Identity Assurance Framework: IAF-1610 Required Assessor Knowledge and Skills

Version	1.0
Publication Date	2019-07-22
Effective Date	2019-11-22
Status	ARB Policy
Approval Authority	ARB
Approval	2019-05-27

Editor	Richard G. Wilsher Zygma Inc.
Contributors	ARB Members, voting and non-voting, current as of the date of publication.

Abstract

This document describes the ARB's requirements for knowledge and skills which must be met by applicants for Kantara-Accredited Assessor status. These requirements are to be applied in accordance with KIAF-1350 'Assessor Accreditation Handbook' for the purposes of assessing and determining Credential Service Providers' services for conformity against specific selections of available Kantara Service Assessment Criteria.

Notice

45 ## Contents

66

1 INTRODUCTION

Kantara Initiative operates an Identity Assurance Framework approval scheme (IAF) in order to have conformity to the Kantara Initiative's sets of Service Assessment Criteria assessed and determined by qualified and independent assessors.

This document sets out the requirements which applicants must fulfill in order to become Kantara-Accredited Assessors. These requirements will be used by the Assessment Review Board (ARB) to validate applicants' suitability, according to the processes described in IAF-1350 "*Assessor Accreditation Handbook*".

1.1 Changes in this revision

This is the first publication of this document under its given identity and title. However, it is effectively a re-write of IAF-1600 "*Assessor Qualifications and Requirements*" v4.0, and its genesis is worthy of being recorded here,

In late 2017 the ARB took a decision to review its actual operations against those initially described in its specification IAF-1300 "*Assurance Assessment Scheme*". That document has since been deprecated and replaced by IAF-1340 "*Service Approval Handbook*" and IAF-1350 "*Assessor Accreditation Handbook*".

As a part of the preparation of IAF-1350, Kantara's requirements for determining the acceptability of an applicant for recognition as being qualified to perform assessments of applicants for Kantara Approval the contents of the then extant IAF-1600 were reviewed, revised and re-structured. The present document is the first publication of the outcome of that work.

2 GLOSSARY

The following terms are used specifically in this document, in addition to other terms from the IAF Glossary:

Audit Organization - an organization which undertakes audits or assessments of entities and their services to establish their conformity to or compliance with specific standards or other widely-recognized criteria, and which wishes to make an Accreditation application to Kantara.

(Accreditation) Applicant - an **Audit Organization** applying to Kantara Initiative for accreditation under the ACS;

(Kantara-Accredited) Assessor – an **Applicant** which has satisfied the requirements of the IAF and to which Accreditation has been granted;

(Audit) Subject - the organization submitting its nominated services to a **Kantara-Accredited Assessor** for assessment and Approval. (*Note – this usage of 'Subject' is exclusive strictly to this document – readers should note that it has a different and very specific meaning in other contexts, including within Kantara Initiative, e.g. in the PKI and Identity Management domains, and is consequently defined otherwise in the IAF Glossary, for wider use*).

3 Required Assessor Knowledge and Skills (RAKS)

3.1 General Introduction

Baseline Assessor Knowledge and Skills are those competencies which the IAF requires of its assessors, irrespective of whether they have prior recognition and qualification under any other scheme, framework, or process acknowledged by the ARB, or are seeking initial demonstration against the baseline characteristics.

3.2 Baseline Assessor Knowledge and Skills

The baseline competencies selected are derived from the following sources:

[FPKI FSC PAG]	Federal PKI Policy Authority, SAFE-BioPharma Policy Authority and CertiPath Policy Management Authority "*PKI Audit Guidelines*"
[IAF]	Kantara Initiative Identity Assurance Framework
[IRCA802]	IRCA/802/08/1 "*Criteria for Certification as an Information Security Auditor*"
[IS 17021]	ISO/IEC 17021 "*Conformity assessment - Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems*"
[IS 17065]	ISO/IEC 17065 "*Conformity assessment - Requirements for bodies certifying products, processes and services*"
[IS 27006]	ISO/IEC 27006 "*Information technology - Security - Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of information security management systems*" (NB – IS 27006 mirrors IS 17021 but, where deemed necessary, provides supplemental requirements explicitly for *information security* management systems)
[ISACA_SGP]	"*ISACA IS Standards, Guidelines and Procedures for Auditing and Control Professionals*"
[ISACA_CISA]	"*ISACA Candidate's Guide to the CISA Exam and Certification*", 2007
[PCIQSA]	Payment Card Industry Security Standards Council "*Validation Requirements for Qualified Security Assessors*" Version 1.1

The requirements in this document have drawn on these sources, where possible at latest publication and version statuses, to identify useful attributes and competencies which Kantara Initiative requires of its accredited assessors, whether by virtue of their prior qualifications or by the provision of explicit evidence relating to specific requirements.

