



SCM1-2026

**SUPPORT SERVICE QUALITY STATE
DETERMINATION, VERIFICATION, AND
CLAIMS METHODOLOGY**

*Controlled Methods for Evidence-Supported Determinations,
Verification, and Bounded Support Service Quality Claims*

First Edition — Updated August 2026

AMERICAN SUPPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE

Foreword

Editorial Alignment Note (August 2026). This updated First Edition aligns SCM1 with the stabilized Whole Quality architecture reflected in WQI_VOC1, AMSI VOC1, WQS1, AMSI ORF1, the updated AMSI Core Standards, and their Context Guides. The revision strengthens the relationship among the declared Support Service Quality Object, Structural Checkpoints, internal and external Boundaries and Interfaces, Evidence-Supported Findings, Quality Factor Interpretation, Critical Service Condition review, Support Service Quality State determination, Verification, and bounded Support Service Quality Claim Statements. The methodology continues to preserve the separation among determination, verification, claim decision, and claim.

Support services are performed and experienced through people, relationships, occupational work, organizations, technologies, environments, and changing real-life conditions. A service may be authorized, funded, staffed, documented, or completed without sufficient Evidence that its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results were realized within the declared Support Service Quality Object.

AMSI VOC1 establishes the authoritative Support Service Quality Applied Concepts. WQS1 explains the AMSI Whole Quality Framework. AMSI ORF1 provides the cross-cutting SOC-Anchored Occupational Reference Framework. Applicable AMSI Core Standards establish invariant quality architecture and requirements, and Context Guides provide bounded Context-Specific Interpretation. SCM1 occupies the methodology layer: it governs how a Support Service Quality State is determined, how the supporting determination and proposed claim are verified, and how bounded first-party, second-party, and third-party claims are decided and communicated.

SCM1 preserves a deliberate separation among the underlying Support Service Quality State, the determination of that state, verification of the supporting basis, the decision to issue or continue a claim, and the claim itself. These activities may be connected, but they are not interchangeable. A favorable result, compliant record, completed checklist, or absence of reported concern does not by itself establish a satisfactory Quality State or authorize a broad claim.

This Methodology is voluntary, service-model neutral, context-adaptive, and non-regulatory. It does not create a certification scheme, authorize use of an AMSI mark, establish legal duties, define professional scope of practice, prescribe a service-delivery model, or replace applicable laws, regulations, program rules, contracts, individual plans, or professional responsibilities. Third-party certification may be issued only under a separately authorized scheme that satisfies the requirements stated in this Methodology.

Because support-service determinations may concern safety, health stability, dignity, autonomy, communication, privacy, employment, participation, and essential daily-life support, all activities under SCM1 shall be proportionate, transparent, respectful, and attentive to consent, confidentiality, disruption, power imbalance, and the rights of the Person Receiving Support.

Table of Contents

Foreword	2
1 Purpose, Position, and Scope.....	6
1.1 Purpose	6
1.2 Position Within the AMSI Architecture.....	6
1.3 Scope	6
1.4 Exclusions and Non-Authorization.....	7
1.5 Service-Model Neutrality and Context Adaptability	7
2 Governing Methodological Principles.....	7
2.1 Object and Function First	7
2.2 Structural Completeness Before Interpretation	7
2.3 Separation of Determination, Verification, Decision, and Claim.....	8
2.4 Evidence Over Assertion	8
2.5 Critical Conditions and Non-Substitutability.....	8
2.6 Proportionality, Dignity, and Non-Intrusion	8
2.7 Transparency and Continued Validity	8
3 Governing Concepts, Roles, and Procedural Expressions	9
3.1 Authoritative Concepts Adopted by Reference	9
3.2 Party Status.....	9
3.3 Determination Team and Responsible Authority.....	9
3.4 Verifier, Reviewer, and Decision Authority	9
3.5 Competence, Impartiality, Independence, and Conflict of Interest.....	9
3.6 Procedural Expressions Used in SCM1	10
4 Support Service Quality State Determination.....	10
4.1 Determination Purpose and Entry Conditions	10
4.2 Determination Sequence.....	10
4.3 Object, Period, Context, and Claim Boundary.....	11
4.4 Governing Core and Context Basis.....	11
4.5 Evidence Planning and Evaluation	11
4.6 Evidence-Supported Findings and Quality Factor Interpretation.....	12
4.7 Critical-Condition and Non-Substitutability Review	12
4.8 Determining and Recording the Quality State	12
4.9 Indeterminate and Restricted Determinations	12
5 Verification Planning	12
5.1 Verification Purpose and Scope	12
5.2 Verification Plan.....	13
5.3 Risk and Proportionality.....	13
5.4 Sampling.....	13

5.5 Access, Consent, Privacy, and Data Protection	13
5.6 Competence and Assignment	13
6 Evidence Evaluation Method.....	13
6.1 Evidence Characteristics	13
6.2 Evidence Sources.....	14
6.3 Triangulation and Contrary Evidence	14
6.4 Missing, Stale, or Contradictory Evidence	14
6.5 Absence of Reported Concern or Observed Failure	14
6.6 Results Emerging Over Time	15
6.7 Evidence Continuity.....	15
7 Support Service Quality Verification.....	15
7.1 Verification Review	15
7.2 Verification Findings	15
7.3 Corrective Action and Re-Verification.....	15
7.4 Verification Records	16
8 Claim Types, Claim Decisions, and Claim Statements	16
8.1 Claim Types.....	16
8.2 Claim Decision Outcomes	16
8.3 Required Claim Content	16
8.4 Claim Wording and Prohibited Implications.....	17
8.5 Conditions for Continuation, Restriction, Suspension, and Withdrawal	17
9 Third-Party Support Service Quality Certification.....	17
9.1 Separate Scheme Authority.....	17
9.2 Independence and Impartiality	17
9.3 Separation of Functions and Decision Control	17
9.4 Surveillance and Continued Validity	18
9.5 Marks, Symbols, and Public Representation.....	18
9.6 Complaints and Appeals.....	18
10 Records, Transparency, and Governance	18
10.1 Determination and Verification Records	18
10.2 Traceability	18
10.3 Record Protection and Retention	18
10.4 Corrections, Newly Discovered Information, and Misuse	18
10.5 Methodology Governance and Controlled Change	18
Annex A (informative) — Determination and Claim Record.....	19
Annex B (informative) — Verification Plan and Verification Record	20
Annex C (informative) — Claim Statement Structures.....	20
C.1 First-Party Claim Structure.....	20

C.2 Second-Party Claim Structure	21
C.3 Third-Party Certification Structure.....	21
Annex D (informative) — Continued-Validity Review Triggers.....	21
Copyright and Use Notice	22

1 Purpose, Position, and Scope

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of SCM1 is to establish a controlled, traceable, and proportionate methodology for Support Service Quality State determination, Support Service Quality Verification, claim decisions, bounded Support Service Quality Claim Statements, and third-party certification where a separately authorized certification scheme applies.

