TIC1-2026

SUPPORT-SERVICE QUALITY & TECHNOLOGY

Why Technology Must Follow the Whole Quality Architecture

AMSI Analytical Publication within the Whole Quality Methodology

Updated Edition - August 2026

AMERICAN SUPPORT STANDARDS INITIATIVE

Abstract

Editorial Alignment Note (August 2026)

This edition aligns TIC1 with the stabilized August 2026 Whole Quality and AMSI document architecture. It preserves TIC1 as an analytical publication while strengthening the Support Service Quality Object framework, Structural Checkpoints, object- and Scale-relative Boundaries and Interfaces, Boundary Transparency, Interface Transparency, Evidence traceability, and bounded Support Service Quality Claims.

Artificial intelligence, digital platforms, communication tools, sensors, scheduling systems, documentation systems, and other technologies are increasingly used in support services. They may assist communication, coordination, accessibility, documentation, pattern recognition, scheduling, monitoring, and organization of Evidence. They may also narrow attention, alter Support Work, introduce new Interfaces, obscure responsibility, expose personal information, amplify bias, or create unsupported confidence in a service decision or Quality Claim.

TIC1 applies the stabilized Whole Quality architecture to these conditions. Technology does not define Support Service Quality. The analysis begins with the declared Support Service Quality Object, Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, Support Work, Support Results, Support Service Boundaries, Support Service Interfaces, Service Context, applicable Core Quality Factors and Core Quality Indicators, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, Critical Service Conditions, Uncertainty, and the Support Service Quality Claim Boundary. Technology is evaluated only after this structure is visible.

The governing principle is standards first, technology second. A technology system may become a component of the Support Service Quality Object, a Support Service Realization Pathway, an Interface, a source of Data, a possible source of Evidence, or part of the applicable Reference Layer. Its role depends on the declared Boundary. It cannot substitute for the Person Receiving Support, responsible Support Workers, Function Realization, Evidence Sufficiency, Quality State determination, or accountable claims.

TIC1 therefore provides a controlled method for assessing whether technology supports, preserves, weakens, distorts, or remains unrelated to Support Service Quality. It is analytical and explanatory. It does not approve a technology, certify an AI system, establish a procurement rule, replace professional or legal responsibilities, or authorize automated decision-making.

Terminology note. TIC1 uses technology-supported service, AI-supported work, and technology-related quality condition as explanatory expressions. Technology and Technology Governance are WQI Root Concepts. Support Service Quality Object, Support Work, Support Result, Support Service, Service Context, Support Service Quality State determination, and Support Service Quality Claim Statement are AMSI Applied Concepts governed by AMSI VOC1.

Table of Contents

1 Purpose and Analytical Position

TIC1 examines the relationship between technology and Support Service Quality. It asks whether a technology system or technology-mediated practice materially supports or undermines realization of the declared Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results. The technology is not evaluated in the abstract. It is evaluated in relation to a defined Support Service Quality Object, Service Context, Service Period, participants, Support Work, Support Results, Boundaries, Interfaces, Evidence needs, Critical Service Conditions, and intended claim.

The analytical position is quality-first and technology-neutral. TIC1 does not presume that new technology improves quality, and it does not presume that technology necessarily harms quality. A technology-related finding must be based on the role the system actually performs, the conditions under which it is used, the Effects it produces or fails to produce, and the Evidence available within the declared Boundary.

Narrative clarification. Technology is assessed neither as an isolated product nor as a general promise of modernization. Its quality relevance arises only through the material role it performs within the declared Support Service Quality Object. Accordingly, the analysis must distinguish technical capability from actual use, intended use from realized effect, and system output from the Support Result experienced by the Person Receiving Support.

