



Whole Quality Root Vocabulary Standard

WQI STANDARD VOC1

Second Draft Edition - August 2026

Authoritative Root Concepts for the Whole Quality Methodology

WHOLE-QUALITY INSTITUTE

Foreword

Whole Quality is intended to be applicable across very different Quality Objects: infrastructure systems, support services, management arrangements, health states, educational systems, environmental services, and other objects and systems-of-systems. These domains require different applied language, but they cannot support one methodology if their principal concepts drift apart.

This Standard establishes the WQI Root Vocabulary: the authoritative vocabulary of concepts that belong to the Whole Quality methodology itself. It provides the common conceptual foundation from which Applied Vocabularies, Core Standards, Context Guides, and other Whole Quality documents are developed.

The Root Vocabulary is not an exhaustive dictionary for every application domain. It defines only concepts that must retain a stable meaning across domains. Infrastructure-specific terms remain in IQI_VOC1. Support-service and occupational terms remain in AMSI_VOC1. Other application domains may develop their own Applied Vocabularies while adopting the Root Concepts without modification.

This Second Draft Edition retains the established Root Vocabulary architecture while refining selected concepts through controlled cross-domain review. The principal revisions strengthen Boundary, Interface, and Boundary Transparency; introduce Interface Transparency; and align the conceptual dependency and Annex B with the revised Foundational Article 7.

This Standard is voluntary and non-regulatory. It does not establish technical, clinical, service-delivery, management, certification, or legal requirements. Its purpose is to preserve one coherent language for Whole Quality reasoning.

Table of Contents

Revision and Development Note	3
Editor's Note (Second Draft Edition).....	3
1 Introduction.....	3
2 Reference Documents.....	4
3 Root Conceptual Framework and Vocabulary Scope	4
4 Root Terms and Definitions	5
5 Rules for Applied Vocabulary Development.....	13
6 Scope, Applicability, and Exclusions	14
Annex A (informative) - Root-to-Applied Vocabulary Matrix.....	14
Annex B (informative) - Conceptual Dependency Map	15
Copyright and Use Notice	16

Revision and Development Note

This Second Draft Edition is a controlled refinement of the initial consolidation of the WQI Root Vocabulary. It preserves the layered architecture established in Foundational Article 5 (Second Edition): one methodology, one Root Vocabulary, many Applied Vocabularies, many Core Standards, and many Context Guides.

The vocabulary was developed by comparing concepts used in WQI Foundational Articles, IQI_VOC1, and AMSI_VOC1 and separating them into Root Concepts whose meanings belong to the Whole Quality methodology and Applied Concepts required for particular classes of Quality Objects.

This edition reflects cross-domain testing of Boundary and Interface concepts through WQI, IQI, and AMSI. It does not reopen the vocabulary as a whole. Existing Root Concept numbers remain unchanged, and Interface Transparency is added as the next available Root Concept.

Following publication of this draft, a targeted alignment review should confirm that IQI_VOC1 and AMSI_VOC1 adopt the revised Root meanings without creating competing definitions.

Editor's Note (Second Draft Edition)

This Second Draft Edition refines selected Root Concepts to reflect the continued maturation of the Whole Quality methodology. The revisions strengthen Boundary and Interface, clarify their relationship to declared Quality Objects, Scale, Function Realization, Evidence, and bounded Quality Claims, and introduce Interface Transparency as a complementary Root Concept. The revisions preserve backward compatibility with previously published WQI, IQI, and AMSI documents while improving conceptual precision. Further methodological explanation is provided in WQI Foundational Article 7 - Boundaries in Whole Quality, Second Edition.

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Standard is to establish authoritative definitions for Root Concepts of the Whole Quality methodology and to define the rules by which those concepts are adopted and extended in Applied Vocabularies.

1.2 Position Within the Whole Quality Architecture

The WQI Root Vocabulary occupies the second layer of the Whole Quality document architecture, following the Foundational Articles and preceding Applied Vocabularies, Core Standards, and Context Guides.

- Foundational Articles explain.
- The WQI Root Vocabulary defines.
- Applied Vocabularies extend.
- Core Standards require.
- Context Guides interpret.

