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# INTRODUCTION

## Status and Readership

This document sets out **normative** Kantara requirements and is required reading for all applicant Service Providers and Kantara Accredited Assessors. It will also be of interest to those wishing to gain a detailed knowledge of the workings of the Kantara Initiative’s Identity Assurance Framework.

## Purpose

The goal of the Kantara Initiative Identity Assurance Framework (IAF) is the facilitation of intra- and inter-Federation transactions based upon a range of identity credentials, across various levels of assurance, so that Relying Parties can have the confidence that the credentials bearing the Kantara Initiative Trust Mark are worthy of their trust.

To accomplish this Kantara Initiative operates an *Assurance Assessment Scheme (AAS)*, an assessment and approval program that assesses the operating standards of service providers in the Identity and Credential Assurance Management space against strict criteria, and grants to Applicants to the scheme the right to use the Kantara Initiative Trust Mark, a symbol of trustworthy identity and credential management services at specified Assurance Levels (i.e. a Grant of Rights of Use – hereafter ‘Grant’).

The AAS grants rights of use of the Kantara Initiative Trust Mark to:

1. Services and Service Components, operated by their providers as Kantara-Approved Services and Service Components
2. Assessors assessing those services as Kantara-Accredited Assessors;

A common model is used as the basis for all assessments for receiving the rights to use of the Kantara Initiative Trust Mark, varying only in terms of, the mutual obligations which are established between Kantara Initiative and the Application / Grant holder, and the nature of the Grant.

§4 of this document describes the generic procedures and rules that shall be applied in handling Applications for any type of Kantara Initiative Grant which may be awarded in connection with the Kantara Initiative Trust Mark. §5 and §6 of this document describe specific requirements for Service Assessments and Assessor Accreditation, respectively.

The latest versions of each of the IAF documents referenced in this document can be found on Kantara’s [Identity Assurance Framework - General Information web page](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/x/e4R7Ag).

## Changes in this revision

This AAS revision records actual evolved practices being applied within Kantara. These include:

1. recognizing that the ARB and Assessors are the only authoritative bodies within the operation of the IAF;
2. re-structuring to more efficiently address that scope;
3. revisions to better align with ‘Ready-To-Operate’ and ‘Period-of-Time’ assessment practices as outlined in K-IAF 1800 RAA;
4. general practices.

In addition, the document has been revised to align with the latest IAF document identification and authorization practices, and internal structure.

## Summary of Grant Categories and Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grant Category …** | **Authoritative body** | **Application Document** | **Applicable assessment criteria or requirements** | **Applicable agreement**  | **Described in Clause …** |
| Approved Service | Kantara Assurance Review Board | [Application](#_Application) for Kantara Assessment  | Specification of a Service Subject to AssessmentStatement of ConformityKantara Assessment Report | [Trademark License Agreement](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20Initiative%20IAF%20TMLA-v2-2%2020150226.pdf?api=v2) | §5 |
| Accredited Assessor | [Kantara Initiative Board of Trustees](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/BoT/Home) | [Application for Kantara Accreditation](#_Hlk231173418) | [Assessor](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/x/e4R7Ag) Qualifications & Experience Requirements (IAF 1600) | [Trademark License Agreement](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20Initiative%20IAF%20TMLA-v2-2%2020150226.pdf?api=v2) | §6 |

# TERMINOLOGY

All special terms used in this document are defined in the *IAF Glossary.*

# REVIEW BOARD AND SECRETARIAT

## Authoritative Bodies

### Assurance Review Board

The principle authoritative body shall be the Kantara Initiative Board of Trustees (BoT) which shall, at all times, be the final arbiter on all decisions concerning use of the Kantara Initiative Mark. The constitution of the BoT is beyond the scope of this document. Please see the Kantara Initiative website ([www.kantarainitiative.org](http://www.kantarainitiative.org/)) for a description of the BoT and its members.