1.1 Relationship to the AMSI document architecture

AMSI SAM1 explains why support services need their own quality standards. AMSI VOC1 establishes the authoritative Applied Vocabulary. WQS1 explains the Whole Quality Framework for support services. AMSI ORF1 preserves occupational identity, Support Roles, Functional Scope, Competence, authorization, and responsibility. AMSI Core Standards establish invariant service-domain architecture; Context Guides provide bounded interpretation; and AMSI SCM1 governs Support Service Quality State determination, verification, claims, and third-party certification. TIC1 applies that architecture to technology without redefining any Root, Applied, Core, or methodology concept.

1.2 Scope and limits

TIC1 applies to technologies used in personal assistance, vocational rehabilitation, job coaching, community and residential support, communication support, health-related support, education, employment, and adjacent support-service settings. It includes AI-enabled and non-AI technologies. It does not establish product-safety requirements, cybersecurity controls, medical-device approval, software validation, legal compliance, procurement specifications, or a general technology-governance system. Such requirements may form part of the applicable Reference Layer and remain controlling where relevant.

1.3 Framework Principle

The Support Service Quality Object framework is the governing conceptual model for TIC1. Technology shall be interpreted only after the declared Support Service Quality Object, its Scale, Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, Support Work and Support Results, Service Period, Internal Boundaries, External Boundary, Internal Interfaces, External Interfaces, responsibilities, Context, Evidence basis, Critical Service Conditions, and intended Support Service Quality Claim Boundary are sufficiently visible. TIC1 does not establish an alternative quality methodology or redefine authoritative Root, Applied, Core, occupational, determination, verification, or claim concepts.

1.4 Framework and Vocabulary Governance

TIC1 uses the authoritative terminology established by WQI_VOC1, AMSI VOC1, WQS1, AMSI ORF1, the governing Core Standard and applicable Context Guide, and AMSI SCM1. It does not create competing definitions. Where a technology-related expression is used for explanation, it remains subordinate to the governing Root, Applied, occupational, Core, determination, verification, and claim terminology. Internal or external classification of a Boundary, Interface, participant, system, Data source, or responsibility is always relative to the declared Support Service Quality Object and its declared Scale.

The controlled interpretive sequence is: Support Service Quality Object and Description; Structural Checkpoints; Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results; Support Work and Support Results; Internal

Boundaries and Internal Interfaces; External Boundary and External Interfaces; Core Quality Factors and Core Quality Indicators; Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria; Data and Evidence evaluation; Evidence-Supported Findings; Quality Factor Interpretation; Critical Service Condition and Non-Substitutability Review; Support Service Quality State determination; Verification; and a bounded Support Service Quality Claim Statement.

2 Quality Architecture Before Technology

2.1 The Support Service Quality Object is the primary reference point

Every technology analysis begins with a declared Support Service Quality Object and a sufficiently complete Support Service Quality Object Description. The description identifies the service whole, Support Intended Functions and Support Intended Results, Support Work, Support Results, participants, Scale, Service Period, Support Service Boundaries, Support Service Interfaces, responsibilities, Service Context, expected or available Evidence sources, known Uncertainty, and intended Support Service Quality Claim Boundary.

Structural Checkpoints should be completed before detailed technology interpretation proceeds. A vague statement that technology is used in the service is insufficient. The description should identify the system, its actual role, users, affected persons, inputs, outputs, decision pathways, data flows, responsibility arrangements, limitations, update conditions, and relationship to the Support Intended Function. Where these elements are unclear, the object or proposed claim should be refined or restricted.

A technology description is methodologically incomplete when it identifies only a product name, feature set, vendor, or deployment status. The description must show where the technology enters the service, whose Work it changes, what Result it is expected to support, what human or organizational responsibilities remain, and what conditions would make its use inappropriate, ineffective, or outside the declared Boundary. This prevents adoption status from being mistaken for Function Realization.

2.2 Technology follows the function, not the reverse

The Support Intended Function expresses what the Support Service Quality Object is expected to support, enable, preserve, protect, maintain, develop, restore, or otherwise realize for the Person Receiving Support. Technology may be selected only after this function and the relevant Support Intended Results are sufficiently visible. The design or availability of a tool does not establish that the tool is needed, appropriate, effective, or within the permissible service Boundary.