SCM1 answers three distinct questions: What Support Service Quality State is supported by the Evidence? Does the determination and proposed claim adequately represent that Evidence and the governing quality architecture? What bounded claim, if any, may responsibly be issued or continued?

1.2 Position Within the AMSI Architecture

- WQI_VOC1 defines Root Concepts that remain invariant across application domains.
- AMSI VOC1 defines the authoritative Support Service Quality Applied Concepts and controlled usage rules.
- WQS1 explains the AMSI Whole Quality Framework and document architecture.
- AMSI ORF1 provides the cross-cutting occupational reference used to interpret Occupations, Jobs, Support Roles, Functional Scope, and occupational arrangements.
- AMSI Core Standards establish invariant quality architecture and requirements for defined support-service domains.
- AMSI Context Guides provide bounded Context-Specific Interpretation of a governing Core Standard.
- AMSI SCM1 governs the controlled methodology for determination, verification, claims, and third-party certification without redefining Root, Applied, or Core concepts.

The governing Core Standard determines what quality architecture and requirements apply. SCM1 determines how the applicable architecture is used to produce, verify, record, and communicate a bounded determination or claim.

Framework Alignment Principle. The Support Service Quality Object framework is the governing conceptual model for applying SCM1. Determination begins with one declared and sufficiently described Support Service Quality Object. Internal Boundaries and internal Interfaces are interpreted within that object; the external Boundary distinguishes the object from the surrounding Reference Layer; and external Interfaces make material influences, responsibilities, transfers, and limitations visible without automatically incorporating external systems into the object. SCM1 governs the controlled pathway from the declared object through Evidence, Evidence-Supported Findings, Quality Factor Interpretation, Critical Service Condition and Non-Compensability Review, Support Service Quality State determination, Verification, claim decision, and a bounded Support Service Quality Claim Statement.

1.3 Scope

SCM1 applies to declared Support Service Quality Objects within personal, social, employment, residential, community, health-related, educational, and adjacent support-service domains. It may be used for one Interaction, one Episode, one Service Period, one Support Service Arrangement, one coordinated arrangement, a service-family application, or another sufficiently bounded object.

The Methodology may support first-party determination and claims, second-party review and claims, and third-party certification. It is intended for providers, workers, Persons Receiving Support, authorized representatives, purchasers, contracting parties, evaluators, reviewers, certification bodies operating under an authorized scheme, researchers, standards developers, and other responsible users.

1.4 Exclusions and Non-Authorization

SCM1 does not define the Support Intended Function, Core Quality Factors, Core Quality Indicators, or service-specific requirements for a domain. It does not create Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, determine professional scope of practice, establish a mandatory audit frequency, prescribe one Evidence technology, or require universal scoring, rating, or sampling models.

Publication or use of SCM1 does not authorize any person or organization to issue AMSI certification, use an AMSI certification mark, claim accreditation, or represent that AMSI has approved a provider, worker, organization, program, service, product, or Quality Claim. Such authority must arise from a separately established and controlled scheme.

1.5 Service-Model Neutrality and Context Adaptability

SCM1 is invariant to agency-based, participant-directed, family-delivered, employer-based, contractor, volunteer, hybrid, and emerging service arrangements. Differences in supervision, payment, documentation, authorization, technology, or organizational structure affect the object description, Reference Layer, Evidence, responsibilities, and claim limits; they do not replace the quality question.

The same methodological sequence may be applied in home, community, workplace, residential, educational, virtual, transportation-related, and blended settings. The method remains stable while the applicable Core Standard, Context Guide, Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence sources, risks, Critical Service Conditions, and claim Boundary vary.

2 Governing Methodological Principles

2.1 Object and Function First

Every determination and verification begins with the declared Support Service Quality Object and its Support Service Quality Object Description. The object declaration controls what is included, excluded, observed, interpreted, verified, and claimed. The method remains traceable to the Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results of that object. Internal or external classification is object- and Scale-relative: an element or interaction may be internal for one declared object and external for another. The determination record shall preserve this classification consistently through Evidence evaluation, findings, interpretation, verification, and claims.

Why object and function come first. Evidence cannot be interpreted responsibly until the declared Support Service Quality Object and its Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results are known. The same record, observation, or result may support different conclusions when the Scale, Service Period, Boundaries, Interfaces, responsibilities, or intended claim differ. Object declaration therefore establishes the meaning and permissible reach of every later finding, determination, verification conclusion, and claim.

2.2 Structural Completeness Before Interpretation

Structural Checkpoints shall be completed before detailed interpretation proceeds. Where the object, Service Period, Boundaries, Interfaces, roles, responsibilities, Service Context, expected Evidence sources, uncertainty, or intended claim cannot be described with sufficient clarity, the work shall be refined, restricted, qualified, or deferred rather than converted into an unsupported broad determination.

Why Structural Checkpoints precede interpretation. Structural Checkpoints test whether the service whole is sufficiently described to support interpretation; they do not evaluate whether the service is satisfactory. Requiring completeness first prevents ambiguity in participants, roles, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, Evidence sources, and claim scope from being converted into unsupported positive or negative conclusions.

2.3 Separation of Determination, Verification, Decision, and Claim

The Support Service Quality State is the interpreted condition of the declared object. Support Service Quality State determination is the structured process used to interpret and record that condition. Support Service Quality Verification evaluates whether the Evidence, process, findings, determination, and proposed or issued claim adequately support the stated conclusion. A claim decision authorizes, restricts, defers, declines, continues, suspends, or withdraws a claim. The claim communicates the bounded conclusion. None of these activities shall be represented as another without explicit declaration of the broader scope performed.