The operational authoritative body shall be the Assurance Review Board (ARB), which shall have delegated authority from the BoT to undertake assessments of all types of Applications for a Grant of Rights of Use of the Kantara Initiative Mark and shall make recommendations to the BoT for the award or denial of such Grants.

The constitution and authority of the Assurance Review Board is determined by the BoT.

### Accredited Assessors

Kantara-Accredited Assessors have the authority to produce Kantara Assessor’s Reports expressing findings of conformity, based upon the terms of their Kantara Accreditation and their capabilities as assessors, and the ARB shall determine whether to make a recommendation to the BoT concerning the granting of Kantara-Approved Service status.

## Secretariat

Authoritative Bodies shall be supported by an administrative function known as the Secretariat, which shall be responsible for the receipt and handling of Applications, checking that all necessary supporting documents and processes are complied with, communicating with the Applicant, providing a package for assessment to the ARB for its consideration, and all other necessary supportive functions not requiring the executive or operational authority of the BoT and ARB.

## Recusal policy for ARB Reviews

### Introduction

Kantara Initiative operates according to the highest level of independence, and accountability.

This document defines a procedure for identifying and dealing with conflicts of interest within the ARB membership.

The objective of this policy is to enforce a robust, consistent and comprehensive framework for ensuring the integrity of recommendations made by the ARB.

### Calling for recusals

Once an application is ready to be evaluated by the ARB, the Secretariat shall call for recusals.

Members shall recuse themselves for any of the following reasons:

Financial conflict;

1. Financial conflict;
2. Direct or indirect gain (of all sorts) arising from access to confidential information and/or creation of ARB recommendations;
3. Family/personal relationships and bias;
4. Contractual or affiliation relationships;
5. ARB members seeking employment or post-employment activities in interested Parties;
6. Other circumstances, as they may identify.

Any member of the ARB may identify a conflict they perceive another member to have and may request the recusal of that member.

Those members not recused shall form the Review Team.

# GENERAL ASSESSMENT RESPONSIBILITIES & PROCEDURES

This clause describes the general processes for conducting an assessment of any Application for the Grant of Rights of Use for one of the Kantara IAF Grant Categories.

## Receipt of Applications

Applicants will complete and submit the appropriate Application document, describing the scope and/or purpose of their Application and initiating thereby the initial processing functions.

Kantara Initiative will protect against the potential misuse of its Trust Mark by requiring all applicants to sign the Trademark License Agreement ([TMLA](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20Initiative%20IAF%20TMLA-v2-2%2020150226.pdf?api=v2)) prior to seeking assessment of their service(s). Each Application includes the Applicant’s commitment to the terms and conditions defined in the [TMLA](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20Initiative%20IAF%20TMLA-v2-2%2020150226.pdf?api=v2) These terms and conditions address the complete life-cycle of participation in the AAS: Application for a Grant of Rights of Use, withdrawal of Application (without receipt of a Grant of Rights of Use), during the period in which a Grant of Rights of Use is awarded, after termination of a Grant of Rights of Use, and the Applicant’s signature to the TMLA at the time of Application shall bind them to the terms and conditions at all stages of participation in the AAS thereafter.

The ARB reserves the right to reject an Application without any effort to validate it if, within the preceding three month period, the ARB has ultimately denied an Application from the Applicant, either for the same or any different purpose(s).

When no such limitation exists, on receipt of an Application the Secretariat shall undertake the following validations:

1. review the Application for completeness, including the accessibility of attached documents All documents should be downloaded by the Secretariat
2. Secretariat shall confirm receipt of application
3. where possible, validate any claims made in the Application; such as certifications, insurance policies, etc.;
4. ensure the membership package has been completed and all necessary fees have been paid and have cleared;
5. form the ARB review team, accounting for the Recusal policy;
6. pass the Application for initial approval to the ARB review team;
7. upon completion of the ARB review’s deliberations, advise the APoC of the outcome, either that the Application has been found fit for assessment, or that the application has been rejected with reasons why;
8. .
	1. **Evaluation of Applications**

On notification that an Application is ready for evaluation, the ARB review team shall review the Application and supporting documents within their terms of reference as assigned by the Chairman of the ARB (who may choose to assign specific focuses to specific ARB members because of their particular skills as apply to the Application).

