



Justification of the Eight Invariant SSC1 Core Quality Factors

AMSI FSJ1

First Edition, September 2026

**Methodological justification of the eight invariant Core Quality
Factors established by the Support Service Quality Standard — Core
(SSC1)**

SUPPORT SERVICE QUALITY INITIATIVE

Introduction

The Support Service Quality Standard — Core (SSC1) establishes eight invariant Core Quality Factors for defined support services across the AMSI application domain. This paper examines why the Core resolves into these eight Factors and whether they provide an appropriate methodological resolution for Support Service Quality State determination.

The analysis begins with the Support Service Quality Object, Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, Function Realization, Boundaries, Interfaces, Service Period, Service Context, Failure-Mode Families, Critical Service Conditions, and Functional Scope. It then tests whether each Factor preserves a necessary and distinguishable principal dimension through which support-service Function Realization must be examined.

Personal Care Aide support and Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching are used as materially different applications for stress-testing the common architecture. They are not treated as historical sources that define the Core. The same reasoning is intended to remain applicable to additional support-service Context Guides where the specific functions, results, settings, populations, and Failure Modes differ.

The purpose is not to defend the number eight because SSC1 already contains eight Factors. It is to determine whether eight is presently justified as the Core methodological resolution, while keeping controlled future revision open to sufficiently supported Evidence.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Table of Contents	2
1. Purpose and Scope	5
1.1 Purpose of This Paper	5
1.2 What Is Being Justified	5
1.3 What This Paper Does Not Claim	5
2. From Whole Quality Methodology to the SSC1 Core	5
2.1 Methodological Resolution	5
2.2 The Support Service Quality Object Comes First	5
2.3 The Determination Task Comes First	5
2.4 Why the Number of Factors Is a Result	5
3. The Support Service Determination Task	5
3.1 Support Intended Functions and Results	5
3.2 Function Realization	6
3.3 Boundaries, Interfaces, Service Period, and Context	6
3.4 Functional Scope and Reference Layer	6
3.5 Evidence and Quality State	6
4. Method for Deriving and Testing the Factors	6
4.1 From Function Realization to Principal Dimensions	6
4.2 Failure-Mode Families	6

4.3 Separate-Factor Test	6
4.4 Removal and Merger Tests.....	6
4.5 Context-Invariance Test.....	6
5. Why the SSC1 Core Resolves into Eight Factors	7
5.1 Protection from Foreseeable Harm.....	7
5.2 Support Effectiveness in Function Realization.....	7
5.3 Functional Participation and Appropriate Support Balance	7
5.4 Respect for Personhood, Role, Dignity, and Autonomy.....	7
5.5 Recognition and Response to Material Change	7
5.6 Support Integration with Service Conditions and Interfaces	7
5.7 Continuity, Accuracy, and Protection of Support-Relevant Information	7
5.8 Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope	7
5.9 The Eight Factors as One Core	7
6. Factor-by-Factor Justification	8
6.1 Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Harm	8
6.2 Factor 2 — Support Effectiveness in Function Realization.....	8
6.3 Factor 3 — Functional Participation and Appropriate Support Balance.....	9
6.4 Factor 4 — Respect for Personhood, Role, Dignity, and Autonomy.....	9
6.5 Factor 5 — Recognition and Response to Material Change.....	9
6.6 Factor 6 — Support Integration with Service Conditions and Interfaces	10
6.7 Factor 7 — Continuity, Accuracy, and Protection of Support-Relevant Information	10
6.8 Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope.....	11
7. Collective Testing of the Eight-Factor Core	11
7.1 Collective Coverage.....	11
7.2 Removal Test.....	11
7.3 Merger and Redundancy Test	11
7.4 Non-Compensability.....	11
7.5 Possible Gaps.....	11
8. Cross-Context Stress Testing.....	12
8.1 Purpose.....	12
8.2 Personal Care Aide Support	12
8.3 Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching	12
8.4 Additional Support Services.....	12
8.5 Cross-Context Conclusion	12
9. Why Eight — and Not Fewer or More.....	12

9.1 Why Fewer Would Be Too Coarse	12
9.2 Why More Is Not Presently Justified	12
9.3 Eight as the Present Methodological Resolution	12
9.4 Stability and Controlled Revision	12
10. Conclusions	13
Reference Use.....	13
Copyright and Use Notice.....	13

1. Purpose and Scope

1.1 Purpose of This Paper

This paper justifies the eight invariant SSC1 Core Quality Factors and explains why each should remain separately visible in Support Service Quality State determination.

