of clients from the past two financial years who have commissioned more than five AC per year.	22

¹³ By the second certification at the latest, the evaluation report must contain information on the prognostic or criteria validity of the AC. The relevant requirements are set out in a separate document ("Requirements for evaluation").

¹⁴ This method enables to estimate the average price of an AC specifically for the AC provider being audited. The turnover generated through AC is divided by this average price to obtain the number of AC performed over the past three years. The estimate is based on the average price of the last 10 AC carried out by the AC provider being audited.

<p>To be submitted by everyone during the audit:</p>	
<p>Additional AC files will be randomly reviewed during the audit. At the start of the audit, it will be clarified for which period the actual AC will be reviewed.</p> <p>The files should therefore be archived so that the following are clearly visible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exercises - assessment dimensions - assessment forms - instructions for assessors - schedule - final report/feedback. 	

Overview of any changes made

Checkpoint	Change		Documentation
1 Clarified contractual basis	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
2 Independence of AC providers (internal or external)	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
3 Basic academic models	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
4 Analysis of the specific requirements	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
5 Variety of methods and multiple coverage of the requirement dimensions	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
6 Systematic behavioural observation	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
7 Structured assessment templates	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
8 Relationship observers – participants	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
12 Pre-selection of participants	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
13 Information to participants	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
14 Schedule and premises	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
15 Feedback	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
16 Confidentiality	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•
17 Data protection	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	•

Decision on certification

1. Order clarification and integration

Checkpoint 1: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 2: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 3a/b: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

2. Work and requirements analysis

Checkpoint 4: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

3. Variety of exercises

Checkpoint 5: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

4. Observation and evaluation

Checkpoint 6: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 7: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 8: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

5. Selection and training of observers

Checkpoint 9: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 10: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 11: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

6. Pre-selection and information to participants

Checkpoint 12: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 13: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

7. Preparation and implementation

Checkpoint 14: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

8. Feedback and follow-up

Checkpoint 15: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 16: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 17: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

9. Evaluation

Checkpoint 18: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 19: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

10. Internal focus

Checkpoint 20: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 21: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Checkpoint 22: Have the minimum requirements been met? Yes No

Have all mandatory checkpoints been met? (shaded in grey) Yes No

Have three additional checkpoints been met? Yes No

Have both requirements been confirmed? Quality label