



QUALITY AND HARM

Testing the Dual-Nature Postulate

Research and Justification

WQI_DNP1

First Edition

Whole-Quality Institute

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Foreword	4
1 Scope	5
2 What Is Being Tested	5
2.1 The Dual-Nature Postulate	5
2.2 The Two Parts of the Postulate	6
2.3 What Would Support the Postulate.....	7
2.4 What Could Challenge the Postulate	8
3 Testing Method.....	9
3.1 Start With Independently Established Quality Factors and Indicators	9
3.2 Test Through Contextual Quality Outcome Criteria	10
3.3 Identify the Resulting Quality Condition	11
3.4 Examine the Possible Harm Connection	11
3.5 Preserve Negative and Uncertain Results	12
3.6 Testing Within a Core and Across Independent Cores.....	13
4 Testing Through Support Services	14
4.1 Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI).....	14
4.2 AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard	15
4.3 Personal Care Aide.....	16
4.4 Bathing Support	17
4.5 Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching	18
4.6 Cleaning Services Employment.....	19
4.7 What the AMSI Test Shows	20
5 Testing Through Energy Infrastructure.....	21
5.1 Infrastructure Quality Initiative (IQI)	21
5.2 IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core	22
5.3 Onshore Natural Gas Production Zones	23
5.4 Main Pipelines	24
5.5 Local Distribution Networks	25
5.6 Underground Gas Storage.....	27
5.7 Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure	28
5.8 What the IQI Test Shows	29
6 Cross-Platform Testing.....	30
6.1 Why AMSI and IQI Provide Independent Tests	30
6.2 Different Quality Objects and Independent Cores	31

6.3	No Required One-to-One Correspondence Between Factors and Indicators	32
6.4	What Remains Invariant	33
6.5	What Changes With Context	34
6.6	What the Cross-Platform Test Shows.....	35
7	Findings	36
7.1	Quality Nature Remains Independently Established	36
7.2	Latent Harm-Related Nature Is Observable Through Context.....	36
7.3	Context Reveals but Does Not Create Latent Harm Potential.....	37
7.4	Not Every Quality Deficiency Produces a Harm Pathway	38
7.5	Different Harm Pathways Can Express the Same Underlying Postulate.....	39
7.6	Current Status of the Dual-Nature Postulate	40
8	Limits of Current Testing	41
8.1	Limits of AMSI Tests	41
8.2	Limits of IQI Tests	42
8.3	Limits of Cross-Platform Testing.....	43
8.4	Incomplete Identification of Harm Pathways.....	44
8.5	What Current Testing Does Not Establish	44
9	Further Testing	45
9.1	Additional Contexts Within Existing Core	45
9.2	Additional Quality Objects Within Existing Core	46
9.3	Testing Through Other Independently Developed Cores	47
9.4	Distinguishing Challenge to the Postulate From a Gap in the Core	48
9.5	Conditions That Could Limit, Revise, or Falsify the Postulate	49
10	Conclusion.....	50
	COPYRIGHT AND USE NOTICE	52

Foreword

Foundational Article 14 introduced the Dual-Nature Postulate:

Every invariant Quality Factor and Quality Indicator possesses both a Quality nature and a latent Harm-related nature.

Foundational Article 15 then examined how a resulting Quality condition can be connected to possible Harm, Risk, and Safety.

This publication takes the next step.

It tests the Dual-Nature Postulate.

A meaningful test cannot begin with Harm and then select Quality Factors or Quality Indicators that appear capable of explaining it. Their Quality role must first be established independently.

The test can then ask a separate question:

Does an independently established Quality Factor or Quality Indicator also possess the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Postulate?

This publication examines that question through two substantially different WQI applications.

The first is the Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI). Its Support Service Core Standard, AMSI SSC1, is examined through Personal Care Aide and Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching, including the narrower applications of Bathing Support and Cleaning Services Employment.

The second is the Infrastructure Quality Initiative (IQI). Its independently developed Infrastructure Standard — Core is examined through five natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects: onshore natural gas production zones, main pipelines, local distribution networks, underground gas storage, and liquefied natural gas infrastructure.

The two tests are intentionally different.

AMSI examines the Postulate within support services. IQI provides an independent test through physical energy infrastructure and a separately developed Core.

The Factors and Indicators of the two Cores are not required to correspond to one another. The test is not whether the same Factors, Indicators, Quality conditions, or forms of Harm appear in both platforms.