Why these functions remain separate. Determination interprets the Quality State of the declared object; verification tests the adequacy of the supporting basis; decision controls whether a claim may be issued or continued; and the claim communicates only the bounded conclusion authorized by that decision. Keeping these functions distinct makes responsibility, party status, Independence, limitations, and possible conflicts of interest visible.

2.4 Evidence Over Assertion

Quality, conformity, competence, safety, dignity, continuity, outcome, and claim assertions require an identifiable Evidence basis. Funding, staffing, documentation, compliance, task completion, reputation, intention, data volume, or absence of concern may be relevant, but no one of them is automatically equivalent to a satisfactory Support Service Quality State.

2.5 Critical Conditions and Non-Substitutability

A failed, prohibited, degraded, unresolved, or insufficiently evidenced Critical Service Condition shall not be offset by favorable findings in unrelated areas. Aggregation, averages, ratings, or summary scores shall not conceal a non-compensable condition. The determination and claim shall state the effect of each material Critical Service Condition.

2.6 Proportionality, Dignity, and Non-Intrusion

Determination and verification activities shall be proportionate to the object, consequences, uncertainty, claim purpose, party status, and available Evidence. Evidence collection shall respect dignity, autonomy, privacy, consent, communication needs, cultural and community context, legal protections, and the natural character of service relationships. Intrusion shall not exceed what is reasonably necessary for the declared purpose.

2.7 Transparency and Continued Validity

Assumptions, Uncertainty, Unresolved Conditions, contrary Evidence, access limitations, sampling limits, conflicts of interest, party status, and conditions of continued validity shall remain visible. A claim remains valid only while its declared object, period, Context, Boundaries, Interfaces, criteria, Evidence basis, responsibilities, Critical Service Conditions, and other continued-validity conditions remain applicable. Boundary Transparency and Interface Transparency shall be sufficient to make the declared extent of the object, material inclusions and exclusions, responsibility transfers, and quality-relevant interactions visible. Limitations in either form of transparency shall be recorded and reflected in the determination, verification conclusion, claim decision, and Support Service Quality Claim Statement.

Boundary Transparency and Interface Transparency shall be maintained throughout determination, Verification, claim decision, communication, and continued-validity review. The record shall make visible the basis for including or excluding material participants, roles, Work, Results, technologies, organizations, periods, and responsibilities, together with material internal and external Interfaces, Interface failures, responsibility transfers, access limitations, and Evidence limitations affecting the conclusion or claim.

3 Governing Concepts, Roles, and Procedural Expressions

3.1 Authoritative Concepts Adopted by Reference

SCM1 uses the WQI Root Concepts defined in WQI_VOC1 and the AMSI Applied Concepts defined in AMSI VOC1 without redefinition. The following concepts are especially controlling: Quality Object; Quality Object Description; Intended Function; Intended Result; Function Realization; Boundary; Interface; Context; Failure Mode; Failure-Mode Family; Quality Factor; Quality Indicator; Quality Outcome Criterion; Evidence; Evidence Sufficiency; Evidence-Supported Finding; Quality Factor Interpretation; Critical Condition; Non-Compensability; Quality State; Quality State Determination; Quality Claim; Quality Claim Boundary; Support Service Quality Object; Structural Checkpoint; Support Intended Function; Support Intended Result; Support Work; Support Result; Support Service; Service Period; Service Context; Core Quality Factor; Core Quality Indicator; Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criterion; Critical Service Condition; Support Service Non-Substitutability; Support Service Quality State; Support Service Quality State Determination; Support Service Evidence Continuity; Support Service Quality Claim Statement; Support Service Quality Claim Boundary; Support Service Quality Verification; first-party and second-party claims; Third-Party Support Service Quality Certification; and Support Service Quality Verification Independence.

Where SCM1 explains procedural application of an authoritative concept, the explanation is non-definitional. If wording in SCM1 appears to conflict with WQI_VOC1 or AMSI VOC1, the authoritative vocabulary definition governs.

3.2 Party Status

Party status identifies the relationship between the issuing or verifying party and the declared Support Service Quality Object. First-party status applies to a party responsible for or controlling the service being claimed. Second-party status applies to the Person Receiving Support, an authorized representative, purchaser, contracting party, or another direct-interest party. Third-party status requires a party sufficiently independent from the service and direct-interest relationships for the declared certification purpose.

3.3 Determination Team and Responsible Authority

A determination may be performed by one competent person or a multidisciplinary team. The determination record shall identify who collected Evidence, who derived findings, who interpreted Quality Factors, who completed the Critical-Condition review, and who holds responsibility for the final determination. Team composition shall be proportionate to the object and shall not obscure accountability.

3.4 Verifier, Reviewer, and Decision Authority

A verifier evaluates the support for the determination or claim. A reviewer may perform a broader technical, methodological, or impartiality review. The decision authority is the person or controlled body authorized to issue, restrict, continue, suspend, withdraw, or decline the claim. These functions may be combined for a declared first- or second-party process where appropriate, but the combination and resulting limitations shall be transparent. A third-party certification scheme shall control separation of functions as required by Clause 9.

3.5 Competence, Impartiality, Independence, and Conflict of Interest

Competence concerns the knowledge, skills, judgment, communication ability, methodological capability, service-context understanding, and authority needed for the assigned function. Impartiality concerns objective treatment of Evidence and parties. Support Service Quality Verification Independence concerns freedom from relationships, interests, responsibilities, pressures, or controls capable of materially influencing judgment. A conflict of interest is a condition that may threaten impartiality or Independence and shall be identified, evaluated, managed, and recorded.

3.6 Procedural Expressions Used in SCM1

Procedural expression	SCM1 use
Determination record	The controlled record of the object, method, Evidence, findings, interpretations, Critical-Condition review, Quality State, limitations, and continued-validity conditions.
Verification plan	The documented plan defining the verification purpose, object, period, claim, party status, criteria, competence, Evidence access, sampling, risks, safeguards, and records.
Verification finding	A recorded conclusion about the adequacy, consistency, traceability, or limitation of the determination, Evidence, or claim basis.
Corrective action	Action taken to address a verified deficiency in the determination, Evidence basis, process, responsibility arrangement, or claim.
Re-verification	A new or focused verification performed after corrective action, new Evidence, material change, or a previously unresolved condition.
Continued-validity review	A review of whether an existing determination or claim remains supportable after time, change, new information, or Evidence loss.
Suspension	Temporary cessation of an issued claim while a material condition is investigated or corrected.
Withdrawal	Termination of a claim when its basis is invalid, materially unsupported, misused, or no longer maintained.
Complaint	An expression of dissatisfaction concerning a determination, verification, decision, claim, process, or conduct requiring controlled review.
Appeal	A request by an affected party for reconsideration of a verification or claim decision by an authorized review process.