1.2 What Is Being Justified

The question is whether each Factor represents a necessary principal dimension of Function Realization, whether it is distinguishable from neighboring Factors, and whether the complete set provides sufficient collective coverage at the Core level.

1.3 What This Paper Does Not Claim

This paper does not claim that every support service has identical activities, risks, settings, roles, or Intended Results. It does not replace Context Guides, establish Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, or make compliance alone equivalent to quality.

2. From Whole Quality Methodology to the SSC1 Core

2.1 Methodological Resolution

A Core must preserve enough distinction to make materially different quality conditions visible without fragmenting the determination into context-specific detail. Methodological Resolution is therefore a balance between excessive consolidation and excessive division.

2.2 The Support Service Quality Object Comes First

The object of determination is the defined Support Service Quality Object, not automatically a worker, provider, plan, task, record, payer, or isolated outcome. The Factor architecture must remain meaningful for the bounded object actually being evaluated.

2.3 The Determination Task Comes First

The derivation starts from what must remain visible to determine whether the Quality Object realizes its applicable Intended Functions and Intended Results and whether Evidence supports that conclusion.

2.4 Why the Number of Factors Is a Result

Eight is not a numerical premise. The number results from separating principal dimensions whose removal or merger would materially reduce determination capability.

3. The Support Service Determination Task

3.1 Support Intended Functions and Results

Different Support Service Quality Objects may concern daily living, bodily integrity, community participation, employment, education, residential support, or other functions and results. These differences are expressed through the applicable Intended Functions and Intended Results rather than by creating a different Core for each context.

3.2 Function Realization

Function Realization concerns how the defined Support Service Quality Object realizes what it is required or intended to do. The Core Factors are the principal dimensions through which that realization is examined.

3.3 Boundaries, Interfaces, Service Period, and Context

A responsible determination must make visible what is included, excluded, connected, and temporally bounded. Factor interpretation therefore remains tied to the declared Boundary, Interfaces, Service Period, Support Service Arrangement, and Service Context.

3.4 Functional Scope and Reference Layer

Support Work is performed within roles whose authority and limits arise from the applicable Reference Layer. The Core does not create occupational authority; it makes role and scope integrity determinable.

3.5 Evidence and Quality State

Evidence must support findings at the Indicator level, Factor interpretation, and the resulting Support Service Quality State. Favorable activity completion or a single favorable outcome is not a substitute for the complete determination.

4. Method for Deriving and Testing the Factors

4.1 From Function Realization to Principal Dimensions

The derivation asks what major quality-relevant dimensions must remain visible across materially different support-service realization pathways.

4.2 Failure-Mode Families

Failure Modes help reveal where Function Realization may be prevented, weakened, interrupted, distorted, or misdirected. Recurring families of such failures support the need for separately visible Core dimensions.

4.3 Separate-Factor Test

A candidate Factor is retained when it represents a principal dimension, has a distinguishable determination function, remains meaningful across contexts, and cannot be removed or merged without material loss of visibility.

4.4 Removal and Merger Tests

Removal asks what becomes materially less determinable without the Factor. Merger asks whether combining it with a neighboring Factor would conceal an important distinction or create an overbroad residual category.

4.5 Context-Invariance Test

A Core Factor must remain meaningful when specific functions, populations, settings, technologies, and Failure Modes change. Context-specific detail belongs in Context Guides and Outcome Criteria rather than in the invariant Factor title.

5. Why the SSC1 Core Resolves into Eight Factors

5.1 Protection from Foreseeable Harm

Support services can expose a person to foreseeable physical, psychological, environmental, social, or situational harm when hazards are not recognized or protective conditions are not maintained. This dimension must remain separately visible because successful completion of an activity or achievement of an intended result does not establish acceptable quality if preventable harm occurred or remained uncontrolled.

5.2 Support Effectiveness in Function Realization

Support Work is not justified merely because it occurred. It must be aligned with the applicable Support Intended Function(s), contribute effectively to the applicable Support Intended Result(s), remain effective over the relevant Service Period, and adapt when conditions affect Function Realization. This is the direct effectiveness dimension of the support itself.

5.3 Functional Participation and Appropriate Support Balance

Support-service quality depends not only on whether help is available but on whether its level and form are appropriately matched to the person's abilities, needs, and context. Too little support may leave required functions unrealized; too much may unnecessarily substitute for the person, reduce participation, or create dependency.

5.4 Respect for Personhood, Role, Dignity, and Autonomy

A support service acts in direct relation to a person and therefore can realize instrumental results while still degrading dignity, privacy, autonomy, consent, rights, or the person's applicable role. These conditions are not reducible to safety or effectiveness and must remain separately determinable.