In order to be accredited by Kantara Initiative, applicants must demonstrate that they possess all of these characteristics by fulfilling the following requirements. The following headings preface requirements which address:

1. The Audit Organization itself;
2. Individual Auditors;
3. The collective Audit Team;
4. Audit Domain-specific requirements.

Use of the above sources requires some qualification:

1. IS 17021 is general in its requirements for bodies auditing and certifying management systems in general. For application to the specific interests of these requirements it must be supplemented by specific IT / information security management systems capabilities – these are, at the ISO level, provided in IS 27006 as requirements supplemental to those of IS 17021;

2. ISACA_SGP has been assessed only against the Standards, not the Guidelines and Procedures, which underpin adherence to the Standards. This is justified on the basis that the Standards are the prevailing authority, in addition to which ISACA_CISA ensures that knowledge in reasonable depth is determined.

It should be noted that the IAF neither strives nor claims to embody a rigorous inclusion of all parts of the above references nor to be a proven mapping or comparison between their respective requirements.

The following baseline requirements are to be considered as an holistic set, rather than being individual and separate. Each requirement should therefore be considered to apply in principal to all other requirement topics, e.g., where requirement AO.8 expresses expectations for competencies, such competencies must be shown to address the implied needs of any other requirement area.

Note that the tags used for these requirements are deliberately distinct from the format used to define SACs, to avoid any possibility of confusion between them.

3.3 Knowledge and Skill Requirements

3.3.1 Audit Organization (AO) Requirements

Applicant organizations must:

AO.1 Established operational status

1) Have a recognized status as a legal organization operating in compliance with all applicable requirements of the jurisdiction in which the organization is principally established and also in those jurisdictions in which it has a base(s) of operations.

Guidance: For reasons of confidence in the existence and durability of the Applicant, the organization has to be formally registered in some way as to there being no doubt that it is entitled to purvey its services and that it has an operational background which gives confidence that it has established practices and relevant experience, and all reasonable expectation that it will continue to operate for the medium-term future (at least three years). For this reason Kantara will not accredit a sole individual.

Also of significance is that where the Applicant offers services in more than one jurisdiction (Country, State, Province, etc.) and has an established office in that jurisdiction (rather than providing a trans-border service) which it requires the Accreditation to cover, the same requirements apply to such additional jurisdiction.

Representative evidence would typically be verifiable copies of, or links to, licenses and/or business registrations, etc.

2) be in good standing with a level of liability protection set according to a risk-based determination, accounting for the scale of the organization and the jurisdictions in which operations are conducted.

Guidance: To provide protection for the Subject organizations which it will assess, liability protection is necessary. Potential liabilities may be covered by business insurance or other instruments, e.g. reserves. Representative evidence would be such policies or proof of secured (i.e. fire-walled from application for any other purposes) reserves.

3) have effective documented management and approval structures.

Guidance: Possession and demonstrated application of a documented management structure with clear ownership and approval responsibilities is the most effective way to assess whether the organization is set up to manage and perform assessments in the way required (e.g. with integrity and independence) by other criteria in this set. Representative evidence would therefore be the defined processes and records of their implementation.

AO.2 Independence & impartiality

1) Produce a documented commitment to maintaining its impartiality and independence from any of the potential providers of services within the Kantara Initiative community, and with other CSPs in other Federations with which Kantara Initiative may have established agreements of any kind.

Guidance: The primary requirement is to show the senior management's commitment to allowing no ownership, shareholding, or conflicting contractual or like bindings between the Applicant and those whom it may assess, or with those parties which may have an interest in the outcome of any assessment, e.g. competitors of the Subject. A formal declaration is at the least a basis for addressing any lack of independence should it arise, although the

ARB may seek further assurances where any potential conflicts of interest are known to them, in fact or as possibilities. Note that this requirement focuses on specific parties with which the Kantara Initiative community has relationships and because of this specific focus would generally be provided as a specific statement in support of the application. Representative evidence would be a published statement.

2) acts at all times so as to preserve its impartiality.

