

GCCAP™ Example Proof Pack

Redacted sample — governance illustration only

This document illustrates the structure and governance utility of a GCCAP™ Proof Pack. It contains no client identifiers and is not associated with any specific airline, catering facility, ground handler, or airport.

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Scope boundary | Catering facility release → transport → ramp staging/dwell → aircraft loading |
| Pack type (example) | Monthly Proof Pack (Tier 2 structure) |
| Sample engagement ID | SAMPLE-ENG-0001 |
| Generated (example) | 24 Dec 2025 |

Independence and limitations: GCCAP™ provides independent assurance. This is not certification, not a food safety audit, and does not provide audit sign-off or regulatory/legal compliance guarantees. GCCAP™ does not implement corrective actions or take operational control.

Contents (sample)

- 1. Executive governance summary (RAG)
- 2. Defensibility rating (D1-D4) and rationale
- 3. 10-minute incident test
- 4. Exceptions and CAPA effectiveness review (review only)
- 5. Evidence integrity notes and sample evidence excerpt
- 6. Timeline reconstruction extract
- 7. Scope, limitations, and permitted use

1. Executive governance summary (example)

This page provides an executive-legible summary of exposure and evidence confidence for the reporting period. Status indicators are governance signals, not compliance determinations.

| Signal | Status | Notes (example) |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Defensibility (D-rating) | D2 — Defensible with limited reconstruction | Reconstructable for most handoffs; two evidence gaps |
| Evidence confidence (ECS trend) | Improving | Evidence availability increased at ramp handoff points |
| Exposure drivers (HES drivers) | Stable | Dwell variability concentrated in peak uplift windows |
| Exceptions | 3 open / 5 closed | Two repeat exceptions require escalation evidence |

Top proof gaps (example)

- Ramp staging dwell timestamps inconsistently recorded during disruption windows.
- Two handoff records lack a clear custody owner identifier (role/owner contested).

Minimum viable proof priorities (example)

- Capture time-out-of-control at defined control points (facility release, truck bay, ramp staging start/end, aircraft door).
- Record custody owner (role) at each handoff with consistent identifiers.
- Maintain exception records with closure evidence (not only closure statements).

2. Defensibility rating (D1-D4)

The defensibility rating is a governance classification of whether the ground chain can be defended with evidence under scrutiny. It is not a certification result and does not declare compliance.

| Rating | Meaning |
|----------------------------------|---|
| D1 — Defensible | Chain can be reconstructed and defended with evidence at required control points. |
| D2 — Defensible with limitations | Chain is reconstructable with defined, bounded evidence gaps (explicitly documented). |
| D3 — Not defensible | Material evidence gaps prevent reliable reconstruction or proof of control. |
| D4 — Unknown | Access or evidence constraints prevent a defensible conclusion. |

Current rating (example): D2 — Defensible with limitations

Rationale (example): Evidence supports reconstruction across most handoffs. Two gaps remain: inconsistent ramp dwell timestamping during disruption windows, and custody owner identifiers missing on two handoff records.

Limitations (example)

- This rating is based on evidence accessible during the reporting period.
- Known vs assumed separation is maintained; assumptions are not treated as proof.

3. 10-minute incident test (example)

This page tests whether a defensible narrative can be assembled quickly tomorrow. It is designed to prevent false confidence and highlight proof gaps early.

| Question | What can be proven quickly (example) | Evidence refs (example) | Contestable points |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| Where was custody at each handoff? | Owner role recorded at 6 of 10 handoffs | EV-002, EV-004; EV-006 | Handoffs missing owner role. |
| How long was product outside control estimated for? | Diurnal cycle | EV-003, EV-009 | Ramp staging end timestamp missing |
| Were exceptions recorded? | Most closures supported by evidence | EV-010, EV-011 | Two closures lack effectiveness evidence |

Operator note: This is a governance test; it does not replace investigation or legal processes.

4. Exceptions and CAPA effectiveness review (example)

GCCAP™ reviews evidence of exception handling and CAPA effectiveness. GCCAP™ does not own or implement corrective actions.

| Exception ID | Description (example) | Owner (role) | Status | Evidence of closure / effectiveness |
|--------------|---|--------------|--------|--|
| EX-01 | Ramp staging dwell exceeded target window during distribution | Dispatcher | Open | Escalation note pending; closure evidence not provided |
| EX-02 | Handoff log missing custody owner signature | Dispatcher | Closed | Updated log + training record provided (EV-01) |
| EX-03 | Temperature status recorded as 'OK' without device ID | Dispatcher | Closed | Device ID added; calibration evidence referenced |

Repeat exception rule (example): if the same exception occurs twice, escalation evidence must be recorded.

5. Evidence integrity notes (example)

This section documents evidence limitations to prevent false confidence. Integrity notes are factual (not accusatory).

- Ramp dwell timestamps recorded in multiple systems; reconciliation required during disruption windows.
- Two handoff records lacked role/owner identifier; corrected field added for future use.
- One temperature status recorded without device identifier; calibration traceability strengthened.

Sample evidence excerpt (illustrative)

| Evidence ID | Type | Control point | Fact statement (example) | Integrity note |
|-------------|-------------|------------------|--|--|
| EV-002 | Record | Facility release | Dispatch log shows time of release recorded at 05:12. | |
| EV-003 | Record | Transport | Truck bay scan recorded at 05:21; custody owner role recorded. | |
| EV-009 | Observation | Ramp staging | Staging end time not recorded during disruption period (observed). | Staging end time not recorded during disruption period (observed). |

6. Timeline reconstruction extract (example)

Timeline extracts are built from indexed evidence. Confidence is stated where timing is inferred or incomplete.

| Time (local) | Event (example) | Evidence ref | Confidence |
|--------------|---|--------------|------------|
| 05:12 | Facility release recorded. | EV-002 | High |
| 05:21 | Truck bay scan recorded; custody role recorded. | EV-003 | High |
| 06:05 | Ramp staging commenced (recorded). | EV-006 | Medium |
| — | Ramp staging end time not recorded during disruption with | EV-009 | Low |
| 06:38 | Aircraft door handoff recorded. | EV-008 | High |

Known vs assumed rule: where evidence is missing, the gap is stated and is not replaced with narrative.

7. Scope, limitations, and permitted use

Permitted use: governance, assurance, and audit/incident readiness purposes only. This pack must not be used for marketing, sales, contractual representations, or vendor promotion.

Independence: GCCAP™ has no commercial relationship with evaluated vendors and receives no commissions, success fees, or incentives.

Limitations:

- GCCAP™ does not certify, approve, or guarantee compliance.
- GCCAP™ does not provide legal advice.
- Outputs reflect evidence accessible at the time of assessment and explicitly state known gaps.