These expressions are operational terms used within this Methodology. They do not amend WQI_VOC1 or AMSI VOC1 and shall not be represented as new Root or Applied Concepts.

4 Support Service Quality State Determination

4.1 Determination Purpose and Entry Conditions

A Support Service Quality State determination shall have a declared purpose, responsible authority, object, Service Period, Service Context, intended use, and proposed claim scope where a claim is contemplated. The governing Core Standard shall be identified. An applicable Context Guide shall be used where available or required; where none exists, the determination may proceed only when the context-specific basis remains transparent, bounded, and traceable.

4.2 Determination Sequence

Narrative logic of the sequence. Each stage depends on the preceding stage. Criteria cannot be selected responsibly without a declared object and governing Core; Evidence cannot support findings without applicable criteria; Factor Interpretation cannot precede Evidence-Supported Findings; and a Quality State or claim cannot responsibly exceed the completed Critical-Condition review, Evidence Sufficiency, Uncertainty, and declared limitations.

Stage	Required methodological action
1 Declare the object and purpose	Identify the Support Service Quality Object, Scale, determination purpose, intended users, Service Period, Service Context, and proposed claim purpose.

Stage	Required methodological action
2 Complete the object description	Record composition, Support Intended Functions and Results, Support Work and Results, participants, occupations and roles, external Boundary, material internal Boundaries, material internal and external Interfaces, responsibilities, expected Evidence sources, Uncertainty, and intended Claim Boundary.
3 Complete Structural Checkpoints	Confirm sufficient completeness, boundedness, and internal coherence. Refine, restrict, qualify, or defer where structural completeness is insufficient.
4 Establish the governing basis	Identify WQI_VOC1, AMSI VOC1, WQS1, ORF1 as applicable, the governing Core Standard, applicable Context Guide, Reference Layer, Core Quality Factors, Core Quality Indicators, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, and Critical Service Conditions.
5 Plan and evaluate Evidence	Define Evidence sources, access, consent, sampling, attribution, continuity, risks, and evaluation characteristics. Include contrary and missing Evidence.
6 Derive Evidence-Supported Findings	Record bounded findings against the applicable Indicators and Criteria, including Uncertainty, Assumptions, Unresolved Conditions, and limitations.
7 Interpret Core Quality Factors	Integrate the Evidence-Supported Findings under each Core Quality Factor without unsupported substitution, averaging, or collapse of distinct dimensions.
8 Review Critical Conditions and Non-Substitutability	Determine whether any Critical Service Condition is failed, prohibited, degraded, unresolved, insufficiently evidenced, or otherwise non-compensable.
9 Determine the Quality State	Interpret the object's quality condition for the declared period and context, taking Factor Interpretations, Critical Conditions, Evidence Sufficiency, Uncertainty, and limitations together.
10 Record limits and continued validity	State the Boundary of the determination, conditions of continued validity, review triggers, Evidence-continuity requirements, and any restricted or indeterminate aspects.
11 Prepare a proposed claim, where applicable	Draft a bounded claim that does not exceed the determination. The proposed claim remains subject to applicable verification and decision controls.

4.3 Object, Period, Context, and Claim Boundary

The determination Boundary shall identify included and excluded Work, Results, participants, roles, Episodes, organizations, technologies, settings, responsibilities, Evidence, and time. A proposed Support Service Quality Claim Boundary may be narrower than the determination Boundary and shall never be broader. Findings from one worker, task, Interaction, Episode, provider unit, or Service Period shall not be generalized to a broader object without explicit support.

4.4 Governing Core and Context Basis

Core Quality Factors and Core Quality Indicators are established by the governing Core Standard and remain invariant across its Context Guides. Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria shall remain traceable to the applicable Core Quality Indicator and appropriate to the declared object, Context, period, consequences, and claim purpose. SCM1 does not create alternative Core Factors or Indicators.

4.5 Evidence Planning and Evaluation

The determination plan shall identify the Evidence needed to support each material Indicator, Criterion, Critical Service Condition, responsibility, Interface, and claim element. Evidence collection shall be proportionate and shall avoid collecting data with no defined relevance to the object or decision. The plan shall address Evidence continuity where participants, providers, technologies, records, or responsibilities may change during the Service Period.

4.6 Evidence-Supported Findings and Quality Factor Interpretation

Information becomes Evidence only when its relevance, credibility, context, traceability, currency, attribution, and relationship to the declared object and Criterion are established. Each Evidence-Supported Finding shall state what the Evidence supports, what it does not support, and any material contrary information or limitation.

Why findings and interpretation are distinct. An Evidence-Supported Finding is a bounded conclusion about what particular Evidence supports in relation to an Indicator or Criterion. Quality Factor Interpretation integrates multiple findings while preserving differences among Work, Results, participants, periods, Boundaries, Interfaces, and Evidence sources. This prevents one favorable observation or isolated result from being treated as the complete Quality State.

Quality Factor Interpretation integrates the findings under the applicable Core Quality Factor. It shall preserve important distinctions among Support Work, Support Results, participants, roles, Boundaries, Interfaces, periods, and Evidence sources. A single favorable Indicator or result shall not automatically establish a favorable Factor Interpretation.

4.7 Critical-Condition and Non-Substitutability Review

The responsible authority shall review every applicable Critical Service Condition before determining a positive or unrestricted Quality State. The record shall identify the required condition, Evidence basis, status, consequence of failure or uncertainty, and effect on the determination and proposed claim. Where the condition is unresolved or insufficiently evidenced, the determination shall be restricted, qualified, deferred, or indeterminate as appropriate.