1.3 One Concept - One Authoritative Definition

Each Whole Quality concept shall have one authoritative definition at the document layer appropriate to that concept. A Root Concept is defined in this Standard. An Applied Concept is defined in the relevant Applied Vocabulary. Core Standards and Context Guides use and cross-reference those definitions; they do not redefine them.

1.4 Relationship to Applied Vocabularies

Applied Vocabularies adopt Root Concepts without modification and define only additional concepts required by the relevant class of Quality Objects. IQI_VOC1 therefore retains infrastructure-specific concepts, while AMSI_VOC1 retains support-service, occupational, and caregiving concepts.

1.5 Intended Use

This Standard is intended to support consistent drafting, interpretation, comparison, revision, and expansion of Whole Quality documents across application domains.

2 Reference Documents

- WQI Foundational Articles 1-9.
- FTA5 - One Root Vocabulary, Many Applied Vocabularies, Second Edition.
- FTA7 - Boundaries in Whole Quality, Second Edition.
- IQI_VOC1 - Infrastructure Quality Vocabulary Standard, current draft edition.
- AMSI_VOC1 - Support Service Quality Vocabulary Standard, current draft edition.
- Relevant WQI, IQI, and AMSI Core Standards and Context Guides used to test conceptual consistency.

External laws, regulations, codes, classifications, scientific sources, and professional standards may form part of a Reference Layer in particular applications, but they do not control the meaning of Root Concepts within Whole Quality documents unless expressly incorporated for a defined purpose.

3 Root Conceptual Framework and Vocabulary Scope

3.1 Root Conceptual Dependency

The Whole Quality method is organized around the following principal dependency:

Quality Object -> Quality Object Description -> Boundaries and Interfaces -> Intended Functions and Intended Results -> Function Realization -> Failure-Mode Families -> Quality Factors -> Quality Indicators -> Quality Outcome Criteria -> Evidence-Supported Findings -> Quality Factor Interpretation -> Critical-Condition and Non-Compensability Review -> Quality State -> Quality Claim

3.2 Quality Object as the Primary Reference Point

Every Whole Quality determination begins by defining and sufficiently describing the Quality Object. The object controls the relevant functions, results, boundaries, interfaces, factors, indicators, criteria, evidence, uncertainty, Quality State, and permissible claim scope.

3.3 Invariance and Context

Root Concepts are invariant in meaning across domains and scales. Their application is not context-free. Applied Vocabularies and Context Guides identify the domain-specific objects, relationships, evidence sources, failure modes, and interpretations needed to use Root Concepts accurately.

3.4 Vocabulary Scope

This Standard defines methodological concepts. It does not define every object-specific term, technical requirement, service role, occupational category, clinical condition, performance threshold, evidence protocol, certification procedure, or jurisdictional obligation.

4 Root Terms and Definitions

4.1 Whole Quality

A methodology for determining and communicating the quality state of a defined Quality Object by examining the realization of its intended functions and intended results within declared boundaries and interfaces, using Quality Factors, Quality Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, and sufficient evidence.

Note 1. Whole Quality is applicable across different classes and scales of Quality Objects.

Note 2. The methodology does not assume that all aspects of an object are equally observable or that uncertainty can be eliminated.

4.2 Quality

The degree to which a defined Quality Object realizes its intended functions, purposes, or results within declared boundaries and interfaces, as interpreted against defined Quality Outcome Criteria and supported by sufficient evidence.

Note 1. Quality is a condition of the Quality Object, not a synonym for activity, effort, documentation, compliance, certification, or absence of known failure.

Note 2. Quality may be interpreted only within the declared object, context, time, evidence basis, and claim boundary.

4.3 Quality Object

The defined object, system, service, process, condition, arrangement, asset, platform, or system-of-systems whose quality state is being determined.

Note 1. The Quality Object is the primary reference point for Whole Quality analysis.

Note 2. Its declaration controls what is included, excluded, observed, interpreted, and claimed.

Note 3. A Quality Object may be broad or narrow, but its boundaries and interfaces must be sufficiently clear for the intended determination.

4.4 Quality Object Description

A structured description of the Quality Object sufficient to identify what the object is, what it is intended to do or produce, its relevant composition, declared Scale, context, and the boundaries and interfaces that control the Quality State determination.

Note 1. The description should be proportionate to the Scale, complexity, consequence, and uncertainty of the object.