The question is whether independently established invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators continue to show both natures proposed by the Postulate.

The testing must also permit a negative result.

A Factor or Indicator cannot be treated as possessing a latent Harm-related nature merely because the Postulate says that it should. If the proposed second nature cannot be demonstrated, that result must remain visible and may challenge the Postulate.

The testing presented in this publication therefore does not seek to prove the Postulate by assumption.

It asks whether the Postulate survives testing within AMSI, independently within IQI, and across the two platforms.

The results support the Postulate within the tested applications.

They do not establish universal validity.

The Dual-Nature Postulate remains open to further testing, limitation, revision, or falsification.

1 Scope

This Research and Justification publication tests the Dual-Nature Postulate developed in Foundational Article 14:

Every invariant Quality Factor and Quality Indicator possesses both a Quality nature and a latent Harm-related nature.

The publication tests the Postulate through two independently developed WQI application platforms:

- the Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI); and
- the Infrastructure Quality Initiative (IQI).

Within AMSI, the test uses the invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators of AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard. It examines them through Personal Care Aide and Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching, including the narrower applications of Bathing Support and Cleaning Services Employment.

Within IQI, the test uses the invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators of the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core. It examines them through five natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects:

- onshore natural gas production zones;
- main pipelines;
- local distribution networks;
- underground gas storage; and
- liquefied natural gas infrastructure.

The publication then compares the results across AMSI and IQI.

The testing asks whether the Quality nature of each tested Factor or Indicator remains independently established and whether its latent Harm-related nature can be demonstrated through contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, and possible Harm pathways.

The testing does not require the same Factors, Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, Harm pathways, or forms of Harm to appear in different contexts or platforms.

It also does not assume that every Quality deficiency produces a Harm pathway or that every Harm pathway results in realized Harm.

The publication does not establish universal validity of the Dual-Nature Postulate.

Its purpose is narrower: to determine whether the Postulate is supported, challenged, or contradicted by the AMSI and IQI applications examined here, and to identify the limits of those findings.

Detailed implications for Evidence Quality and Quality Determination are reserved for the next article in the Quality and Harm set. Quality Claims are addressed separately in later WQI work.

The testing presented here is methodological and comparative. It does not constitute empirical or statistical validation of the Postulate.

2 What Is Being Tested

2.1 The Dual-Nature Postulate

Foundational Article 14 established the Dual-Nature Postulate:

Every invariant Quality Factor and Quality Indicator possesses both a Quality nature and a latent Harm-related nature.

The Postulate concerns two natures of the same Factor or Indicator.

A Quality Factor has a Quality nature because it represents a fundamental dimension necessary for determining the Quality of the applicable class of Quality Object.

A Quality Indicator has a Quality nature because it makes an aspect of that Factor visible and examinable.

These Quality roles exist independently of Harm.

The Postulate proposes that the same invariant Factor or Indicator also possesses a latent Harm-related nature.

This does not mean that the Factor or Indicator causes Harm.

It does not mean that every non-achievement produces a Harm pathway.

It does not mean that Harm must become realized.

The proposed latent Harm-related nature means that contextual non-achievement associated with the Factor or Indicator can produce a resulting Quality condition through which Harm can become possible.

The latent Harm potential belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator within its applicable Core.

Its particular expression is contextual.

Context does not create the latent Harm potential. Context reveals the particular form it can take through contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, and possible Harm pathways.

This publication tests this proposition rather than assuming it.

The central question is therefore:

Do independently established invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators demonstrate both the Quality nature and the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Dual-Nature Postulate?

2.2 The Two Parts of the Postulate

The Dual-Nature Postulate contains two propositions that must both remain visible in testing.

The first concerns Quality.

An invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator must have an independently established role in Quality Determination.

The Factor or Indicator must therefore be necessary for determining Quality before its possible relationship to Harm is examined.

This is the Quality nature.

The second concerns latent Harm potential.

The same Factor or Indicator must also be capable, through contextual non-achievement, of being associated with a resulting Quality condition that can support a credible pathway to possible Harm.

This is the latent Harm-related nature.

The two parts are connected, but they must not be tested in reverse order.

The analysis cannot begin with a known form of Harm, identify something associated with that Harm, and then treat it as evidence of the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The Quality nature must first stand on its own.

Only then can the second question be asked:

Can contextual non-achievement associated with this independently established Factor or Indicator produce a condition capable of supporting a credible Harm pathway?