Guidance: Whilst a declaration of impartiality is an important public statement, the practices to effect that impartiality must exist and be implemented. This requirement is that such practices be in place and continuously exercised. Potential threats to impartiality relate to organizational conflicts as well as those arising from other services which may have been offered to the Subject or personal interests or participation of individuals. Representative evidence would be records of instances where the Applicant has had to exhibit its impartiality (potentially in addressing a complaint or appeal, e.g.).

3) produce documented practices to perform impartiality risk reviews and retain record of threats to impartiality in any assignment, at all stages of its conduct.

Guidance: Ensure that the Applicant undertakes an assessment of the risks, with regard to its impartiality undertakings, involved with each assessment it is engaged to perform, and that there is a review of that risk over the duration of the assignment. As a minimum, an initial assessment and one immediately prior to issuing a report would be expected, although others may be included where the assignment is extended or there are other obvious reasons to do so, such as a change of ownership or significant re-organization (of either party). 'Practices' include documented record of the application of such practice, and the ARB may require evidence to be provided, as it may for any criterion. This requirement essentially underpins sub-requirement (3) of this clause. Representative evidence would be the required documentation.

AO.3 Management responsibility & liability

1) show management commitment to adherence to best governance practices supported by having documented policies and procedures which ensure adherence to professional standards and practices and in particular to the auditing standards and processes under which it operates.

Guidance: Notwithstanding the clear need for the practitioners actually undertaking the assessments to have requisite skills (addressed in subsequent requirements) it is important that the Applicant organization actually demonstrates that it is set up for and capable of employing best management practices as required. Representative evidence would therefore be identification as to how the Applicant's practices fulfill this requirement and identify the audit and technical standards and/or other references on which its operations are based.

AO.4 Openness / Defined assessment process

1) faithfully document and publish the assessment process(es) it applies, describing the technical procedures, accounting for principles such as impartiality, objectivity and confidentiality, any applicable reference standards, and its contractual arrangements with its clients.

Guidance: Kantara Initiative seeks a consistency in the application of assessments leading to certification of Kantara-recognized Service Providers and therefore requires that Kantara-Accredited Assessors have in place a documented and well-defined process for engaging with clients and performing their assessments which can be repeated and in an ideal world would yield consistent results for the same Subject service. Representative evidence would be the documentation defining the process and records of its implementation.

AO.5 Confidentiality

1) have in place procedures which ensure that proprietary information relating to clients is securely stored and controlled in all aspects of its use.

Guidance: Many Subjects will be vying for business from Kantara Initiative members and other participants in the wider community, and as a result assessors will potentially be exposed to proprietary information relating to one or more of another service provider's competitors. As representative evidence, Applicants must show that they have in place procedures which will safeguard their clients' confidentiality in all respects.

AO.6 Responsiveness to complaints

1) Have a means by which clients may lodge appeals or complaints concerning their practices and determinations and have a documented process for objectively addressing those complaints.

Guidance: The Applicant should have the means to receive, process, and respond fairly to any complaints or appeals arising from the conduct of its assessment services, since an objective assessment process may be a cause for contention where findings are concerned. Having in place the means to address and resolve any such issues contributes to the overall assurance from the accreditation process. Representative evidence would be the documented process and samples of its implementation where there are any.

AO.7 Resources

1) Have qualified and competent assessment personnel to manage the organization and to perform the assessments.

Provide for each such qualified person, their name all, their contractual relationship to the organization and their qualifications for holding their position.

Guidance: Provision of documentary evidence of the organization's conformity to preceding criteria is not, of itself, sufficient – these requirements also require that the Applicant shows that it has personnel with the requisite competencies and qualifications necessary to effectively apply the organization's policies, procedures, etc. A register of roles, related job descriptions, and current employee names for the positions having specific relevance would fulfill this requirement.

2) have documented processes to ensure that assessment and support personnel have and maintain the competencies necessary to fulfill their duties according to the systems being assessed, their complexity and their geographic location(s).

Guidance: Provision of documentary evidence of the organization's conformity to preceding criteria is not, of itself, sufficient – Kantara Initiative also requires that the Applicant shows that it has personnel with the requisite competencies and qualifications necessary to effectively apply the organization's policies, procedures, etc. A register of roles, related job descriptions, and current employee names for the positions having specific relevance would fulfill this requirement.

AO.8 Technical competence

1) for each assessor identified in AO.7 (1), have an operating record of a minimum accumulation of three person months of provision of assessment services over an elapsed period of 12 months OR, if unable to fulfill that requirement, having staff who can demonstrate these minima in their professional experience immediately prior to establishing/joining the Applicant organization.