Evaluation of the Application shall progress as follows:

1. in ensuring that supporting evidence provided fulfills each requirement the ARB shall apply whatever measures and expectations it considers reasonable. Whilst guidance may be given with regard to the expected form of conformity (or evidence of such) the ARB is in no sense constrained by the scope of that guidance and shall assess any material provided by the Applicant in support of its compliance. The ARB may, furthermore, ask for clarification or additional evidence in support of the Application where it finds wanting the material submitted;
2. requests for clarification or additional material shall be made to the APoC and recorded, as shall be the Applicant’s response, in whatever form;
3. for each evaluation Requirement, determination of conformity shall be made and recorded in the records of the Application;
4. after all evidence has been assessed the Chairman of the ARB shall call a meeting at which the ARB shall consider the Review´s Team´s findings and determine its recommendation as to whether the Application should be: Granted unconditionally; Granted with conditions, or; Denied, with justification;
5. the ARB’s recommendation shall be communicated to the Kantara Initiative Board of Trustees;
6. the Kantara Initiative Board of Trustees shall take a decision, based upon the ARB’s recommendation and any other considerations the Kantara Initiative Board of Trustees deems necessary, which shall be conveyed in writing by the Secretariat to the Applicant.

When an Application is granted with conditions, the applicable conditions should be such that their cause(s) can be addressed and resolved within six months period of the grant, to be determined by the ARB.

* 1. **Grant of Rights of Use (to the Kantara Initiative Trust Mark)**

When the Application is to be granted (and if conditional, after any appeal has been heard and a final decision made), the following actions shall be performed:

1. a ‘Grant Id’ will be allocated (using the format ‘IAF-«type»-«yy»-«nn»’, where:
«type» is the type of Grant,
«yy» is the year as two digits,
«nn» is a sequence beginning at 01 each new year) and,
2. based upon the applicable Trust Mark, a seal shall be issued to the Applicant as a part of formal notice of the applicable Grant, with any conditions stated;
3. the validity period of the Grant shall be set at three years subject to the continued adherence to conformity terms and conditions defined in the where TMLA.
4. the Grant is conditional, a review schedule shall be set to ensure that the Applicant provides, within the required timescale, adequate grounds for the removal of the conditions, without which the Grant shall lapse at the expiry of that timescale;
5. Kantara Initiative shall update the [Kantara Trust Status List](https://kantarainitiative.org/trust-registry/ktr-status-list/) details of the new Grantee within two business days.
	1. **Appeal**

An Applicant may only appeal decisions against either a conditional Grant or a denial The ARB shall select three volunteers from the Board of Trustees or among recognized authorities in good standing with the Kantara community to act as *ad hoc* ARB members. This Appeal Board shall be subject to ARB confidentiality procedures, for the duration of the conflict resolution process. The *ad hoc* members shall be acceptable to both the Chairman of the ARB and to the Applicant, each of whom shall endeavor to find mutually-acceptable members. However, in the event that the mutually acceptable members cannot be found within one calendar month of the appeal being lodged, the Chairman of the ARB shall have the right to appoint an Appeal Board without further referral to the Applicant.

The appeal shall be heard within a two-week period of the Appeal Board being established. The Appeal Board shall make one of the following recommendations: uphold the ARB decision; override the ARB decision; or, propose a remediation.

* 1. **Termination of Application**

An Application shall be considered terminated under any of the following circumstances:

1. if at any time during the receipt of an Application, the Applicant either chooses to withdraw its Application or fails to fulfill any requests made of it by the Secretariat within a reasonable amount of time to be defined by the ARB
2. if, during the processing of an Application, the Applicant chooses to voluntarily withdraw their Application;
3. in the event that an Application and any subsequent appeal is denied.