A technology-led sequence often begins with a tool and then redesigns the work around the tool. The Whole Quality sequence is different: declare the object -> identify the Support Intended Function and Support Intended Results -> describe required Support Work and responsibility -> identify relevant Failure Modes and Critical Service Conditions -> establish Factors, Indicators, Criteria, and Evidence needs -> determine whether technology can support this architecture without distortion.

This sequence does not prohibit innovation. It disciplines innovation by requiring the proposed tool to answer a declared support need rather than silently redefining that need around what the tool can measure, automate, or sell. Where technology changes the Support Service Realization Pathway, the revised pathway must still preserve the governing Support Intended Functions, Support Intended Results, role limits, Critical Service Conditions, and Evidence requirements.

3 What Technology May and May Not Do

3.1 Permissible support roles

Depending on the declared object and Boundary, technology may support communication, accessibility, reminders, scheduling, navigation, documentation, translation, coordination, information retrieval, pattern recognition, environmental control, remote connection, adaptive interaction, incident detection, Evidence organization, or other defined parts of a Support Service Realization Pathway. A permissible role remains bounded by the applicable Support Role, Functional Scope, authorization, Competence, Service Context, privacy conditions, and human or organizational responsibility.

Technology role	May support	Does not by itself establish
Communication or accessibility aid	Expression, comprehension, access, reminders, or alternative interaction pathways.	Consent, understanding, participation, autonomy, or satisfactory communication support.
Documentation or summarization tool	Organization of records, drafting, retrieval, or structured presentation of information.	Accuracy, completeness, Evidence status, Function Realization, or Quality State.
Scheduling or coordination system	Visibility of assignments, timing, transitions, and information exchange.	Actual continuity, timely Support Work, clear responsibility, or successful Interfaces.
Monitoring, sensing, or alerting system	Detection of declared events or conditions within authorized Boundaries.	Safety, absence of failure, appropriate response, or justification for intrusive surveillance.
Decision-support or pattern-recognition system	Identification of patterns, options, questions, or possible areas requiring review.	Professional judgment, legal authority, service responsibility, or a responsible Quality Claim.
Automation or assistive control	Performance or facilitation of a declared task or environmental action.	Realization of the complete Support Intended Function or satisfactory quality of the broader service whole.

3.2 Prohibited substitution errors

Technology becomes methodologically problematic when it is treated as a substitute for something it cannot establish. Common substitution errors include:

- treating software completion, data entry, or an automated alert as proof that Support Work was adequately performed;
- treating an AI-generated summary as Evidence without establishing source accuracy, traceability, context, review, and relevance;
- treating a favorable score or dashboard as the Support Service Quality State;
- treating the absence of an alert, complaint, or recorded incident as proof of absence of failure;
- treating technology availability as proof of accessibility, usability, consent, participation, or person-centered support;
- treating an automated recommendation as a transfer of responsibility from the authorized person or organization;
- treating efficiency, lower cost, or reduced staffing as evidence that the Support Intended Function is realized.

The common feature of these substitution errors is category collapse: a technical event is treated as though it were Support Work, an output as though it were Evidence, an efficiency gain as though it were a Support Result, or a system score as though it were the Quality State. TIC1 preserves these distinctions so that technology can contribute to responsible interpretation without taking the place of the service architecture it is intended to support.

4 Human Participants, Occupational Identity, and Responsibility

The Person Receiving Support remains a principal participant in the service. Technology may assist expression, access, participation, or supported decision-making, but it does not erase the person's needs, preferences, rights, lived conditions, refusal, consent, or material experience. A technology-mediated interaction should not be treated as person-centered merely because it is individualized by software.

Support Worker is a functional service term. The applicable Occupation, Job, Support Role, Functional Scope, Competence, authorization, and responsibilities remain identifiable when technology is introduced. Technology may change how a function is performed, but it does not automatically change who is responsible for that function or create authority outside the declared work arrangement.