The test can therefore be represented as:

independently established Quality Factor or Quality Indicator

- Quality nature demonstrated
- contextual Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Quality condition
- latent Harm-related nature examined through a possible Harm pathway.

The Postulate is supported only if both parts remain identifiable.

Demonstrating a Quality role without a credible latent Harm-related nature would not support the complete Postulate.

Identifying a possible Harm relationship without first establishing the independent Quality role would also be insufficient.

This publication therefore tests the two natures together while preserving the independence of the evidence supporting each.

2.3 What Would Support the Postulate

The Dual-Nature Postulate is supported when testing shows both proposed natures of an invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator.

First, its Quality nature must already be established independently of Harm.

Second, contextual testing must show that non-achievement associated with the same Factor or Indicator can produce a resulting Quality condition capable of supporting a credible Harm pathway.

The test therefore looks for the following relationship:

invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator

- independently established Quality nature
- contextual Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Quality condition
- Harm-capable condition
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

The particular Harm pathway does not need to be the same in every context.

The form of possible Harm does not need to be the same.

The pathway may be direct or indirect and may involve different affected persons, property, environments, or other defined subjects or interests.

What must remain is the underlying relationship: the same invariant Factor or Indicator that has an established Quality function also possesses latent Harm potential that can be expressed through context.

Testing across materially different contexts within the same Core provides stronger support if this relationship continues to appear while the contextual expression changes.

Testing through an independently developed Core provides a further test because its Factors and Indicators were established for a different class of Quality Object rather than transferred from the first Core.

Support does not require Harm to become realized.

It requires a credible connection between the resulting Quality condition and possible Harm.

Nor does support require every Quality deficiency to become Harm-capable. A particular non-achievement may remain a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway.

The Postulate concerns the latent Harm-related nature of the invariant Factor or Indicator, not a claim that every instance of its non-achievement produces Harm.

The strength of the test therefore comes from finding the proposed relationship without assuming it in advance and while allowing results that do not support it.

2.4 What Could Challenge the Postulate

Testing must allow the Dual-Nature Postulate to be challenged.

The Postulate would be challenged if an invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator has a valid and independently established Quality role, but its proposed latent Harm-related nature cannot be demonstrated across materially different contexts within its applicable Core.

A single case without a demonstrated Harm pathway is not sufficient to reach that conclusion.

The absence of a demonstrated pathway in one case may result from the particular Quality Outcome Criteria, the resulting Quality condition, the context, or insufficient Evidence.

These possibilities must be examined before the Postulate itself is questioned.

The test must also distinguish between two different problems.

The first concerns the Postulate.

An existing Factor or Indicator may repeatedly perform its established Quality function while failing, across materially different contexts, to demonstrate a credible latent relationship to possible Harm.

Such a result could challenge the proposed latent Harm-related nature of that Factor or Indicator and therefore the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The second concerns the completeness of the applicable Core.

A material Quality–Harm relationship may be identified that cannot be adequately traced through the existing Factors or Indicators.

That finding does not automatically falsify the Postulate.

It may instead indicate that the Core does not fully represent the Quality dimensions necessary for its intended scope.

The testing must therefore ask two different questions:

Does an existing invariant Factor or Indicator fail to demonstrate the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Postulate?

or

Does a material Quality–Harm relationship exist that the current Core does not adequately represent?

The first can challenge the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The second can challenge the completeness of the applicable Core.

Neither result should be reinterpreted merely to preserve the Postulate.

The testing must remain open to support, limitation, revision, or falsification according to the Evidence.

3 Testing Method

3.1 Start With Independently Established Quality Factors and Indicators

Testing begins with Quality, not with Harm.

The Quality Factors and Quality Indicators used in the test must already have an established role in determining the Quality of the applicable class of Quality Object.

They cannot be selected because they appear capable of explaining a known Harm.

This order is essential.

If the analysis began with injury, damage, loss, or another adverse outcome and then searched for a Quality Factor or Quality Indicator that could be connected to it, the result would not independently test the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The Harm relationship would already influence what was selected for examination.

The testing therefore begins with the applicable Core.

For each invariant Factor or Indicator, the first question is:

What is its independently established Quality function?

Only after that function is established does the testing ask:

Does the same Factor or Indicator also possess the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Postulate?

This separation allows the two parts of the Postulate to be examined without defining one through the other.

It also prevents the testing from treating every known Harm as evidence for the Postulate merely because a Quality-related explanation can be found afterward.