On termination of an Application the Secretariat shall:

1. advise the APoC in writing of the termination, giving the reasons why;
2. allow a period of two weeks for:
3. -notice of intention to appeal the termination to be received and processed, and in the absence of any such notification (or after a final decision denying an appeal) and within a further two-week period, destroy all record of and documents related to the Application,
4. -save the basic administrative data required to record the fact that an Application was received in the name of the Applicant and terminated for the reasons determined, which shall be recorded, including record of the date, time and means of notice of termination and of the destruction of related materials[[1]](#footnote-1), ensuring that the Applicant receives a written confirmation that their protected materials have been securely disposed-off.
	1. **Oversight of Grantee**

Oversight of Grantees shall be effected by:

1. the Secretariat shall establish a schedule for:
	1. review and removal of any grant conditions on which the Grant was conditionally awarded;
	2. annual review by the ARB;
	3. a request to Grantee to provide evidence of renewal of any prior qualification(s), to which the Grant was subject, which will lapse during the period of accreditation;
2. the ARB exercising review and validation of conformity and currency at points defined in the plan required by the preceding clause;
3. at the discretion of the ARB or in response to any observed or reported deficiency, periodic re-assessment by the ARB of selected areas of conformity.

In the event that oversight identifies areas for concern then the ARB shall investigate further the circumstances and determine whether any corrective action is required.

Annual review (1(a) above) shall be undertaken against a submission of the applicable Annual Conformity Review by the Grantee. This is intended to identify any revisions to status of prior qualifications and submitted evidence since the initial Application or previous annual review. Any new material submitted shall be subject to assessment using the validation techniques applied for the initial Application assessment.

Review of renewal of any prior qualification(s) (1(b) above) shall be undertaken by receipt of evidence of the renewed qualification using the validation techniques applied for the initial Application assessment.

Oversight also requires revision of the [Kantara Trust Status List](https://kantarainitiative.org/trust-registry/ktr-status-list/) in response to any notification of a change in the Grantee’s status or of any service to which they may have awarded a Grant.

Should the applicable requirements be revised all current Applicants and Grantees shall be explicitly notified of the availability of the new versions including identification of all pertinent changes. Existing Grantees shall be allowed twelve months (fifteen months where publication occurs within three calendar months of an Annual Conformity Review) in which to comply with the new requirements. Current Applicants shall be required to make any necessary revisions to their Application to bring them into lines with the revisions.

Any revisions to the applicable agreements shall become effective immediately, subject to a consultation period having been offered to all current Grantees and Applicants.

* 1. **Revocation of Grant**

A Grantee shall have its Grant revoked under any of the following circumstances:

1. if it chooses to terminate or let lapse its Grantee status;
2. if the oversight described in the previous sections determines that the conditions of grant are no longer applicable;
3. a failure to pay renewal fees.

Divergence of a Grantee or its services pertaining to that Grant from that described in the current Application package may not necessarily be a negative event, e.g. the ownership of the Grantee may change such that a conflict of interest comes into existence, or a non-trivial enhance or revision to the service terms or processes. On the other hand, dereliction on the part of the Grantee, failure to honor the terms of the TMLA, or loss of a prior qualification to which the Grant was subject would be less positively-viewed developments, demanding the ARB’s intervention.

On revocation of Grant status the Secretariat shall:

1. advise the APoC in writing of the revocation, giving the reasons why;
2. destroy all record of and documents related to the Grant, save the basic administrative data required to record the fact that an Application was received in the name of the Applicant and revoked for the reasons determined, which shall be recorded, including record of the date, time and means of notice of revocation and of the destruction of related materials[[2]](#footnote-2);
3. Kantara Initiative shall update [Kantara Trust Status List](https://kantarainitiative.org/trust-registry/ktr-status-list/) with the revised status details of the Grantee.
	1. **Annual Conformity Review**

### Introduction

An Annual Conformity Review (ACR) is undertaken as a positive check and reminder to Grantees that their conformity to the TMLA remains their obligation.

### Process

The Secretariat shall populate an ACR pro forma specific to the Grantee and submit that to the Grantee for their completion and return.