Where work involves Blended Occupational Practice, Occupational Time-Sharing, Multiple-Role Practice, remote support, or automated components, responsibility attribution should remain transparent. A person or organization should not rely on the technology as an unnamed participant that absorbs responsibility. The technology role, responsible user, escalation pathway, review duty, and decision authority should be declared within the Role and Responsibility Arrangement.

Responsibility transparency is especially important where a technology recommends, prioritizes, filters, denies, or delays a service action. The record should identify who is expected to understand the output, who may override it, who must respond when it fails, and who remains accountable for the resulting Support Work and Support Result. A human presence alone does not establish meaningful review if the person lacks time, Competence, authority, access to source information, or a practical alternative to accepting the output.

5 Technology Within the Work-Result-Service Relationship

AMSI uses the conceptual relationship Support Work + Support Result = Support Service. Technology may contribute to Support Work, affect a Support Result, or become part of the bounded Support Service Realization Pathway. The relationship remains conceptual, not arithmetic and not exclusively causal.

A tool may perform a task while the intended Result is not achieved. A favorable Result may occur despite a technology failure or for reasons unrelated to the technology. An automated process may produce a technically correct output while weakening dignity, consent, trust, continuity, accessibility, or the Person-Support Worker Interface. Conversely, technology may materially improve Function Realization when its contribution is appropriate, usable, reliable, timely, and integrated with responsible Support Work.

The existence of technology-supported Work or a technology-associated Result does not establish Support Service Quality. Both must be interpreted against the Support Intended Function, Support Intended Result, Service Context, Boundaries, Interfaces, applicable Quality Outcome Criteria, Critical Service Conditions, Evidence, Uncertainty, and claim limits.

The technology contribution should therefore be stated narrowly. It may support one task, one Interface, one information pathway, one Evidence source, or one condition of continuity without establishing the quality of the broader Support Service Quality Object. This bounded interpretation is necessary when several people, organizations, technologies, and natural supports jointly contribute to the same Result.

6 Boundaries, Interfaces, and Technology-Mediated Service Conditions

For TIC1, Boundary Transparency means that the included technology, excluded technology, participants, functions, Data flows, responsibilities, versions, configurations, Service Period, and external dependencies are expressly identified. Interface Transparency means that the material interactions among people, technologies, organizations, Data systems, vendors, funders, and oversight bodies are visible together with their controls, failure pathways, and responsibility arrangements.

6.1 Boundary declaration

The Support Service Boundary should state whether the technology is inside the declared Support Service Quality Object, outside the object as part of the Reference Layer, or partly inside through a defined Interface. This decision controls what is observed, interpreted, and claimed. A provider platform may be part of the service arrangement; a public communication network may be an external dependency; an assistive device may be part of the Person-Technology Interface; and an AI service may cross organizational and jurisdictional Boundaries through remote processing.

Boundary and Interface classification is relative to the declared Support Service Quality Object and its declared Scale. Internal Boundaries organize constituent parts within the object; Internal Interfaces enable Function Realization among those parts. The External Boundary separates the declared object from the External Reference Layer, while External Interfaces connect the object to vendors, public networks, funders, regulators, external data services, and other systems not included within the object. Boundary Transparency and Interface Transparency shall make these inclusions, exclusions, dependencies, responsibilities, and limitations visible.

Boundary Transparency should include technology ownership, control, users, data location where relevant, update authority, vendor dependency, access conditions, failure response, maintenance responsibility, and periods of use. A Quality Claim should not imply evaluation of unexamined software components, vendor practices, future versions, unrelated uses, or service periods outside the declared Boundary.

Boundary Transparency and Interface Transparency also prevent unsupported claim expansion. A finding about a configured system in one setting, for one participant group, during one Service Period, and under one responsibility arrangement cannot be generalized automatically to other versions, vendors, populations, settings, or uses. The claim must remain no broader than the technology role and dependencies actually examined.