This method applies to both tests in this Article.

Within AMSI, the starting point is the invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators of AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard.

Within IQI, the starting point is the independently developed invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators of the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

Their Factors and Indicators were developed for different classes of Quality Objects and do not need to correspond to one another.

What matters for the test is that their Quality roles stand independently before their possible relationships to Harm are examined.

3.2 Test Through Contextual Quality Outcome Criteria

The invariant Factor or Indicator provides the starting point, but the Harm-related test must occur in context.

Within a Core, the Factor or Indicator remains invariant.

The Quality Outcome Criteria express what achievement of that Factor or Indicator requires for the particular Quality Object and context being examined.

The test therefore does not ask whether an invariant Factor or Indicator is harmful in the abstract.

It asks what happens when an applicable contextual Quality Outcome Criterion associated with that Factor or Indicator is not achieved.

The sequence begins:

invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator

→ contextual Quality Outcome Criterion

→ achievement or non-achievement.

Achievement and non-achievement must be determined against the applicable Quality Outcome Criterion.

Non-achievement establishes a Quality deficiency.

It does not, by itself, establish a Harm-capable condition or a Harm pathway.

The next step is to identify the resulting Quality condition created by that non-achievement and examine whether that condition has a credible connection to possible Harm.

This distinction is important because the same invariant Factor or Indicator may be expressed through different Quality Outcome Criteria in different contexts.

Its particular relationship to possible Harm may therefore also appear differently.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criterion does not create the latent Harm potential of the Factor or Indicator.

It provides the contextual basis through which non-achievement and its resulting Quality condition can be examined.

This allows the test to preserve both levels of the Postulate:

the latent Harm-related nature remains with the invariant Factor or Indicator within its applicable Core;

and

its particular expression is revealed through the Quality Object, contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, and resulting Quality conditions.

The AMSI and IQI tests therefore use their respective contextual requirements to examine the same methodological question without requiring the contexts themselves to be alike.

3.3 Identify the Resulting Quality Condition

Non-achievement of a contextual Quality Outcome Criterion establishes that an applicable Quality requirement has not been achieved.

The next step is to identify the resulting Quality condition.

The resulting Quality condition is the actual condition of the Quality Object associated with that non-achievement.

This step is necessary because Quality non-achievement and possible Harm are not the same thing.

The test must not move directly from:

Quality Outcome Criterion not achieved

to:

possible Harm.

It must first ask:

What condition results from the non-achievement?

The sequence is therefore:

invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator

→ contextual Quality Outcome Criterion

→ non-achievement

→ resulting Quality condition.

Only after the resulting Quality condition is identified can its possible relationship to Harm be examined.

Some resulting Quality conditions may have a clear connection to possible Harm.

Others may remain Quality deficiencies without a demonstrated Harm connection.

Still others may require additional Evidence before that relationship can be determined.

The resulting Quality condition therefore provides an essential boundary between Quality Determination and Harm analysis.

It prevents Harm from being assumed merely because a Quality requirement was not achieved.

It also allows different non-achievements associated with the same invariant Factor or Indicator to produce different contextual expressions of its latent Harm potential.

The testing proceeds from the condition that actually results, not from an assumed adverse outcome.

The next question is whether that resulting Quality condition is capable of supporting a credible pathway to possible Harm.

3.4 Examine the Possible Harm Connection

After the resulting Quality condition is identified, the test examines whether it has a credible connection to possible Harm.

This examination must not assume that such a connection exists.

A resulting Quality condition may remain a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway.

Where a credible connection to possible Harm exists, the resulting Quality condition can be identified as Harm-capable.

A Harm-capable condition is capable of supporting a Harm pathway.

It does not, by itself, establish that the Harm pathway has already been demonstrated.

The analysis must therefore examine the connection between the Harm-capable condition and possible injury, damage, or loss affecting an identifiable subject or interest.

Where that connection is supported by Evidence, a Harm pathway can be identified.

The sequence becomes:

resulting Quality condition
→ Harm-capable condition
→ Harm pathway
→ possible Harm.

The Harm pathway may be direct or indirect.

It may involve one Quality condition or interaction among several conditions.

It may develop immediately or over time.

The possible Harm may also take different forms depending on the Quality Object and context.

The purpose of this step is not to calculate Risk or determine Safety.

Those determinations occur after possible Harm and its pathway have been identified and require additional considerations.