4.5 Intended Function

What a Quality Object is expected to do, enable, provide, preserve, prevent, separate, control, support, or otherwise realize within a defined context.

Note 1. An object may have more than one Intended Function.

Note 2. Intended Functions may arise from design, purpose, need, obligation, agreement, biological role, social role, or another valid reference source.

4.6 Intended Result

The condition, outcome, effect, capability, or state expected to be produced or maintained through realization of an Intended Function.

Note 1. An Intended Result may be immediate, delayed, continuous, episodic, tangible, or intangible.

Note 2. The existence of activity or output does not by itself demonstrate realization of the Intended Result.

4.7 Function Realization

The actual achievement, maintenance, or provision of an Intended Function and its associated Intended Results by the Quality Object under the relevant conditions.

Note 1. Function Realization may be complete, partial, unstable, uncertain, not demonstrated, or failed.

Note 2. Quality Factors and Quality Indicators are used to make Function Realization visible and interpretable.

4.8 Boundary

A declared, designed, inferred, discovered, realized, or verified limit that distinguishes what is inside from what is outside, or separates constituents, functions, responsibilities, conditions, periods, observations, or claims in relation to a declared Quality Object.

Note 1. A Boundary may be external, separating the Quality Object from its surrounding environment or other Quality Objects, or internal, distinguishing constituents, functions, responsibilities, conditions, or relationships within the declared Quality Object.

Note 2. Whether a Boundary is internal or external depends on the declared Quality Object and its declared Scale.

Note 3. Boundaries may be physical, functional, organizational, operational, informational, temporal, lifecycle-related, biological, environmental, regulatory, relational, evidentiary, responsibility-based, or claim-related.

Note 4. A Boundary may change throughout the Lifecycle of a Quality Object. A designed or inferred Boundary is not automatically a realized or verified Boundary.

Note 5. The Boundary of a Quality Object, the scope boundary of a Quality State determination, and the Quality Claim Boundary are related but are not necessarily identical.

Note 6. Further methodological explanation is provided in WQI Foundational Article 7 - Boundaries in Whole Quality, Second Edition.

4.9 Interface

A defined location, pathway, relationship, mechanism, or condition at or through which two or more constituents, Quality Objects, systems, persons, organizations, environments,

responsibilities, lifecycle stages, or information sources interact, exchange, transfer, coordinate, influence, receive, interpret, or act in relation to Function Realization.

Note 1. An Interface may be internal, connecting constituents within a declared Quality Object, or external, crossing the external Boundary of the declared Quality Object.

Note 2. Whether an Interface is internal or external depends on the declared Quality Object and its declared Scale.

Note 3. Materials, energy, information, authority, responsibility, work, resources, decisions, Evidence, risk, effects, consequences, or feedback may pass or be realized through an Interface.

Note 4. An Interface does not merge the connected constituents or automatically make them part of the same Quality Object.

Note 5. Interface degradation or failure may impair Function Realization even when the connected constituents appear satisfactory when examined separately.

Note 6. Further methodological explanation is provided in WQI Foundational Article 7 - Boundaries in Whole Quality, Second Edition.

4.10 Boundary Transparency

The degree to which the boundaries, exclusions, interfaces, assumptions, evidence limits, and responsibility limits relevant to a Quality State determination or Quality Claim are made explicit and understandable.

Note 1. Boundary Transparency applies to relevant external and internal Boundaries and depends on the declared Quality Object and Scale.

Note 2. Boundary Transparency does not require the elimination of Uncertainty; it requires material uncertainty, exclusions, assumptions, and limits to be disclosed responsibly.

Note 3. Sufficient Boundary Transparency supports Evidence interpretation and prevents a Quality Claim from extending beyond the scope supported by the determination.

4.11 Scale

The level of aggregation, resolution, or extent at which a Quality Object is defined and its quality is considered.

Note 1. Whole Quality vocabulary is applicable across scales, but evidence and claims are not automatically transferable between scales.

Note 2. A finding about a component does not by itself determine the quality state of the assembled system, and a system-level claim does not automatically describe every component.

4.12 Context

The set of relevant conditions within which a Quality Object exists, functions, is observed, or is evaluated.

Note 1. Context may include operational, environmental, social, organizational, jurisdictional, lifecycle, population, technological, temporal, and other conditions.