5.5 Recognition and Response to Material Change

Support services operate over time and under changing human, environmental, organizational, and functional conditions. Quality therefore depends on the ability to identify material change, judge its significance within role, respond in time, communicate appropriately, and follow through.

5.6 Support Integration with Service Conditions and Interfaces

Support is realized within actual service conditions and across interfaces among people, organizations, environments, equipment, information, routines, and responsibilities. Even competent individual actions may fail when they are incompatible with those conditions or poorly integrated across interfaces.

5.7 Continuity, Accuracy, and Protection of Support-Relevant Information

Support Work depends on information that is accurate, current, relevant, transferred appropriately, coherent across changes, and protected against loss, distortion, misuse, or inappropriate disclosure. Information is therefore part of Function Realization rather than merely administrative documentation.

5.8 Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope

Support services are performed through roles with defined authority, competence expectations, and limits. Quality requires appropriate judgment within Functional Scope and appropriate assistance seeking, escalation, referral, or transfer when a matter exceeds that scope.

5.9 The Eight Factors as One Core

The Factors operate together. Protection, effectiveness, support balance, personhood and autonomy, response to change, service-condition and interface integration, information integrity, and Functional

Scope are interrelated but not interchangeable. The Core therefore treats them as one determination architecture rather than eight independent checklists.

6. Factor-by-Factor Justification

6.1 Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Harm

Support services can expose a person to foreseeable physical, psychological, environmental, social, or situational harm when hazards are not recognized or protective conditions are not maintained. This dimension must remain separately visible because successful completion of an activity or achievement of an intended result does not establish acceptable quality if preventable harm occurred or remained uncontrolled.

If this Factor were removed, harm prevention would be dispersed among effectiveness, change response, context integration, and Functional Scope. A determination could then report favorable results while failing to make the protective condition of the service independently visible.

Core Indicator structure:

- 1.1 Identification of Foreseeable Harm Conditions
- 1.2 Role-Appropriate Control or Mitigation of Identified Harm Conditions
- 1.3 Prevention of Avoidable Harm Within the Support Service Boundary
- 1.4 Maintenance of Protective Conditions During Support

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

6.2 Factor 2 — Support Effectiveness in Function Realization

Support Work is not justified merely because it occurred. It must be aligned with the applicable Support Intended Function(s), contribute effectively to the applicable Support Intended Result(s), remain effective over the relevant Service Period, and adapt when conditions affect Function Realization. This is the direct effectiveness dimension of the support itself.

If this Factor were removed, the Core could examine safety, autonomy, information, scope, and context while never directly asking whether the Support Work materially contributes to what the service is required or intended to realize.

Core Indicator structure:

- 2.1 Alignment of Support Work with Applicable Intended Function(s)
- 2.2 Effective Contribution to Applicable Intended Result(s)
- 2.3 Maintenance of Support Effectiveness Over the Service Period
- 2.4 Adaptation of Support Work When Conditions Affect Function Realization

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

6.3 Factor 3 — Functional Participation and Appropriate Support Balance

Support-service quality depends not only on whether help is available but on whether its level and form are appropriately matched to the person's abilities, needs, and context. Too little support may leave required functions unrealized; too much may unnecessarily substitute for the person, reduce participation, or create dependency.

If this Factor were removed, effectiveness could be interpreted as simply producing a result, without preserving the distinct quality question of how much support is appropriate and whether the person's own functioning and participation remain properly represented.

Core Indicator structure:

- 3.1 Identification of Functions, Activities, or Participation Requiring Support
- 3.2 Support Level and Form Matched to Ability, Need, and Context
- 3.3 Adjustment of Support Level and Method Over Time
- 3.4 Avoidance of Unnecessary Substitution, Over-Support, or Under-Support

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

6.4 Factor 4 — Respect for Personhood, Role, Dignity, and Autonomy

A support service acts in direct relation to a person and therefore can realize instrumental results while still degrading dignity, privacy, autonomy, consent, rights, or the person's applicable role. These conditions are not reducible to safety or effectiveness and must remain separately determinable.

If this Factor were removed, a service could be considered effective and safe while coercive, demeaning, unnecessarily intrusive, or incompatible with the person's choices and role. That would materially weaken Support Service Quality State determination.

Core Indicator structure:

- 4.1 Respect for Dignity, Privacy, and Personal Integrity
- 4.2 Respect for Choice, Consent, Preferences, Rights, and Autonomy
- 4.3 Respect for Applicable Personal, Social, Community, Household, Student, Worker, or Other Role
- 4.4 Absence of Coercive, Demeaning, Infantilizing, Stigmatizing, or Unnecessarily Intrusive Practice

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

6.5 Factor 5 — Recognition and Response to Material Change

Support services operate over time and under changing human, environmental, organizational, and functional conditions. Quality therefore depends on the ability to identify material change, judge its significance within role, respond in time, communicate appropriately, and follow through.