Guidance: Apart from having appropriate competencies, actual experience in their application is required to be shown. This is intended to ensure that the Applicant, organizationally, is active in the assessment arena. Provision is made to 'grandfather' experience from specific staff members when they are able to demonstrate their currency and are assuming an active role within an organization which might otherwise not meet these requirements. Representative evidence would be illustration of past assignments, in terms of scope, date, and resources applied, including which specific personnel participated.

3.3.2 Assessor Qualification (AQ) Requirements

Although the IAF does not accredit individuals, the organization must commit to ensuring that the assessors it uses fulfill the following requirements and that it has in place the means to ensure that these requirements are fulfilled.

Applicant organizations must ensure that their individual Assessors:

AQ.1 Personal attributes

1) exhibit ethical standards by performing assessments in an honest, fair, objective, and discreet manner and with due diligence and professional care.

Guidance: Ethical standing is required of all personnel involved in the oversight, management, performance, review, and granting of certification relating to any assessment process. Ethics require the assessor to be fair, truthful, and honest in their dealings with the assessment client, in their assessment of only factual matters, and in their overall performance of the assessment. This requires strict adherence to professional and technical standards as well as having a balanced personal nature. Whilst some infractions of the law might be identified they may equally be considered to be inconsequential in the context of the performance of the required assessments. On the other hand, convictions such as fraud, embezzlement, other acts of moral turpitude, bankruptcy, would be serious concerns, in the event of which judgment would have to be made as to the risk that may be presented to the good standing of the IAF as a whole should the Applicant be granted Accreditation. On-going investigations or existing allegations may also require careful consideration by the ARB. Factors in such determinations might be the role of any affected individuals within the Applicant organization. The greater the authority and influence of anyone having any unfavorable record should be balanced against the severity and nature of their (possibly alleged) offense when deciding whether to recognize them or not. Required evidence could be an employee-screening process operated by the organization, records of application of that process including background checks, questionnaires, etc.

Note that this requirement does not assess experience and knowledge in the specific assessment field – see AQ.3.

AQ.2 Technical competence

1) Have and maintain the requisite knowledge, training, and experience of applicable generic audit/assessment standards and those specifically addressing information security

335 governance and management, risk assessment, information technology, and related
336 security controls.

337 **Guidance:** In addition to overall technical competence across the organization, individual technical competence
338 must be shown for individual assessors. Required evidence would be identification of the specific training
339 undertaken, of standards and other references about which the individuals have knowledge, and of particular
340 techniques applied.

341 2) have the requisite knowledge and experience of applicable laws, regulations and other
342 such requirements.

343 **Guidance:** A comprehensive assessment must investigate the regulatory aspects of the subject and hence, in
344 addition to technical skills, assessors must have knowledge of applicable legislation, etc. Required evidence
345 would be identification of such laws, etc., and where the assessor purveys their work in more than one
346 jurisdiction, indication of the differing requirements across jurisdictions.

347

348 AQ.3 Subject Matter-specific competence

349 1) Where the IAF includes criteria aligned to a specific sector or domain, be sufficiently
350 knowledgeable about, trained, and current in the specific management, operational, and
351 technical aspects of the specific domain & technology in which the assessment is performed
352 (see note below), including accepted practices, and applicable standards and specifications.

353 **Note**: For the purposes of being deemed qualified to perform assessments of CSPs claiming conformity to the
354 Kantara Initiative IAF Service Assessment Criteria, the requirements for «*specific domain & technology*» shall
355 be fulfilled by conformity to the requirements set forth herein under group 'AD'.

356 Where other organizations and federations wish to use Kantara-accredited assessor organizations for
357 assessments performed in their own «*specific domain & technology*» (e.g. PCI DSS, Federal PKI, …) they
358 should state their own criteria to be used in lieu of (or in addition to, according to their chosen scoping) those
359 in group 'AD' herein when fulfilling this requirement and take their own measures to determine the
360 Applicant's conformity to those specific needs.

361 **Guidance:** Subject-specific knowledge and experience is required to enable the effective application of the
362 generic assessment competencies to the specific subject area. Since the Kantara Initiative Assurance Assessment
363 Scheme is, but for this particular requirement, generic and agnostic in its choice of baseline characteristics such
364 that it can be adopted for other uses or assessors accredited against it can be used in other domains where the only
365 additional requirement is the domain-specific knowledge, this present requirement can be either substituted for by
366 an alternative domain's set of specific requirements or extended with other such requirements where the two
367 specific areas are both necessary.