4.13 Failure Mode

A way in which an Intended Function or Intended Result may be prevented, degraded, distorted, interrupted, destabilized, or lost.

Note 1. Failure modes may arise within the object, at its boundaries or interfaces, or through changing context.

4.14 Failure-Mode Family

A broad, conceptually related grouping of failure modes used to support systematic derivation and interpretation of Quality Factors.

Note 1. Failure-Mode Families help prevent Quality Factors from becoming arbitrary lists of desirable topics.

4.15 Quality Factor

A broad dimension of quality derived from the Quality Object, its Intended Functions and Intended Results, boundaries, interfaces, and relevant Failure-Mode Families.

Note 1. A Quality Factor organizes related Quality Indicators and makes a major dimension of Function Realization visible.

Note 2. A Quality Factor is not, by itself, a measurement, score, threshold, task, or requirement.

4.16 Quality Indicator

An observable, assessable, or otherwise examinable aspect of a Quality Factor used to determine how Function Realization becomes visible.

Note 1. A Quality Indicator identifies what is examined; it does not by itself define the acceptable or required state.

Note 2. A Quality Indicator may be supported by qualitative, quantitative, direct, indirect, or combined evidence.

4.17 Quality Outcome Criterion

A defined expected condition, result, relationship, threshold, or evidence-supported state against which a Quality Indicator is interpreted.

Note 1. Quality Outcome Criteria define what state or result is expected; they are distinct from the Indicator that identifies what is examined.

Note 2. Criteria may be qualitative or quantitative and may include necessary conditions, prohibited conditions, tolerances, or bounded ranges.

4.18 Evidence

Information, observation, record, measurement, testimony, analysis, or other support used to determine or justify a finding about a Quality Indicator, Quality Outcome Criterion, Quality Factor, Quality State, or Quality Claim.

Note 1. Evidence may be direct or indirect, qualitative or quantitative, current or historical.

Note 2. Evidence does not define quality by itself; it supports interpretation against the relevant criteria and boundaries.

4.19 Evidence Sufficiency

The degree to which available evidence is adequate in relevance, credibility, coverage, consistency, timeliness, and traceability to support the intended Quality State determination or Quality Claim.

Note 1. Evidence Sufficiency is relative to the declared object, criteria, consequence, uncertainty, time, and claim scope.

Note 2. More evidence is not necessarily more sufficient if it does not address the relevant Indicator or Criterion.

4.20 Evidence-Supported Finding

A bounded finding about an Indicator or Criterion that is justified by the available evidence and states relevant limitations or uncertainty.

Note 1. Evidence-supported findings are interpreted together at the Quality Factor level before a Quality State is determined.

4.21 Reference Layer

The set of applicable external or internal sources used to interpret Intended Functions, Quality Outcome Criteria, evidence, responsibilities, or Quality Claims.

Note 1. The Reference Layer may include laws, regulations, standards, contracts, policies, scientific knowledge, professional guidance, design bases, plans, accepted practices, or other valid sources.

Note 2. A source belongs to the Reference Layer only to the extent that it is relevant to the declared object and context.

4.22 Uncertainty

A condition in which relevant knowledge, evidence, boundaries, mechanisms, relationships, future behavior, or interpretation is incomplete, variable, ambiguous, or not fully resolved.

Note 1. Uncertainty is not automatically a defect, but it must be considered in the Quality State determination and bounded in any Quality Claim.

4.23 Unresolved Condition

A relevant condition, discrepancy, anomaly, evidence gap, uncertainty, or potential failure mechanism that has not been sufficiently resolved for the intended determination or claim.

Note 1. An Unresolved Condition may require monitoring, investigation, restriction, qualification, or exclusion from a claim.

4.24 Assumption

A proposition accepted for the purpose of analysis or interpretation when it has not been fully demonstrated by direct evidence.

Note 1. Assumptions should be declared when they materially affect the Quality State determination or claim.

4.25 Assumption Drift

The loss of validity, relevance, or visibility of an assumption as the Quality Object, context, evidence, or time changes.

Note 1. Assumption Drift may occur when an original design, service, organizational, biological, social, or operating assumption is carried forward without re-examination.

4.26 Critical Condition

A condition whose absence, failure, violation, or unresolved status prevents a responsible positive Quality State determination or Quality Claim, regardless of satisfactory findings elsewhere.