The Secretariat shall review the grantee’s returned ACR for any indication that inconsistencies or variations have occurred during the period of the review. If the Secretariat observes inconsistencies or variations, the grantee shall provide supporting evidence as deemed necessary for the ARB to review conformity.

The TMLA requires Grantees to notify the Secretariat of any divergences as and when they are identified.

Verifications that were required during the Application processing stage should be applied during the ACR, e.g. ensuring dates are concurrent and extend beyond the present period. In the event that actual assessment of additional evidence is required then a ‘mini-review’ shall be performed, adopting the procedures defined for the initial processing of Applications so as to limit time and effort expended whilst ensuring Kantara’s expectations and standards are maintained. The Chairman of the ARB has sole authority to seek additional information as appropriate.

# ASSESSMENT: APPROVED SERVICE

This clause describes aspects of the Application and assessment processes that are specific to Kantara-Approved Services.

* 1. **Type of Grant**

The type of Grant shall be that of a Kantara-Approved Service, denoted by the «type» field in the Grant Id being ‘Approval’ or ‘Component’, as applies to either a Service Component or Full Service Application, respectively.

* 1. **Application**

Applications shall be submitted using the [*Application for Kantara Approval*](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20IAF-3510%20Application%20for%20Service%20Approval%20v3-0.docx?api=v2) form (‘Application’, for the purposes of this clause), describing their service(s) for which recognition is sought.

The Application includes two documents on which the evaluation will rely: the first is the [*Trademark License Agreement*](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20Initiative%20IAF%20TMLA-v2-2%2020150226.pdf?api=v2) (TMLA) ; the second is the [*Specification of Services Subject to Assessment*](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20IAF-3520%20S3A%20v2-0bis.docx?api=v2) *(*S3A*)*.

* 1. **Basis of** **Assessment**

The *Kantara IAF* [*Service Assessment Criteria*](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20IAF-1400%20SAC%20v4-0.pdf?api=v2)(SAC) shall be the minimum basis against which the Application is assessed. Actual assessment must be carried-out by a Kantara-Accredited Assessor, which will perform an assessment of the service(s) referenced in the Application, with the objective of determining the specified service as being conformant to the applicable SACs. The CSP may identify further criteria and profiles which do not conflict with the applicable SAC criteria to be included in the scope of the assesment.

* 1. **Specific Application Review Steps**

Where the Application is for a Full Service Approval, the ARB will ensure that the overlay of the collective criteria covered by the combination of the Applicant’s SoC and those of its component parts encompasses 100% of all SAC for the chosen Assurance Level.

Evidence of its acceptance of the TMLA is a necessary pre-requisite to enable the Applicant’s chosen Assessor to formalize the contract for Assessment. Once the Assessment has been completed and the Applicant has received the Assessor’s Assessment Report, that Report shall then be returned to the Secretariat and the Application processing shall then continue according to the finding conveyed in the Kantara Assessment Report (KAR), i.e. whether or not a finding of conformant has been made.

When the KAR indicates that the Assessment has found conformity it shall be added to the assessment package, which shall then be passed to the ARB.

The KAR will indicate the type of Assessment undertaken, i.e. ‘Period-of-Time’ or ‘Ready-To-Operate’.

The Secretariat shall review each application package and ensure that the application and S3A are consistent with those previously submitted, and resolve with the applicant any discrepancies. The Secretariat shall also review the KAR and ensure that it states either a finding of unqualified conformity or, if qualified, that only a small number of **minor** con-conformities are found, and that each has a remedial action indicated. Any KAR which does not meet these conditions shall be rejected and returned to the Applicant, with a letter explaining the reasons for rejection.

Once an application package has met the above requirements it shall be passed to the ARB for review.

Withdrawal of an Application constitutes termination, which is addressed in §4.

When Approval is granted on the basis of a RTO assessment the status of the Approval shall carry the qualifier ‘Ready To Operate’.