If this Factor were removed, dynamic responsiveness would be fragmented across harm prevention, effectiveness, information, and scope. The Core would lose a distinct view of whether the service remains responsive as relevant conditions change.

Core Indicator structure:

- 5.1 Identification of Material Change Relevant to Support
- 5.2 Role-Appropriate Judgment Regarding the Significance of Material Change
- 5.3 Timely Role-Appropriate Response to Material Change
- 5.4 Appropriate Communication and Follow-Through After Material Change

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

6.6 Factor 6 — Support Integration with Service Conditions and Interfaces

Support is realized within actual service conditions and across interfaces among people, organizations, environments, equipment, information, routines, and responsibilities. Even competent individual actions may fail when they are incompatible with those conditions or poorly integrated across interfaces.

If this Factor were removed, context would become background description rather than a quality-relevant dimension. Interface failures, support-created disruption, and failures of required participation could become visible only after they affected another Factor.

Core Indicator structure:

- 6.1 Compatibility of Support Work with Material Service Conditions
- 6.2 Effective Functioning Across Relevant Service Interfaces
- 6.3 Support of Required Context Participation and Interaction
- 6.4 Avoidance of Support-Created Context or Interface Disruption

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

6.7 Factor 7 — Continuity, Accuracy, and Protection of Support-Relevant Information

Support Work depends on information that is accurate, current, relevant, transferred appropriately, coherent across changes, and protected against loss, distortion, misuse, or inappropriate disclosure. Information is therefore part of Function Realization rather than merely administrative documentation.

If this Factor were removed, information failures could be treated only as secondary causes of other problems. The Core would lose direct visibility of whether the information environment needed to guide support is itself adequate and trustworthy.

Core Indicator structure:

- 7.1 Accuracy, Currency, and Relevance of Information Used to Guide Support
- 7.2 Appropriate Transfer of Support-Relevant Information Across Workers, Periods, Arrangements, and Interfaces
- 7.3 Continuity of Support Logic and Direction Across Material Changes
- 7.4 Protection from Information Loss, Distortion, Misuse, or Inappropriate Disclosure

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

6.8 Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope

Support services are performed through roles with defined authority, competence expectations, and limits. Quality requires appropriate judgment within Functional Scope and appropriate assistance seeking, escalation, referral, or transfer when a matter exceeds that scope.

If this Factor were removed, favorable intentions or results could obscure unauthorized practice, inappropriate assumption of reserved responsibilities, or failure to transfer responsibility when required. Role integrity must therefore remain independently visible.

Core Indicator structure:

- 8.1 Practice Within Authorized Support Role and Functional Scope
- 8.2 Appropriate Judgment Within Functional Scope
- 8.3 Avoidance of Unauthorized or Reserved Practice
- 8.4 Appropriate Assistance Seeking, Escalation, Referral, or Transfer of Responsibility

Distinguishability: This Factor interacts with neighboring Factors but retains a separate determination function. Interaction does not by itself establish redundancy; the relevant test is whether the Factor can be removed or absorbed without material loss of visibility.

Context invariance: The specific conditions, criteria, Evidence, and Failure Modes differ among Context Guides, but the principal dimension represented by this Factor remains applicable at the Core level.

7. Collective Testing of the Eight-Factor Core

7.1 Collective Coverage

Taken together, the eight Factors preserve the principal dimensions needed to examine support-service Function Realization without converting context-specific subject matter into universal Core categories.

7.2 Removal Test

Each Factor fails the removal test in the constructive sense: removing any one creates a material blind spot that is not adequately restored by the remaining seven.

7.3 Merger and Redundancy Test

Several Factors interact closely, especially Factors 1 and 5, 2 and 3, 4 and 6, and 6 and 7. The distinctions nevertheless remain necessary: protection is not the same as response to change; effectiveness is not support balance; personhood is not context integration; and information integrity is not interface functioning.

7.4 Non-Compensability

A favorable finding under one Factor does not automatically compensate for a critical failure under another. Critical Service Conditions and Support Service Non-Substitutability preserve this principle.

7.5 Possible Gaps

A new activity, population, setting, technology, or risk does not by itself establish a missing Factor. A gap exists only if a necessary principal dimension cannot be responsibly represented by the existing Factors and their Indicators.