Note 1. Critical Conditions express non-compensability: favorable evidence in other areas cannot substitute for a failed critical condition.

4.27 Non-Compensability

The principle that a failed, prohibited, or unresolved critical condition cannot be offset by favorable findings for other Quality Factors, Indicators, or criteria.

Note 1. Non-compensability protects the integrity of Quality State determinations that would otherwise be distorted by averaging or substitution.

4.28 Quality Factor Interpretation

The reasoned interpretation of evidence-supported findings associated with a Quality Factor, including relevant relationships, limitations, uncertainty, and critical conditions.

Note 1. Quality Factor Interpretation is not merely aggregation or arithmetic scoring unless a valid method specifically supports such use.

4.29 Quality State

The interpreted condition of a defined Quality Object in relation to its Intended Functions and Intended Results, within declared boundaries, interfaces, context, time, criteria, evidence, uncertainty, and critical conditions.

Note 1. A Quality State is evidence-supported and bounded; it is not an intrinsic label detached from scope or time.

Note 2. Different Quality States may be determined for different boundaries, scales, contexts, or periods of the same broader object.

4.30 Quality State Determination

The structured process of deriving evidence-supported findings, interpreting them at the Quality Factor level, reviewing critical conditions and non-compensability, and establishing the Quality State of a defined Quality Object.

Note 1. The process should preserve traceability from the Quality State back to the Quality Object, Indicators, Criteria, evidence, and declared limitations.

4.31 Quality Claim

A bounded communication that states or represents a determined Quality State, Quality Factor interpretation, or other quality-related conclusion about a defined Quality Object.

Note 1. A Quality Claim may be made by a first, second, or third party, but its validity depends on its basis and boundary rather than the party label alone.

Note 2. A Quality Claim should not exceed the evidence-supported determination from which it is derived.

4.32 Quality Claim Boundary

The declared scope and limits within which a Quality Claim is intended to be valid.

Note 1. The boundary should identify the Quality Object, scale, context, lifecycle or evaluation period, relevant criteria, evidence basis, exclusions, uncertainty, and any conditions of continued validity.

4.33 Absence of Observed Failure

A condition in which no failure has been identified within the available observation or evidence, without demonstrating that the Quality Object satisfies all relevant Quality Outcome Criteria.

Note 1. Absence of observed failure is not equivalent to demonstrated quality.

Note 2. The meaning of non-observation depends on the adequacy and coverage of monitoring and evidence.

4.34 Data

Recorded representations of observations, measurements, events, conditions, transactions, or other information that may be used as evidence after evaluation of relevance, reliability, context, and meaning.

Note 1. Data are not automatically evidence, and evidence is not automatically sufficient.

4.35 Technology

The organized application of knowledge, methods, tools, systems, or techniques to perform functions, produce results, support decisions, or affect a Quality Object.

Note 1. Technology may form part of a Quality Object, an interface, the context, the evidence system, or the method of determination.

4.36 Technology Governance

The allocation and exercise of responsibility, authority, controls, oversight, and accountability for the selection, use, modification, monitoring, and retirement of technology relevant to a Quality Object.

Note 1. Technology Governance is an applied concept when domain-specific responsibilities and controls are defined.

4.37 Lifecycle

The sequence of relevant stages through which a Quality Object is conceived, created, established, used, maintained, changed, transitioned, and ended.

Note 1. Lifecycle stages depend on the nature of the Quality Object and should not be forced into a single universal sequence.

Note 2. Evidence and assumptions may originate in one stage and affect Quality State determination in another.

4.38 Lifecycle Gate

A defined transition or decision point between lifecycle stages at which specified conditions, evidence, responsibilities, or quality determinations are reviewed.

Note 1. Lifecycle Gate is a Root concept; particular gate names and requirements belong in Applied Vocabularies, Core Standards, or Context Guides.

4.39 Stakeholder / Interested Party

A person, group, organization, community, authority, or other entity that affects, is affected by, has responsibility for, or has a legitimate interest in a Quality Object or Quality Claim.

Note 1. The term does not imply that all interests are identical or that all parties have the same authority or responsibility.

4.40 Foundational Article

A WQI publication that explains the concepts, principles, development, and reasoning of the Whole Quality methodology without replacing authoritative vocabulary definitions or establishing detailed requirements.