* 1. **Annual Conformity Review**

The schedule maintained by the Secretariat shall record the expiration dates of any Prior Qualifications and shall seek from the Grantee evidence of renewal, as dates fall due.

* 1. **Assessment of Services**

### Contracting for Assessment

Applicants may find a list of Kantara-Accredited Assessors from which to select an assessor in the. [Kantara Trust Status List](https://kantarainitiative.org/trust-registry/ktr-status-list/)

On receipt of the counter-signed [TMLA](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/26771473/Kantara%20Initiative%20IAF%20TMLA-v2-2%2020150226.pdf?api=v2) the CSP should select and contract with a Kantara-Accredited Assessor, in order to have their service(s) assessed. Kantara Initiative will maintain and publish a list of Accredited Assessors in the Kantara Trust Status List. Assessors have executed an agreement not to engage with a CSP for the purposes of assessing for conformity to the SAC unless the CSP provides copy of its TMLA, counter-signed by Kantara Initiative.

Kantara Initiative’s only requirement is that the Applicant selects an Assessor which is Kantara-Accredited: Kantara has no preference and considers any Assessor which it accredits to be equal to all others, for the given range of *Assurance Levels* and technologies for which they have recognized expertise. It is therefore the Applicant’s sole responsibility to select, and make and fulfill all contractual arrangements with, their chosen Assessor. Subject to the adherence of both the Assessor and the CSP to their respective agreements with Kantara Initiative, all arrangements between the CSP and its selected Assessor for the performance of the Assessment of the CSP’s services are entirely between those two parties and Kantara Initiative shall have neither interest nor influence in them.

It should be noted that, depending on the scope of their Application for Accreditation, some Assessors may not be accredited to assess against the full scope of the SAC. CSPs should therefore check the entitlement of the Assessor to address their service(s), whilst at the same time it is incumbent upon Assessors to do likewise and advise potential client CSPs where the scope of the required Assessment services exceeds that of their Accreditation. Although this is not anticipated to be a frequent problem it is nonetheless a real possibility which needs to be accounted for.

### Performing Assessments

The CSP shall submit to its contracted Assessor the following documents as the minimum set required by Kantara Initiative. The Assessor may have its own processes which require additional submissions from the CSP which will be a matter of private contract between those parties. This clause primarily addresses the responsibilities which Accredited Assessors have in performing a Kantara assessment. CSPs shall provide, as a minimum, the following required document set:

1. TMLA, counter-signed by Kantara Initiative;
2. S3A;
3. SoC;
4. supporting evidence demonstrating its compliance with the applicable SAC, per its SoC.

The Assessor shall then perform the Assessment according to the terms of its Accreditations and its defined processes.

At the conclusion of the assessment the Assessor shall prepare a Kantara Assessor’s Report (KAR). This report may be a separate document prepared for Kantara’s consumption or may be a document with wider applicability, subject only to fulfilling at least the requirements for a KAR.

A KAR shall always be required, irrespective of whether the CSP withdraws from the assessment, concludes the assessment but fails to demonstrate its conformity as required, or succeeds in gaining an Approval recommendation from its Assessor. Only in the last of these possible outcomes (i.e. an affirmative Approval recommendation) will Kantara exercise its right to make public that information from the S3A that is specified as being for publication. All other information and all other outcomes Kantara Initiative shall retain as confidential under the terms of the TMLA.

(Even in the case of withdrawal of the CSP, provision of the KAR will allow Kantara Initiative to close the processing of the Application for recognition.)

### Initial Assessment versus Annual Conformity Review

Initial Assessments (i.e. those conducted for the purposes of a Grant of a three-year Approval) shall require assessment against all criteria defined in the Applicant’s SoC and agreed-to by the ARB

The Kantara IAF’s assessment model is based on established best practice as defined in ISO/IEC 17021, “*Conformity assessment - Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems*”), which allows for annual reviews to be less demanding than the initial assessment, subject to the three-year cycle being re-commenced when the Grant of Approval is renewed on the third anniversary of it being last granted.