4.8 Determining and Recording the Quality State

The Support Service Quality State shall be recorded as an interpreted condition of the declared object at a stated time or during a stated period. The record shall include the principal Factor Interpretations, status of Critical Service Conditions, Evidence Sufficiency, Uncertainty, unresolved matters, and limitations. A governing Core Standard, Context Guide, or authorized application may define controlled state labels; SCM1 does not impose one universal rating scale across all support-service domains.

Why the Quality State is an interpreted condition rather than a score. The Quality State represents the condition of the declared Support Service Quality Object as a whole for the stated period and Context. Numerical summaries or labels may assist communication, but they cannot replace the underlying Factor Interpretations, Critical Service Conditions, Evidence Sufficiency, Uncertainty, and non-compensability rules.

Where summary language or a rating is used, it shall remain traceable to the underlying Factor Interpretations and shall not imply that non-compensable conditions were averaged or offset.

4.9 Indeterminate and Restricted Determinations

A determination is indeterminate where the Evidence, object description, criteria, access, attribution, continuity, or Critical-Condition status is insufficient to support a responsible interpretation.

Indeterminate does not mean satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A restricted determination may support a conclusion for a narrower object, period, function, participant, role, Factor, or claim Boundary while broader questions remain unresolved.

5 Verification Planning

5.1 Verification Purpose and Scope

Verification shall have a declared purpose: review of a determination, proposed claim, issued claim, corrective action, continued validity, or third-party certification basis. The verification scope shall identify the object, period, determination, claim, Core Standard, Context Guide, criteria, Evidence, party status, and decision to be supported.

5.2 Verification Plan

Before verification begins, a Verification Plan shall identify:

- purpose, scope, object, period, Context, and claim under review;
- governing vocabulary, Core Standard, Context Guide, criteria, and Reference Layer;
- party status and the required degree of Independence and impartiality;
- verifier competence, authority, assignments, and any technical support;
- Evidence access, sampling, interviews, observation, records, technology, and data limitations;
- Critical Service Conditions, higher-risk areas, and required direct coverage;
- consent, privacy, communication, accessibility, dignity, and non-intrusion safeguards;
- conflicts of interest, safeguards, recusals, and residual risks;
- expected records, reporting, corrective action, review, and decision authority.

5.3 Risk and Proportionality

Verification effort shall be proportionate to the consequences of an incorrect conclusion, the object's complexity, Critical Service Conditions, uncertainty, claim breadth, service history, prior findings, Evidence continuity, and party status. Risk-based focus does not permit neglect of lower-visibility conditions that are material to Function Realization or a responsible claim.

5.4 Sampling

Sampling may be used where examination of every Interaction, Episode, record, participant, or period is impracticable and where sampling can responsibly support the declared claim. The method, population, selection basis, sample size, time coverage, exclusions, limitations, and relationship to Critical Service Conditions shall be documented. A sampled finding shall not be generalized beyond what the sampling basis and Evidence support.

Where a Critical Service Condition requires complete coverage, direct observation, confirmation of every applicable case, or another scheme-defined control, sampling alone shall not be treated as sufficient unless the governing method expressly justifies it.

5.5 Access, Consent, Privacy, and Data Protection

The Verification Plan shall define lawful and ethical access to people, settings, records, technologies, and service interactions. Consent and authorization requirements shall be identified. Evidence acquisition shall protect confidentiality, minimize unnecessary disclosure, accommodate communication and accessibility needs, and avoid coercion or retaliation. Limitations on access shall be recorded and reflected in the verification conclusion.

5.6 Competence and Assignment

Verifier competence shall be matched to the assigned method, service domain, occupational work, risks, Evidence types, Context, communication needs, and claim purpose. No person shall be assigned solely because of organizational position or credential where the necessary applied competence has not been demonstrated. The record shall identify technical assistance and any limitation in the verification team's competence or authority.

6 Evidence Evaluation Method

6.1 Evidence Characteristics

Characteristic	Required consideration
Relevance	Connection to the declared object, function, Indicator, Criterion, Critical Service Condition, determination, or claim.

Characteristic	Required consideration
Credibility	Degree to which the source, method, and circumstances support confidence in the information.
Traceability	Ability to connect Evidence to the participant, role, Work, Result, period, source, Criterion, finding, and decision.
Currency	Fitness of the Evidence for the declared Service Period and current claim.
Integrity	Protection from material loss, alteration, distortion, misattribution, or inappropriate disclosure.
Attribution	Visibility of whose Work, Result, observation, statement, decision, or record the Evidence represents.
Continuity	Availability and interpretability across Interactions, Episodes, periods, transfers, systems, and responsibility changes.
Sufficiency	Adequacy of the total Evidence basis for the stated finding, determination, verification conclusion, or claim.
Balance	Consideration of favorable, unfavorable, contradictory, missing, and uncertain information without selective omission.

6.2 Evidence Sources

Evidence may include direct observation; communication with the Person Receiving Support; worker, family, employer, purchaser, provider, or other stakeholder testimony; demonstrations; service and work records; plans; schedules; functional conditions; Support Results; incident, complaint, safeguarding, and corrective-action information; technology and sensor records; supervision and competence records; external requirements; and other sources relevant to the object and criteria.

No source is automatically controlling merely because it is official, quantitative, electronic, recent, or produced by an organization. Evidence weight depends on relevance, credibility, traceability, context, and the total Evidence basis. The lived experience and communication of the Person Receiving Support are material Evidence where relevant and shall not be reduced to a satisfaction score alone.

6.3 Triangulation and Contrary Evidence

Where material conclusions depend on information susceptible to bias, incompleteness, or narrow perspective, the method should use more than one Evidence source, method, time, or participant where proportionate and feasible. Triangulation does not mean that every source has equal weight. Contradictory Evidence shall be investigated, reconciled where possible, or preserved as Uncertainty or an Unresolved Condition.

6.4 Missing, Stale, or Contradictory Evidence

Missing, stale, inaccessible, unauthenticated, contradictory, or weakly attributable information shall not be silently treated as satisfactory Evidence. The record shall state the affected Criterion, the reason for the limitation, efforts to resolve it, and the effect on the finding, Quality Factor Interpretation, Critical Service Condition, Quality State, verification conclusion, or claim.

6.5 Absence of Reported Concern or Observed Failure

Absence of a complaint, incident, visible problem, known nonconformity, or observed failure is an Evidence condition, not proof of satisfactory quality. Its significance depends on the opportunity and capability to observe, communicate, report, record, investigate, and preserve Evidence during the declared period, including power imbalance, communication barriers, fear of retaliation, service isolation, and monitoring adequacy.