4.41 Root Vocabulary

The single authoritative vocabulary that defines concepts belonging to the Whole Quality methodology itself and that are intended to retain the same meaning across application domains.

Note 1. The WQI Root Vocabulary is adopted without redefinition by Applied Vocabularies and other Whole Quality documents.

4.42 Root Concept

A concept whose meaning is methodological and broadly applicable across different classes of Quality Objects and application domains.

Note 1. A concept should be placed in the Root Vocabulary only when cross-domain use demonstrates broad methodological significance.

4.43 Applied Vocabulary

A controlled vocabulary that adopts Root Concepts without modification and defines additional concepts required to represent a particular class of Quality Objects or application domain accurately.

Note 1. An Applied Vocabulary does not replace or alter the Root Vocabulary.

Note 2. Examples include infrastructure and support-service Applied Vocabularies.

4.44 Applied Concept

A concept required to describe a defined class of Quality Objects or application domain but not sufficiently universal to belong to the Root Vocabulary.

Note 1. Applied Concepts must remain consistent with Root Concepts and should not duplicate an existing Root definition.

4.45 Core Standard

A document that uses the Root Vocabulary and relevant Applied Vocabulary to establish a stable quality architecture and requirements for a defined class of Quality Objects.

Note 1. A Core Standard may establish Intended Functions, Quality Factors, Quality Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, evidence requirements, critical conditions, non-compensability rules, Quality State Determination requirements, and permissible Quality Claims.

4.46 Context Guide

A document that interprets a Core Standard within a bounded application context without redefining Root or Applied Concepts or changing the invariant Core architecture.

Note 1. A context may be defined by object type, service, technology, environment, lifecycle stage, population, jurisdiction, or another application condition.

4.47 Context-Specific Interpretation

The explanation of how Root and Applied Concepts, Core requirements, Indicators, criteria, evidence, boundaries, interfaces, and failure modes are understood and applied within a defined context.

Note 1. Context-specific interpretation clarifies application; it does not create a conflicting definition.

4.48 Authoritative Definition

The controlling definition of a concept located at the document layer appropriate to that concept.

Note 1. Each concept should have one authoritative definition. Other documents should adopt it or cross-reference it rather than reproduce a modified version.

4.49 Conceptual Dependency

A defined logical relationship through which one Whole Quality concept depends on, precedes, constrains, or supports another concept.

Note 1. Conceptual dependencies support traceability and help prevent terms from becoming disconnected glossary entries.

4.50 Interface Transparency

The degree to which an Interface, its participating constituents, exchanged or transferred elements, responsibilities, conditions, assumptions, and supporting Evidence are sufficiently identified, described, and understandable to support reliable interpretation of Function Realization and determination of the Quality State.

Note 1. Interface Transparency complements Boundary Transparency.

Note 2. A transparent Boundary does not necessarily imply a transparent Interface.

Note 3. Insufficient Interface Transparency may reduce confidence in Function Realization, Evidence interpretation, Quality State determination, or Quality Claims.

Note 4. Interface Transparency should be considered throughout the Lifecycle of the declared Quality Object.

5 Rules for Applied Vocabulary Development

5.1 Adoption of Root Concepts

An Applied Vocabulary shall adopt Root Concepts and their authoritative definitions without modification. Where explanation is needed, the Applied Vocabulary may add an application note or define an Applied Concept derived from the Root Concept, provided the Root meaning is preserved.

5.2 Introduction of Applied Concepts

An Applied Concept may be introduced only when the relevant application domain requires language that is not already provided by the Root Vocabulary. The definition shall identify the relationship to the relevant Root Concept where such a relationship exists.

5.3 Screening Questions

- Does the concept retain the same meaning across substantially different Quality Objects and domains?
- Is the concept necessary to the Whole Quality methodology itself, rather than to one domain?
- Would moving the concept to the Root Vocabulary reduce duplication without forcing unlike objects into inaccurate language?
- Has use across more than one application domain demonstrated broad methodological significance?

- Would changing the concept affect multiple Applied Vocabularies, Core Standards, or Context Guides?

A concept that satisfies these questions may be considered for controlled addition to the Root Vocabulary. A concept that remains object-specific should remain in the relevant Applied Vocabulary.