368

369 AQ.4 Education / Professional qualification/certification

370 1) Have received at least a secondary education (and would preferably hold a bachelor's
371 degree in any subject) plus any one (at least) of the following professional technical
372 IT/information security management qualifications, which must be current: CGEIT, CISA,
373 CISSP, CISM, CITP, IRCA for ISMS/ITSM, PCI QSA, or equivalent qualification or
374 experience.

Guidance: Current professional qualifications are the more important part of this requirement, underpinning the basic training qualifications – although a secondary education is the minimum acceptable, a bachelor's degree is the preferred baseline educational experience and those without it may have to show stronger work experience to be acceptable. Holding one of these professional qualifications gives confidence in the underlying knowledge of the assessor, which may be broader than some specific experience has allowed. Required evidence would typically be certified copies of award of qualification or a URL to a professional body's registry, which can be authenticated.

AQ.5 Impartiality & Professional Competence

1) Have no connection to the client, the material subject to the assessment, or any relevant parties other than in their professional assessor capacity, nor be of a disposition vulnerable to coercion.

Guidance: Although preceding requirements require independence and impartiality on the part of the organization, its audit staff must also exhibit these qualities and be qualified to perform the audit. Past professional experience and assignments will be one way to make an assessment of their impartiality, e.g. ensuring that the auditee organization was not a previous employer of the assessor, or the assessor a previous employer of any of the auditee's staff, or that the assessor had not previously given consultancy to the auditee organization, preferably in any form whatsoever, or otherwise demonstrably in a manner which could not have any relationship to the material which the audit will address. Inter-personal relationships might also color judgment but will be harder to identify without the cooperation of the assessor. Even harder to assess, unless there is a pattern of auditee's complaints about the fairness of an assessor, is the intellectual objectivity, truthfulness, and impartiality which are the scope of professional competence in this context.

Forms of evidence could be the individual assessor's assertions or the applicant organization's processes and records for reviewing previous employment or customer complaints.

AQ.6 Experience

No stipulation – see AO.8.

Guidance: This requirement accommodates 'desk assessment, i.e. review of documents from the assessor's own offices, but also requires on-site assessment experience, since this is the most demanding, challenging, and also effective experience. Verifiable personal or organizational records of assignments undertaken would generally satisfy this need.

3.3.3 Assessment Team (AT) Requirements

Assessment Teams must:

AT.1 Collective skills

1) Consist of assessment professionals who collectively have the necessary skills and experience to assess the policies, procedures, and practices of the subject in all general and specific respects; a single assessor is acceptable but must meet the requirements for Lead Assessor (below).

Guidance: Although an assessment team may actually be a single person, the nature of the assessment subject may require a range of differing expertise which can only be effectively fulfilled by a team of complementary individuals. A process for determining the skill requirements for any particular assessment and selecting suitably

skilled assessment staff, supported where required by evidence of past assignments and the selected team's skills would typically be the form of required evidence.

AT.2 Leader Assessor's skills

1) be led by an individual who has participated as a Team Leader (including supervised in that capacity) for a minimum of 15 days of assessment services, of which 10 days must have been on-site, over an elapsed period of 24 months.

Guidance: This simply requires that the Lead Assessor has either received training in this role or has performed it as a qualified Leader within a reasonable period of time and at a reasonable level of effort. Staff records should be the most practical form of evidence to support conformity to this requirement.

2) be led by an individual who has knowledge of all areas which are addressed by the assessment, although other team members may have specialist roles.

Guidance: The selected Lead Assessor's curriculum vitæ, or similar evidence of past experience and training, should demonstrate that they have the requisite skills, at least at a level where, supported by specialist advice, they can make informed and balanced decisions.

3) be capable of planning an assessment with such a scope.

Guidance: The Applicant is expected to demonstrate by past performance, available resource, and tactical capability that they are able to plan and execute an assessment of the form required to satisfy Kantara Initiative expectations. Record of past performance would be an obvious way to evidence conformity to this requirement.

AT.3 Use of SMEs

1) Where necessary, only use Subject Matter Experts (SME) which exhibit the same degree of impartiality and competence in their specific field as do the assessors in theirs. SMEs may advise the Lead Assessor but may not dictate findings, recommendations, or remedial actions.