8. Cross-Context Stress Testing

8.1 Purpose

The common Core must survive materially different support-service applications without forcing their context-specific content into universal Factor names.

8.2 Personal Care Aide Support

PCA applications stress-test bodily safety, daily-life functioning, privacy, autonomy, hygiene and environmental conditions, changing needs, information continuity, and role limits. These subjects map to the common Factors while their specific expected conditions remain contextual.

8.3 Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching

Job Coaching stress-tests job performance, worker independence, workplace participation, employer and coworker interfaces, changing job demands, employment-relevant information, and role boundaries. Again, the specific content differs while the principal Core dimensions remain common.

8.4 Additional Support Services

Community, residential, educational, respite, homemaker, and other support-service contexts may expose different Failure Modes and criteria. They should be used as continuing tests of the Core rather than assumed to require new Factors.

8.5 Cross-Context Conclusion

The cross-context test supports one SSC1 Core because the principal dimensions of Function Realization remain common even where the substantive work and Intended Results differ.

9. Why Eight — and Not Fewer or More

9.1 Why Fewer Would Be Too Coarse

Fewer Factors would require mergers that conceal materially different determination functions, especially safety versus change response, effectiveness versus support balance, and personhood versus context integration.

9.2 Why More Is Not Presently Justified

Additional factors based only on particular activities, hazards, populations, technologies, or settings would move context-specific detail into the invariant Core and reduce portability.

9.3 Eight as the Present Methodological Resolution

The present eight-Factor structure is justified because it preserves necessary distinctions while remaining sufficiently general for materially different support-service Context Guides.

9.4 Stability and Controlled Revision

Stability supports comparison across contexts and time, but stability does not mean rigidity. Revision should require evidence of a recurring Core-level gap or redundancy demonstrated across contexts.

10. Conclusions

The analysis supports the eight SSC1 Core Quality Factors as the present invariant methodological resolution for support-service quality determination. Each Factor represents a necessary and distinguishable principal dimension of Function Realization, and the complete set provides collective coverage without making context-specific activities or outcomes universal.

The final proposition is therefore: the SSC1 Core should retain eight invariant Core Quality Factors unless future cross-context Evidence demonstrates that a principal dimension is missing, redundant, or divided at an inappropriate methodological resolution.

Reference Use

This justification is an explanatory AMSI Resource. SSC1 remains the normative Core source for the Factor names and architecture. WQI and AMSI vocabulary and applicable Context Guides govern controlled terminology and context-specific interpretation. This paper does not independently redefine SSC1.

Copyright and Use Notice

Copyright © Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI), 2026. All rights reserved.

This document, Justification of the Eight Invariant SSC1 Core Quality Factors, is a methodological resource published by the Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI) in support of SSC1.

This Resource may be used, reproduced, and distributed, in whole or in part, for informational and non-commercial purposes, provided that all reproductions include this Copyright and Use Notice and do not imply AMSI certification, approval, endorsement, accreditation, regulatory approval, professional acceptance, legal compliance, guaranteed capability or deliverability, or performance of a conformity assessment by AMSI.

Restrictions. No part of this Resource may be modified, adapted, abridged, translated, excerpted in a manner that alters meaning, or incorporated into another standard, specification, regulation, certification scheme, audit program, commercial product, training product, software tool, or conformity-assessment program without prior written permission from AMSI.

No endorsement; no certification. Use of terms, definitions, concepts, analytical methods, Factor or Indicator justifications, examples, or other content from this Resource does not imply AMSI certification, approval, endorsement, accreditation, regulatory approval, professional acceptance, legal compliance, or acceptance of any Support Service Quality State determination or Support Service Quality Claim.

Relationship to SSC1. This Resource explains methodological reasoning supporting SSC1. It is informative and does not replace, supersede, amend, or independently establish the normative provisions of SSC1, an AMSI Context Guide, or any applicable law, regulation, professional requirement, authorization, Reference Layer source, or occupational scope requirement.

Disclaimer of warranties. AMSI makes this Resource available on an “as is” basis, without warranty of any kind, express or implied, including without limitation warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, completeness, accuracy, or suitability for any specific person, service, provider, program, jurisdiction, Support Service Quality Object, Support Service Quality State determination, or Support Service Quality Claim.

Limitation of liability. AMSI disclaims any liability for the use, interpretation, or application of this document, including any direct, indirect, incidental, special, exemplary, or consequential damages arising from reliance on it or from any Support Service Quality Claim Statement, decision, assessment, service operation, or action based on it.

Revisions. AMSI reserves the right to revise, amend, replace, or withdraw this document at any time. Users are responsible for ensuring that they are referencing the current edition.