5.4 Cross-References and Reproduction

Other Whole Quality documents should cross-reference the authoritative definition. Reproduction may be permitted for usability only when the wording is unchanged and the authoritative source is clearly identified.

5.5 Controlled Evolution

Changes to Root Concepts require an assessment of conceptual dependencies and effects across all Applied Vocabularies, Core Standards, Context Guides, tools, diagrams, and Quality Claim structures. Changes should be edition-controlled, traceable, and proportionate to demonstrated methodological need.

6 Scope, Applicability, and Exclusions

6.1 Scope

This Standard applies to the use of Root Concepts throughout the Whole Quality family of documents and applications. Root Concepts are intentionally stable and are revised only when cross-domain application demonstrates a need for greater conceptual precision while preserving backward compatibility.

6.2 Applicability

The vocabulary may be applied to human-invented, natural, biological, social, organizational, technical, informational, and mixed Quality Objects at different scales, provided the object, boundaries, context, evidence, and claim scope are declared.

6.3 Relationship to Laws and Other Standards

This Standard does not replace laws, regulations, professional standards, technical codes, contracts, policies, classification systems, or domain-specific requirements. Those sources may inform the Reference Layer for a defined application.

6.4 Exclusions

This Standard does not establish mandatory performance thresholds, technical design rules, service-delivery requirements, clinical decisions, conformity-assessment procedures, certification rules, or authorization to make any particular Quality Claim.

Annex A (informative) - Root-to-Applied Vocabulary Matrix

The following matrix illustrates the division between Root Concepts and selected Applied Concepts. It is an initial working matrix and should be expanded during alignment of IQI_VOC1 and AMSI_VOC1.

WQI Root Concept	IQI Applied Example	AMSI Applied Example
Quality Object	Infrastructure Quality Object	Support Service Quality Object
Boundary	Infrastructure/asset boundary; operating-medium boundary	Service boundary
Quality State	Infrastructure Quality State	Service Quality State
Critical Condition	Critical infrastructure condition	Critical service condition
Lifecycle	Design-decommissioning lifecycle stages	Service period, support episode, participation period
Quality Claim	Infrastructure Quality Claim Statement	Service-quality claim / verification claim
Stakeholder / Interested Party	Owner, operator, regulator, community, worker	Person supported, caregiver, family, provider, funder
Reference Layer	Codes, regulations, design bases, technical standards	SOC, program rules, service standards, individual plans
Quality Object components	Infrastructure asset, element, component, operating medium	Occupation, job, work, result, service, caregiver role
Context Guide	Asset/facility/network Context Guide	Service/population/setting Context Guide

Annex B (informative) - Conceptual Dependency Map

The following questions provide a practical reading sequence for the Root Vocabulary:

- What is the Quality Object?
- Has the Quality Object been described with sufficient clarity, including its composition, Scale, and context?
- What is inside and outside its external Boundary?
- Which internal Boundaries distinguish material constituents, functions, responsibilities, conditions, periods, or states within the object?
- Are Boundary assumptions, exclusions, lifecycle changes, and Evidence limits transparent?
- Where and how does the object interact through internal and external Interfaces?
- Are the participating constituents and the elements exchanged, transferred, coordinated, received, interpreted, or acted upon at each material Interface sufficiently visible?
- Is Interface Transparency sufficient for reliable interpretation of Function Realization?
- What Intended Functions and Intended Results define the object's purpose?
- How is Function Realization achieved, maintained, interrupted, degraded, or lost?
- How can those functions fail or become degraded?
- Which Quality Factors represent the major dimensions of Function Realization?
- Which Quality Indicators make those dimensions observable?
- Which Quality Outcome Criteria define the expected states or results?
- What Evidence supports the findings, Boundaries, and Interfaces, and is it sufficient?
- What Uncertainty, Assumptions, Unresolved Conditions, and Critical Conditions remain?
- What Quality State can responsibly be determined?
- What bounded Quality Claim can responsibly be communicated?

Copyright and Use Notice

© 2026 Whole-Quality Institute. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, stored, or otherwise used in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the Whole-Quality Institute, except for brief quotations used for scholarly, educational, review, or citation purposes with appropriate attribution.

Document designation: WQI_VOC1 - Whole Quality Root Vocabulary Standard - Second Draft Edition, August 2026.