Therefore, the Annual Conformity Reviews performed on the first and second anniversaries of the initial Grant of Approval may have a reduced scope, as defined in the RAA.

For ACRs conducted at ALs 2, 3 and 4, CSP’s shall submit to the ARB a KAR confirming continued conformance with all applicable criteria (per the CSP’s SoC), on which the ARB shall base its decision regarding a recommendation that the Grant of Approval shall be confirmed.

# ASSESSMENT: ACCREDITED ASSESSOR

This clause describes aspects of the Application and assessment processes which are specific to Kantara-Accredited Assessors.

* 1. **Type of Grant**

The type of Grant shall be that of a Kantara-Accredited Assessor, denoted by the «type» field in the Grant Id being ‘AA’.

* 1. **Application document**

Applications shall be submitted using the on-line [*Accredited Assessor Application*](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/38928761/Accredited%20Assessor%20Application.doc?version=1&modificationDate=1314220857000&api=v2) form (‘Application’, for the purposes of this clause).

The Application includes the agreement document.

On receipt the Application package shall be stored separately from any other applicant’s data. There shall be an Application available to the Secretariat to select Applications by reference and to represent the material as seen by the Applicant, with the applicable evidential files available.

* 1. **Basis of Assessment**

The Kantara IAF [*Assessor Qualifications & Requirements*](http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/download/attachments/67634093/Kantara%20IAF-1600%20Assessor%20Qualifications%20and%20Requirements%20v2-0.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1421694655000&api=v2) (AQR) shall be the basis against which the Application is evaluated.

* 1. **Specific Assessment steps**

When initially validating the Application the ARB review team shall apply the following specific steps in executing the general pocedures defined in §4:

* + 1. Documents that are used to claim ‘credit’ with regard to Accreditation requirements shall first of all be validated. Validation shall be either by visual inspection, or online (e.g. authentication of issuer’s seal or validation against a recognized registry). The ARB review team shall take the longevity and currency of such documents into consideration.
		2. Claims of ‘credit’ based on validated prior qualifications shall be recognized, subject to any qualifications applied by Kantara Initiative;
		3. For each such requirement:
	1. Validated unqualified credit shall be granted without question (unless exceptional circumstances prevail);
	2. Validated qualified credit shall be assessed to ensure that supporting evidence provided fulfills the requirement;
	3. For any other requirement, ensure that supporting evidence provided fulfills the requirement.

ARB review team shall apply whatever measures and expectations it considers reasonable in order to ensure the supporting evidence fulfills each requirement The ARB is not constrained by the guidance provided in the AQR for assessment of materials provided by the applicant in support of its compliance, and shall assess any material provided by the Applicant in support of its compliance. The ARB review team may ask for clarification or additional evidence from the applicant.

* 1. **Annual Conformity Review**

The schedule maintained by the Secretariat shall record the expiration dates of any Prior Qualifications and shall seek from the Grantee evidence of renewal.

The use of an ACR as a consistency audit covering the preceding twelve months will rest largely upon the fact that oversight provisions of Prior Qualifications (which most Accredited Assessors are anticipated to rely upon) are themselves performing sufficient oversight.

* 1. **Performing the Assessment**

### Process

An Assessor shall require a CSP to submit the minimum set documents identified in §5.6. The assessor may have its own processes that require additional submissions from the CSP. This clause primarily addresses the responsibilities Accredited Assessors have in performing a Kantara assessment. :

At the conclusion of the Assessment the Assessor shall prepare a [Kantara Assessment Report](http://www.kantarainitiative.org/) (KAR). This report may be a separate document prepared for Kantara’s consumption or may be a document with wider applicability, subject only to fulfilling at least the requirements for a KAR.

Regardless of whether the CSP successfully concludes or withdraws an assessment, a KAR shall always be required.. Kantara may publish information from the S3A that is specified as being for publication, only if the assessment is successful.

All other information and all other outcomes Kantara shall retain as confidential under the terms of the TMLA.
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