6.2 Principal technology-related Interfaces

Interface	Possible support	Possible failure mode	Necessary control or visibility
Person-Technology	Communication, access, environmental control, reminders, choice expression.	Inaccessibility, coercion, confusion, exclusion, privacy loss, overreliance.	Consent, usability, alternatives, accessibility, support, refusal pathway, impact Evidence.
Support Worker-Technology	Information access, documentation, coordination, prompts, decision support.	Automation bias, rigid workflow, divided attention, inaccurate output, responsibility ambiguity.	Competence, review duty, override authority, escalation, time and workload effects.
Person-Support Worker through technology	Remote support, mediated communication, shared information.	Loss of context, weakened trust, missed cues, distorted interaction.	Appropriate modality, continuity, communication accessibility, backup pathway.
Provider-Vendor or System	Implementation, maintenance, analytics, technical support.	Vendor lock-in, unannounced change, unavailable support, unclear data or decision control.	Contractual responsibilities, version control, incident handling, change review.
Funder or Oversight-Technology	Authorization, reporting, quality visibility, payment or monitoring.	Reduction of service to coded activity, perverse incentives, surveillance, claim inflation.	Separation of administrative Data from Evidence and Quality State determination.
Technology-Technology or Data Interface	Information exchange, integration, continuity, automated workflow.	Data loss, mismatch, duplication, latency, corrupted context, untraceable transformations.	Interface testing, traceability, reconciliation, responsibility and fallback arrangements.

7 Technology Governance and Structural Checkpoints

Technology Governance concerns how technology selection, configuration, use, access, change, oversight, and retirement are controlled in relation to the declared Quality Object and Intended Function. It does not mean that every service requires a separate governance bureaucracy. Controls should be proportionate to complexity, consequence, Uncertainty, privacy impact, and the breadth of the intended claim.

Technology Governance is not separate from quality architecture. It is the controlled means by which selection, configuration, access, use, review, change, incident response, and retirement remain traceable to the declared object and Function Realization. Structural Checkpoints confirm that these relationships are sufficiently visible before a favorable technology-related finding or claim is considered; they do not themselves establish that the technology is safe, effective, accessible, unbiased, or quality-supporting.

7.1 Pre-use and continuing checkpoints

Before technology becomes material to the service or a Quality Claim, the following questions should be answered:

- What Support Intended Function, Support Intended Result, Support Work, Interface, Evidence need, or Critical Service Condition is the technology intended to support?
- Is the technology role inside or outside the declared Support Service Quality Object and Claim Boundary?
- Who is authorized and responsible for selection, configuration, use, review, override, maintenance, escalation, and discontinuation?
- What participants are affected, what consent or refusal conditions apply, and what accessible alternative exists?
- What Data enter the system, what outputs leave it, what transformations occur, and what traceability is preserved?
- What Failure Modes, Uncertainty, bias, privacy, security, continuity, or accessibility risks are material to Function Realization?
- What Evidence will show whether the technology supports, preserves, weakens, or distorts the service?
- What change in software, model, data source, configuration, vendor, participant, context, or use would require reassessment or restriction of the claim?

7.2 Change, Assumption Drift, and lifecycle conditions

Technology changes over time. Software updates, model changes, data drift, configuration changes, altered user behavior, new vendor terms, declining maintenance, or changed Service Context may invalidate earlier assumptions. Assumption Drift should remain visible. A finding about one version, configuration, population, context, or Service Period is not automatically transferable to another.

A material change may require renewed Structural Checkpoints, revised Evidence planning, a restricted Support Service Quality Claim Boundary, or a new Quality State determination. Continued use of an earlier claim after a material technology change may be misleading even where the document or certification validity period has not formally expired.