6.6 Results Emerging Over Time

Some Support Results are immediate; others emerge, stabilize, deteriorate, or become visible over time. The determination and verification shall distinguish current Evidence from projected or expected Results, identify time dependencies, and avoid treating a short observation window as proof of long-term Function Realization. Delayed Evidence may require a restricted claim, later review, or staged determination.

6.7 Evidence Continuity

Support Service Evidence Continuity shall be evaluated where service responsibility, workers, providers, settings, technologies, records, communication systems, or Service Periods change. Retention alone is insufficient: Evidence shall remain interpretable and connected to the relevant object, Work, Result, role, Indicator, Criterion, finding, and decision. Material Evidence loss may require renewed determination, claim restriction, suspension, or withdrawal.

7 Support Service Quality Verification

7.1 Verification Review

Verification evaluates whether the determination process, Evidence, findings, Quality Factor Interpretations, Critical-Condition review, Support Service Quality State, Claim Boundary, and proposed or issued claim adequately support the stated conclusion. The verifier shall not silently perform a new determination and describe it only as verification; any expanded scope shall be declared and recorded.

Why verification is not repetition of determination. Verification examines whether the determination and proposed or issued claim are adequately supported, traceable, proportionate, and bounded. It does not silently substitute a second undisclosed determination. Where verification expands the object, Evidence, criteria, or interpretive work, that expanded function shall be declared and recorded.

The review shall address at least:

- consistency of the declared object, period, Context, Boundaries, Interfaces, and claim scope;
- completion and adequacy of Structural Checkpoints;
- use of the governing Core Standard, Context Guide, Criteria, and Reference Layer;
- Evidence relevance, credibility, traceability, currency, attribution, continuity, balance, and sufficiency;
- logical connection from Evidence to findings, Factor Interpretations, Critical Conditions, Quality State, and claim;
- visibility of Assumptions, Uncertainty, Unresolved Conditions, limitations, and contrary Evidence;
- party status, competence, conflicts of interest, Independence, impartiality, and safeguards;
- continued-validity conditions and change triggers.

7.2 Verification Findings

Verification findings shall identify adequate support, deficiencies, inconsistencies, unsupported generalization, missing Evidence, unresolved critical matters, process deviations, claim overstatement, or other limitations. Findings shall be sufficiently specific to support correction, decision, and traceability. A verification finding concerning the method or claim does not automatically change the underlying service condition, but it may change what can responsibly be determined or communicated.

7.3 Corrective Action and Re-Verification

Where a correctable deficiency is identified, the responsible party may take corrective action concerning the object description, Evidence basis, method, service condition, responsibility arrangement, or proposed claim. Corrective action shall not be accepted solely by assertion. Re-verification shall examine the relevant correction and any consequential changes. A failed Critical

Service Condition may require renewed Quality State determination rather than document correction alone.

7.4 Verification Records

The verification record shall identify the plan, verifier, party status, competence, conflicts and safeguards, Evidence reviewed, access and sampling limitations, verification findings, corrective actions, unresolved matters, conclusion, decision authority, and date. The record shall distinguish the verifier's conclusion from the final claim decision.

8 Claim Types, Claim Decisions, and Claim Statements

8.1 Claim Types

Claim type	Issuing party	Minimum basis	Principal limitation
First-Party Support Service Quality Claim	Provider, Support Worker, organization, or other party responsible for or controlling the service.	Bounded determination and first-party verification performed or controlled by that party.	First-party status, self-interest, control, access advantages, and limitations shall be visible.
Second-Party Support Service Quality Claim	Person Receiving Support, authorized representative, purchaser, contracting party, or another direct-interest party.	Bounded Evidence review and second-party verification appropriate to the declared purpose.	Experience and testimony are material Evidence but do not automatically establish the complete Quality State.
Third-Party Support Service Quality Certification	Competent and sufficiently independent third party operating under a separately authorized certification scheme.	Impartial third-party verification and an accountable certification decision.	Requires scheme authority, competence, Independence, impartiality, decision control, continued-validity rules, and controlled public representation.

8.2 Claim Decision Outcomes

For a proposed claim, the authorized decision may:

- issue the claim as proposed where the supporting basis is sufficient and the wording is proportionate;
- issue a narrower, qualified, or time-limited claim where only a restricted conclusion is supported;
- defer the decision pending additional Evidence, correction, clarification, or resolution of a material condition;
- decline or deny the claim where the determination, verification, Evidence, authority, or Critical-Condition status does not support issuance.

For an existing claim, the authorized decision may continue, restrict, correct, suspend, withdraw, or require renewed determination and verification. The decision and rationale shall be recorded.

8.3 Required Claim Content

Every Support Service Quality Claim Statement shall identify, as applicable:

Why claims must remain bounded. A Support Service Quality Claim Statement is a communication derived from a completed determination, verification, and decision; it is not the Quality State itself. Its wording shall therefore preserve the declared object, period, Scale, Boundaries, Interfaces, Evidence basis, Critical Service Conditions, Uncertainty, limitations, and continued-validity conditions needed to prevent unsupported generalization.

- claim type and issuing party;
- declared Support Service Quality Object and included or excluded constituents;

- Service Period, Service Context, Scale, Boundaries, Interfaces, participants, and roles;
- governing Core Standard, Context Guide, Criteria, and Reference Layer;
- quality conclusion and the Factor, function, or object scope to which it applies;
- Evidence basis and verification status;
- Critical Service Conditions and any effect on the claim;
- Assumptions, Uncertainty, Unresolved Conditions, limitations, and contrary Evidence material to interpretation;
- date of decision, validity period or review date, and conditions of continued validity;
- issuer, verifier, and decision authority where distinct.
- • limitations arising from insufficient Boundary Transparency or Interface Transparency, where material to the claim;

8.4 Claim Wording and Prohibited Implications

Claim wording shall be accurate, understandable, bounded, and no stronger than the supporting determination and verification. It shall not imply that all workers, all services, all Results, all contexts, all periods, all provider operations, or all future performance were assessed unless expressly included and evidenced. A claim shall not imply legal compliance, funding eligibility, licensure, clinical approval, accreditation, government approval, or AMSI endorsement unless separately and validly established.