Guidance: SMEs may be either internal or external, although in the latter case the ARB would expect to see that the organization had in place the means to ensure that the SME, organizationally and individually, would not impinge upon the applicant organization's ability (once accredited) to fulfill its obligations under its Accreditation. Evidence of a process for validating and selecting SMEs, possibly supported by records of the application of that process, would be appropriate evidence.

3.3.4 Assessment Domain (AD) Requirements

Assessors assessing Subjects which are Credential Service Providers must describe their relevant sector knowledge and experience sufficient to convince the ARB that it should recommend the Applicant for Accreditation:

AD.1 Capability in the information security assessment domain

1) Describe the organization's involvement in the following fields and areas of expertise, citing the year of commencing practice in the field, any notable achievements, some metrics to show active participation, and any other factors which you believe will demonstrate your track record in the information security assessment domain and hence eligibility for Accreditation as a Kantara Assessor:

   i) Information/Cyber Security;
   ii) Information/Cyber Security Management;
   iii) Identity/Credential Management;
   iv) Privacy Management;
   v) Relevant technologies;
   vi) Standardization participation;
   vii) Audit/assessment practices;
   viii) Any other fields where you believe you have directly relevant experience (explain).

As applicable, describe your knowledge, skills, and experiences in regard to the above list of information security domain facets, to include the applicable Kantara Classes of Approval for which you believe these skills and experiences establish your competence.

Guidance: This criterion is intended to give the ARB's reviewers a broad understanding of the Applicant's experience and skills. No explicit recency requirements are stated in this criterion, since these are sought where appropriate in the following criteria.

3.4 Recognition of prior qualification

These requirements are based upon the principle that it shall impose the minimum additional effort upon Applicants, and Kantara Initiative itself, commensurate with sufficient confidence being established in the Applicants' conformity to all of the requirements known collectively as the 'baseline characteristics'. Through the 'grandfathering' principle maximum recognition is given to Applicants who can demonstrate their qualification against certain recognized industry references, these being those cited in §3.2.

By their very nature, these references provide 'credit' against different groups of these requirements, and Applicants may use collective credits from multiple prior qualifications.

The ARB will, where the published credit allowed is 'qualified' or 'none', allow credit where the Applicant can demonstrate that specific requirements were in fact addressed by the particular prior qualification they are presenting. This recognizes that the determination made in this document is based upon a generic interpretation of the applicable reference, rather than a specific instance of it.

The continued validity of the credit granted to Applicants with certified (or otherwise proven) conformity to the requirements of each reference shall be reviewed and revised accordingly whenever the relevant reference source is revised.

3.4.1 Validity

Where an Applicant's Accreditation is based on prior qualification the Accreditation will lapse six months after the first-occurring expiration date of any claimed prior qualifications, at any given point during the first two-and-a-half years of the three year Accreditation validity.

After the first three years of Accreditation continued qualification will shift towards being based on practical experience through the performance of Kantara Assessments and any other directly-related experience.

3.4.2 Waivers

Applicants with reasonable grounds for doing so may request that a waiver be granted where these requirements are not strictly met but the Applicant requests a 'conformity exception' (CE) and offers sufficient evidence to convince the ARB that their specific qualifications or evidence are equally acceptable. For example, special experience may have been acquired and used to gain a professional qualification in lieu of conventional requirements, in which case, assuming that the qualification was one recognized by the ARB, the same argument would most likely be accepted as fulfillment of these requirements for relevant experience.

Kantara Initiative reserves the right, at the sole determination of the ARB, to decline requests for waivers, grant waivers on a one-off basis and for whatever time period it deems fit, or to undertake revision of these requirements to include the circumstances of the request as a permanent part of this handbook.

3.4.3 Alternative claims for prior qualification

Should an Applicant believe themselves to be in possession of an existing qualification which is not one of those listed in this document they may cite it in response to the Knowledge and Skill requirements herein if they cite source documents and applicable clause with which the Applicant complies and which they believe fulfill the needs of Kantara's applicable criteria.

3.5 Revisions to baseline Required Knowledge and Skills

Kantara Initiative reserves the right, subject to due notice and consultation, to revise these criteria as it sees fit, including the addition of requirements in response to any CE requests which suggest that such evidence is justifiable and likely to be sufficiently commonplace or valuable to the overall accreditation process to deserve recognition through revision to requirement.

519 # 4 Revision History

520

Vn.	Date	Status	Notes	Approved
1.0	2019-05-27	Final	First Publication	ARB

521
522