8 Data, AI Outputs, Evidence, and Evidence Continuity

8.1 Data are not automatically Evidence

Data, system outputs, records, alerts, scores, predictions, summaries, and recommendations remain Data until their relevance, credibility, Context, traceability, currency, attribution, integrity, and relationship to the declared object and applicable criterion are established. Only then may they contribute to Evidence-Supported Findings. A Finding is not itself a Quality Factor Interpretation, and neither a Finding nor a technology-generated score independently determines the Support Service Quality State.

Technology may generate Data, records, logs, alerts, transcripts, scores, images, predictions, summaries, or recommendations. These outputs become Evidence only when their relevance, credibility, context, traceability, currency, and relationship to the declared object, Indicator, Criterion, and claim are established. Volume, precision, fluency, or technical complexity does not by itself establish Evidence Sufficiency.

A system-generated record may document that an event was logged without proving that the event occurred as represented. A prediction may identify possible risk without proving the presence of the risk. A summary may omit contrary information or contextual meaning. A sensor may fail silently or detect the wrong condition. Technology output should therefore be evaluated together with source conditions, known limitations, corroborating information, and the consequences of error.

8.2 AI-generated and transformed outputs

The distinction is consequential: Data describe recorded or generated information, while Evidence is information whose relationship to a particular object, criterion, period, source, and claim has been established. Evidence-

Supported Findings are then bounded conclusions derived from that Evidence. Neither Data nor a Finding independently constitutes Quality Factor Interpretation or the overall Support Service Quality State.

Where AI generates, transforms, classifies, ranks, or summarizes information, the Evidence record should identify the source material, system role, relevant configuration or version where feasible, review process, corrections, unresolved uncertainty, and the responsible person or authority. Human review is not a ceremonial approval step. The reviewer should have sufficient Competence, access, authority, and time to identify material errors and to reject or qualify the output.

Review of AI output should be understood as an active quality function rather than a formal signature. The reviewer must be able to test the output against the source material, the declared Service Context, contrary information, and the consequences of error. Where that review cannot be performed responsibly, the output should remain qualified, restricted, or excluded from the Evidence basis rather than accepted because it appears fluent or technically sophisticated.

For lower-consequence administrative uses, proportionate review may be sufficient. For decisions affecting safety, dignity, consent, essential support, employment, health-related stability, rights, or access to services, stronger Evidence and independent checks may be necessary. A technology vendor statement, benchmark, or general accuracy rate does not establish suitability or quality in the declared Service Context.

8.3 Evidence continuity and absence of alerts

Support Service Evidence Continuity requires that material Evidence remain connected across Interactions, Episodes, Service Periods, participants, systems, and transitions where that continuity is necessary to interpret the service. Technology may strengthen continuity through reliable information transfer, or weaken it through fragmented records, incompatible systems, inaccessible formats, version changes, data loss, or automated compression of context.

Absence of a technology-generated alert, recorded complaint, or detected failure is an Evidence condition, not proof of satisfactory quality. Its significance depends on observation coverage, system sensitivity, correct configuration, access, user behavior, service history, contrary Evidence, and the declared claim Boundary.

9 Critical Service Conditions and Non-Substitutability

Some technology-related conditions are critical because their failure or unresolved status prevents a responsible positive Quality State determination or claim. Examples may concern consent, privacy, essential communication access, timely response to alerts, safe fallback, continuity of indispensable support, responsibility for high-consequence decisions, or Evidence Sufficiency.

Support Service Non-Substitutability means that favorable findings elsewhere cannot compensate for a failed or unresolved Critical Service Condition. Efficiency, lower cost, high user adoption, strong documentation, a favorable model score, or good performance in unrelated areas cannot offset a material failure affecting safety, dignity, autonomy, consent, or essential Function Realization.

Technology-related Critical Service Conditions should be derived from the governing Core Standard and Service Context rather than assumed universally. A failure that is tolerable in one low-consequence administrative use may be non-compensable in a service pathway on which essential communication, health-related stability, or immediate safety depends.

This review also prevents favorable technical performance from compensating for a failed service condition. A system may be accurate, fast, available, or cost-saving and still be unsuitable for a declared object because consent, accessibility, responsibility, fallback, communication, dignity, or Evidence Sufficiency is not maintained. Technical strength and Support Service Quality are related only through the conditions of Function Realization.