Terms such as certified, independent, verified, approved, compliant, safe, effective, high quality, or whole quality shall not be used without a declared meaning, basis, party status, scope, and authority appropriate to the claim.

8.5 Conditions for Continuation, Restriction, Suspension, and Withdrawal

An issued claim shall be reviewed when a material change, new contrary Evidence, complaint, incident, service interruption, participant or provider change, responsibility transfer, Evidence loss, expired criterion, Critical Service Condition, or misuse may affect validity. The authorized party shall act without unreasonable delay and shall preserve the reason, effective date, communication, and corrective conditions for any restriction, suspension, or withdrawal.

9 Third-Party Support Service Quality Certification

9.1 Separate Scheme Authority

SCM1 establishes methodological requirements but does not itself establish or authorize a certification scheme. Third-party certification requires a separately controlled scheme defining ownership, eligibility, applicable standards, application, verification, competence, Independence, impartiality, decision authority, certification period, continued-validity review, surveillance where applicable, complaints, appeals, marks, public representation, suspension, withdrawal, and governance.

9.2 Independence and Impartiality

The certification body and persons performing verification, review, and decision functions shall demonstrate Support Service Quality Verification Independence proportionate to the claim and consequences. Financial, organizational, contractual, supervisory, personal, advocacy, service-delivery, purchasing, referral, employment, and other relationships capable of influencing judgment shall be identified and managed. Independence shall be demonstrated, not merely asserted.

9.3 Separation of Functions and Decision Control

The scheme shall define which functions may be combined and which require separation. The certification decision shall be made by a competent authority with sufficient independence from the service and, where necessary, from the Evidence-collection and verification activities. The decision authority shall have access to the complete relevant record and authority to restrict, defer, decline, suspend, or withdraw certification.

9.4 Surveillance and Continued Validity

The scheme shall define how certification remains valid during the stated period. Controls may include scheduled or event-triggered review, updated Evidence, focused verification, surveillance, complaint review, change notification, or renewed determination. The method shall be proportionate to the object, risks, variability, claim breadth, and Critical Service Conditions. Certification shall not be represented as a guarantee of future performance or elimination of risk.

9.5 Marks, Symbols, and Public Representation

Use of certification marks, symbols, certificates, directories, or public statements shall be separately authorized and controlled. Representation shall identify the certified object and claim Boundary and shall not imply certification of every worker, provider operation, service context, result, or future period. Misleading use shall require correction and may require suspension or withdrawal.

9.6 Complaints and Appeals

A third-party scheme shall maintain accessible, impartial, documented processes for complaints and appeals. Persons affected by support services shall be able to communicate concerns through accessible means without retaliation. Review personnel shall be sufficiently independent from the original matter. Outcomes, corrective actions, claim effects, and communications shall be recorded while protecting confidentiality and legal rights.

10 Records, Transparency, and Governance

10.1 Determination and Verification Records

Records shall be sufficient to reconstruct the object, applicable method, Evidence basis, findings, Factor Interpretations, Critical-Condition review, Quality State, verification, decision, claim, limitations, and continued-validity conditions. A concise record may be appropriate for a narrow low-consequence object; a complex or high-consequence claim requires correspondingly detailed records.

10.2 Traceability

Traceability shall connect the claim to the decision, verification conclusion, determination, Quality Factor Interpretations, Evidence-Supported Findings, applicable Criteria, Evidence sources, object description, Service Period, Context, roles, responsibilities, Boundaries, Interfaces, and governing documents. Traceability shall remain usable after personnel, provider, technology, or record-system change.

10.3 Record Protection and Retention

Records shall be protected against unauthorized access, alteration, loss, misuse, and inappropriate disclosure. Retention shall be proportionate to the claim, service, legal and contractual requirements, risk, complaint and appeal periods, and continued-validity needs. Retention does not authorize collection or preservation of information irrelevant to the declared purpose.

10.4 Corrections, Newly Discovered Information, and Misuse

Material errors, omissions, newly discovered Evidence, changed conditions, or misuse of a claim shall be evaluated promptly. The responsible authority shall determine whether correction, renewed determination, re-verification, claim qualification, public clarification, restriction, suspension, withdrawal, or other action is required. Historical records shall preserve what was known, decided, and changed rather than silently overwriting the earlier basis.

10.5 Methodology Governance and Controlled Change

AMSI shall maintain SCM1 as a controlled methodology document. Proposed changes shall be reviewed for consistency with WQI_VOC1, AMSI VOC1, WQS1, AMSI ORF1, applicable Core

Standards and Context Guides, the principle of one concept—one authoritative definition, and the separation between quality architecture and verification methodology. Changes to SCM1 shall not silently modify a Root, Applied, or Core concept.

Where a methodological expression becomes stable and necessary across multiple Whole Quality application domains, it may be considered for WQI Root-level or other controlled stabilization. Until such action occurs, SCM1 shall identify the expression as procedural rather than redefine the governing vocabulary.

Annex A (informative) — Determination and Claim Record

Record section	Required content
1 Record control	Identifier; version; responsible authority; status; dates; preparer; reviewer; decision authority.
2 Purpose and intended use	Reason for the determination; intended users; contemplated claim type and use.
3 Support Service Quality Object	Name; Scale; composition; included and excluded constituents; Service Period; Service Context.
4 Object description	Support Intended Functions and Results; Support Work and Results; participants; occupations; Jobs; Support Roles; Functional Scopes; arrangements.
5 Boundaries, Interfaces, and responsibilities	Physical, functional, relational, organizational, informational, occupational, jurisdictional, and temporal limits and connections.
6 Governing basis	WQI_VOC1; AMSI VOC1; WQS1; ORF1 where applicable; Core Standard; Context Guide; Reference Layer; criteria and version control.
7 Structural Checkpoints	Completion status; deficiencies; refinements; restrictions; qualifications; unresolved matters.
8 Evidence plan and sources	Sources; access; consent; methods; sampling; attribution; continuity; privacy and dignity safeguards.
9 Evidence-Supported Findings	Findings by Core Quality Indicator and Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criterion; contrary Evidence; limitations.
10 Quality Factor Interpretations	Integrated interpretation under each Core Quality Factor; relationship among Work, Results, Interfaces, and context.
11 Critical Service Conditions	Applicable conditions; status; Evidence; consequence; Non-Substitutability effect.
12 Uncertainty and assumptions	Assumptions; Uncertainty; Unresolved Conditions; Assumption Drift; missing or delayed Evidence.
13 Support Service Quality State	Interpreted condition; state labels if authorized; period and Boundary; restricted or indeterminate aspects.
14 Proposed claim	Claim type; exact wording; Claim Boundary; Evidence and verification basis; issuer and intended communication.
15 Continued validity	Review date; change triggers; Evidence-continuity requirements; correction, suspension, and withdrawal conditions.
16 Approvals and history	Determination approval; verification status; decision; corrections; superseded records; communications.

Annex B (informative) — Verification Plan and Verification Record

Verification element	Required content
A Verification purpose	Determination, proposed claim, issued claim, corrective action, continued validity, or third-party certification basis.
B Scope	Object; period; Context; claim; governing documents; criteria; exclusions; access limitations.
C Party status	First party, second party, or third party; relationship to service, recipient, purchaser, provider, and decision.
D Competence and assignments	Verifier(s); reviewer(s); technical support; decision authority; competence basis; limits.
E Independence and conflicts	Relationships; interests; pressures; safeguards; recusals; residual risks.
F Risk and sampling	Risk profile; Critical Service Conditions; population; sampling method; time coverage; justification; limits.
G Evidence reviewed	Sources; access; consent; observation; interviews; records; data; continuity; missing and contrary Evidence.
H Verification tests	Traceability, consistency, method conformity, Evidence Sufficiency, claim-boundary and wording tests.
I Verification findings	Adequate support; deficiencies; unsupported generalization; unresolved matters; required correction.
J Corrective action and re-verification	Action owner; due date; Evidence of correction; focused or full re-verification result.
K Verification conclusion	Conclusion concerning the determination and proposed or issued claim; limitations; date.
L Decision record	Issue, restrict, defer, decline, continue, suspend, or withdraw; authority; rationale; effective date.
M Communication and retention	Persons notified; public correction if needed; retention period; confidentiality controls.

Annex C (informative) — Claim Statement Structures

C.1 First-Party Claim Structure

FIRST-PARTY SUPPORT SERVICE QUALITY CLAIM

Issuer and declared first-party status
 Declared Support Service Quality Object, Service Period, and Service Context
 Quality conclusion and exact Claim Boundary
 Governing Core Standard, Context Guide, criteria, and Evidence basis
 First-party verification status
 Critical Service Conditions, Uncertainty, limitations, and continued-validity conditions
 Decision date and responsible authority

C.2 Second-Party Claim Structure

SECOND-PARTY SUPPORT SERVICE QUALITY CLAIM

Issuer, direct-interest relationship, and authority to act
Declared Support Service Quality Object, Service Period, and Service Context
Experience, testimony, and other Evidence used
Quality conclusion and exact Claim Boundary
Second-party verification status
Uncertainty, limitations, Critical Service Conditions, and continued-validity conditions
Decision date and responsible authority

C.3 Third-Party Certification Structure

THIRD-PARTY SUPPORT SERVICE QUALITY CERTIFICATION

Authorized certification scheme and certification body
Declared certified Support Service Quality Object, period, Context, and Claim Boundary
Governing standards, criteria, and verification basis
Statement of third-party status and Independence controls
Certification decision, issue date, expiry or review date, and certificate identifier
Limitations, continued-validity conditions, surveillance or review requirements
Controlled mark or public-directory status where separately authorized

The structures in this Annex are not claim authorizations and shall not be used to imply AMSI certification. Exact wording shall be controlled by the applicable responsible party or authorized scheme and shall remain proportionate to the supporting determination and verification.

Annex D (informative) — Continued-Validity Review Triggers

- material change in the Support Service Quality Object, Scale, Support Intended Function, or Support Intended Result;
- change in the Person Receiving Support, Support Worker, provider, purchaser, organization, Support Role, Functional Scope, or responsibility arrangement where material;
- new or changed Service Context, setting, technology, Interface, Boundary, schedule, service intensity, or Service Period;
- new incident, complaint, safeguarding concern, adverse Support Result, service interruption, or contrary Evidence;
- failed, degraded, unresolved, newly applicable, or insufficiently evidenced Critical Service Condition;
- loss, corruption, inaccessibility, misattribution, or discontinuity of material Evidence;
- expiration, withdrawal, or material revision of a governing standard, Context Guide, Criterion, law, regulation, contract, plan, or Reference-Layer requirement;
- identified conflict of interest, competence deficiency, Independence concern, process deviation, or decision error;
- misleading use, overstatement, unauthorized mark, or representation beyond the Claim Boundary;
- expiry of the declared claim period or scheduled review date.

A trigger does not automatically determine the final action. It requires proportionate review to decide whether the existing determination and claim may continue, require correction or restriction, must be suspended or withdrawn, or require renewed determination and verification.

Copyright and Use Notice

Copyright © American Support Standards Initiative (AMSI), 2026. All rights reserved.

This document, SCM1-2026 — Support Service Quality State Determination, Verification, and Claims Methodology, is an AMSI methodology publication for evidence-supported determinations, verification, bounded Quality Claims, and third-party certification requirements within the Whole Quality methodology.

Permitted non-commercial use. This document may be used, reproduced, distributed, cited, and discussed, in whole or in part, for informational, educational, research, governmental, professional, service-delivery, and non-commercial standards-development purposes, provided that AMSI is clearly identified as the source, the text is not materially altered in meaning or context, and no implication is made that AMSI endorses a specific organization, program, person, provider, worker, certification body, product, service, decision, or Quality Claim.

This publication does not constitute a law, regulation, professional standard of practice, clinical guideline, accreditation program, certification scheme, audit authorization, funding requirement, contractual obligation, or legal opinion. It does not replace applicable laws, regulations, program requirements, individual plans, professional judgment, safeguarding responsibilities, occupational requirements, or contractual agreements.

Use of this publication does not imply AMSI or WQI certification, approval, endorsement, accreditation, conformity assessment, legal compliance, funding authorization, provider approval, worker approval, service approval, or authorization to use an AMSI mark. Third-party certification requires a separately authorized and controlled certification scheme.