10 Rights, Dignity, Privacy, Accessibility, and Bias

Technology-supported Support Work should preserve dignity, autonomy, participation, privacy, accessibility, and supported decision-making. These are not optional additions to technical performance. They may form part of

the Support Intended Function, Core Quality Factors, Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria, or Critical Service Conditions applicable to the object.

Bias may arise from training data, design assumptions, missing representation, inaccessible interfaces, language limitations, proxy variables, unequal monitoring, organizational use, or unequal ability to challenge an output. A system can perform consistently and still create unequal or inappropriate service conditions. Bias analysis should therefore examine the service effect, not only the technical model.

Privacy and surveillance require Boundary discipline. More observation is not automatically more Evidence or more quality. Collection should be proportionate, authorized, relevant, and limited to the declared purpose. People should not be required to surrender unnecessary privacy as the default price of receiving support where less intrusive Evidence can provide sufficient visibility.

The Person Receiving Support should not be treated merely as a data subject, user account, risk profile, or recipient of a system decision. The analysis must preserve the person as a constituent part of the Support Service Quality Object whose communication, preferences, rights, refusal, lived experience, and actual Support Results are material to the determination. Where technology reduces that visibility, the loss is itself a quality-relevant condition.

11 Support Service Quality State Determination and Claims

A Support Service Quality State is the interpreted quality condition of the declared object at a stated time or during a stated Service Period. A technology-related finding contributes to that determination only through its material relationship to the relevant Quality Factors, Indicators, Criteria, Evidence-Supported Findings, Critical Service Conditions, Non-Substitutability, Assumptions, Uncertainty, and limitations.

Technology does not determine the Quality State by producing a score, recommendation, or dashboard. Such output may support interpretation when its Evidence status and limits are established. The responsible determination remains bounded by the object and governed by the applicable Core Standard, Context Guide, and SCM1 method.

The determination sequence remains cumulative but non-collapsible: Data may support Evidence; Evidence may support bounded Findings; Findings are integrated through Quality Factor Interpretation; Critical Service Conditions and Non-Substitutability limit the conclusion; and the resulting Support Service Quality State bounds any claim. A technology-generated result cannot bypass any of these stages.

11.1 Claim controls

A Support Service Quality Claim Statement involving technology should identify, as applicable:

- the declared Support Service Quality Object, Service Context, Service Period, and Claim Boundary;
- the technology system, version or configuration where material, role, users, and Interfaces included;
- the Support Intended Function, Support Work, Support Result, Factor, Indicator, or Criterion the technology supports;
- the Evidence basis, review process, contrary Evidence, Assumptions, Uncertainty, and known limitations;
- the responsible party, decision authority, Independence status, and conditions of continued validity;
- any excluded technology component, unassessed vendor practice, unobserved context, or future use that the claim does not cover.

A claim should not state or imply that a technology is AMSI-approved, WQI-approved, safe for all contexts, unbiased, autonomous, person-centered, or quality-assuring unless that exact bounded assertion is supported by an authorized and sufficient determination. Certification of a Support Service is not general certification of the technology, vendor, worker, provider, or all future services.

Controlled architectural dependency: Support Service Quality Object and Description -> Structural Checkpoints -> Support Intended Functions and Results -> Support Work and Results -> Internal Boundaries and Interfaces -> External Boundary and Interfaces -> Core Quality Factors and Core Quality Indicators -> Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria -> Data and Evidence evaluation -> Evidence-Supported Findings -> Quality Factor

Interpretation -> Critical Service Condition and Non-Substitutability Review -> Support Service Quality State determination -> Verification and bounded Support Service Quality Claim Statement.

12 A Controlled Technology-Assessment Sequence

A practical TIC1 analysis can proceed through the following sequence:

1. Declare and describe the Support Service Quality Object, Service Context, Service Period, participants, responsibilities, and intended Claim Boundary.
2. Complete Structural Checkpoints and refine or restrict the object where technology role, data flow, responsibility, or Boundary remains unclear.
3. Identify the governing Support Intended Functions, Support Intended Results, Core Standard, applicable Context Guide, Core Quality Factors, Core Quality Indicators, and Critical Service Conditions.
4. Describe the Support Work, Support Results, Support Service Realization Pathways, and Interfaces before adding the technology analysis.
5. Declare the technology role, users, inputs, outputs, data transformations, configuration, responsible authority, access conditions, fallback, and lifecycle assumptions.
6. Identify technology-related Failure Modes, bias, accessibility, privacy, continuity, security, responsibility, and Evidence risks material to Function Realization.
7. Define Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria and Evidence sources capable of showing actual support, preservation, weakening, distortion, or unresolved effect.
8. Evaluate Data and outputs for Evidence status, traceability, credibility, contrary information, and sufficiency; do not treat absence of alerts as proof of satisfactory quality.
9. Interpret technology-related findings at the Quality Factor level and complete Critical-Condition, Non-Substitutability, Assumption, and Uncertainty review.
10. Determine the Support Service Quality State and formulate any claim so that the technology role, Evidence basis, limitations, responsible parties, and conditions of continued validity remain transparent.

The sequence may be proportionately simplified for a narrow, low-consequence use, but the logical order should be preserved. Technology should not be adopted first and justified afterward through a claim whose quality architecture was never declared.

13 Practical Implications for Stakeholders

- For the Person Receiving Support and family or representative: preserve meaningful choice, consent, refusal, accessible alternatives, privacy, dignity, and visibility of how technology affects the real service.
- For Support Workers: identify how the tool changes Support Work, attention, workload, responsibility, communication, Competence needs, documentation, and the Person-Support Worker Interface.
- For providers: evaluate technology against the governing Core Standard and Service Context rather than against efficiency or procurement claims alone; maintain version, change, incident, training, and Evidence controls proportionate to risk.
- For payers and commissioning parties: avoid making platform use, data capture, automation, or vendor compliance a substitute for object-level Support Service Quality; test incentives and authorization rules for distortion of Work and Results.
- For regulators and oversight bodies: distinguish product, data, privacy, accessibility, employment, professional, and service-quality questions while preserving the controlling Reference Layer.
- For technology developers and vendors: design systems to support declared functions, Boundaries, Interfaces, responsibility, accessibility, traceability, and Evidence needs; do not represent technical performance as general service quality.
- For evaluators and certifying parties: define the technology role and Evidence basis precisely, preserve Independence, and restrict claims when system behavior, data, configuration, or Service Context is not sufficiently visible.

14 Conclusion

The practical significance of this architecture is that technology can be adopted, evaluated, changed, and discontinued without allowing the tool to become the hidden definition of the service. The Quality Object remains primary, the Intended Function remains controlling, and technology remains a bounded means whose contribution must be demonstrated through responsible Evidence and judgment.

Technology can materially support communication, accessibility, coordination, documentation, continuity, analysis, and other aspects of Support Work. It can also narrow the service, obscure context, alter responsibility, weaken human Interfaces, introduce bias, reduce privacy, fragment Evidence, or create unsupported confidence. The technology itself does not resolve this question.

Whole Quality establishes the necessary order. The Support Service Quality Object, Intended Function, Work, Result, Boundaries, Interfaces, Context, Factors, Indicators, Criteria, Evidence, Critical Service Conditions, Quality State determination, and Claim Boundary come first. Technology is then evaluated as a bounded contributor, dependency, Interface, Evidence source, or possible Failure Mode within that architecture.

The governing AMSI principle remains: technology may support the service, but it may not silently redefine the service or substitute for responsible Function Realization, human and organizational accountability, sufficient Evidence, or bounded Quality Claims. Technology must follow Whole Quality.

Copyright and Use Notice