The purpose here is narrower:

Does the resulting Quality condition provide a credible, evidence-supported connection through which Harm can become possible?

If yes, the contextual expression of the Factor or Indicator's latent Harm-related nature has been demonstrated for that case.

If no credible connection can be demonstrated, the condition remains a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway.

If the available Evidence does not permit either conclusion, the Harm relationship remains uncertain.

These different outcomes must remain visible in the testing.

3.5 Preserve Negative and Uncertain Results

A valid test must allow results that do not support the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The analysis must therefore preserve three possible outcomes.

The first is a demonstrated Harm relationship.

A resulting Quality condition is Harm-capable, and an evidence-supported Harm pathway to possible Harm can be identified.

The second is no demonstrated Harm pathway.

A Quality Outcome Criterion is not achieved and a resulting Quality condition exists, but no credible Harm pathway can be demonstrated.

The condition remains a Quality deficiency.

It must not be made Harm-related merely to support the Postulate.

The third is uncertainty.

Available Evidence may be insufficient to determine whether the resulting Quality condition supports a credible Harm pathway.

In that case, the relationship to possible Harm remains unresolved.

Uncertainty must not be treated as evidence either for or against the Postulate.

These outcomes can be represented as:

Quality non-achievement

→ resulting Quality condition

→ demonstrated Harm pathway;

or

Quality non-achievement

→ resulting Quality condition

→ no demonstrated Harm pathway;

or

Quality non-achievement

→ resulting Quality condition

→ uncertain relationship to possible Harm.

Preserving these distinctions prevents the testing method from producing its own desired result.

It also prevents absence of demonstrated Harm in one case from being treated automatically as evidence against the Postulate.

The Postulate concerns the latent Harm-related nature of the invariant Factor or Indicator across its applicable Core.

Its testing therefore requires examination across materially different contexts, while preserving negative and uncertain findings wherever they occur.

Only after those findings remain visible can the overall evidence for or against the Postulate be evaluated.

3.6 Testing Within a Core and Across Independent Cores

The Dual-Nature Postulate is tested at two levels in this publication.

The first is testing within an applicable Core.

An invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator is examined across materially different Quality Objects or contexts governed by the same Core.

The Factor or Indicator remains invariant.

Its contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, Harm pathways, and possible forms of Harm may change.

This provides a test of whether the proposed latent Harm-related nature remains with the invariant Factor or Indicator while its particular expression changes with context.

The AMSI testing uses this approach.

AMSI SSC1 remains the applicable Core while the testing moves through Personal Care Aide and Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching and their narrower applications.

The IQI testing also examines variation within one Core.

The IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core remains invariant while its Factors and Indicators are examined through five different natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects.

The second level is testing across independently developed Cores.

This provides a different and stronger challenge to the Postulate.

AMSI and IQI address fundamentally different classes of Quality Objects.

Their Cores were developed independently.

Their Quality Factors and Quality Indicators are not required to correspond to one another.

Cross-platform testing therefore does not ask whether AMSI and IQI contain the same Factors, Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, or Harm pathways.

It asks whether the same proposed relationship appears independently in both:

an invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator has an established Quality nature;

and

the same Factor or Indicator possesses latent Harm potential whose particular expression can be revealed through context.

Testing within a Core examines whether this relationship persists across contextual variation.

Testing across independent Cores examines whether the relationship also appears in a fundamentally different Quality framework.

Together, these two levels provide the basis for the AMSI, IQI, and cross-platform tests that follow.

Neither level establishes universal validity.

They provide progressively broader tests of the Postulate while leaving it open to support, limitation, revision, or falsification.

4 Testing Through Support Services

4.1 Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI)

The first test of the Dual-Nature Postulate is conducted through the Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI).

AMSI provides a useful first test because its Quality framework was developed to determine the Quality of support services rather than to identify Harm.

Its Core therefore provides independently established Quality Factors and Quality Indicators from which the test can begin.

Support services also provide materially different contexts in which the same invariant Core can be examined.

The testing in this Article uses two support-service Quality Objects:

- Personal Care Aide; and
- Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching.

Each is also examined through a narrower application:

Personal Care Aide

→ Bathing Support;

and

Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching

→ Cleaning Services Employment.

These applications differ substantially.

Personal Care Aide concerns support with activities needed in daily life.

Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching concerns support related to participation and performance in employment.

Bathing Support narrows the first Quality Object to a specific personal-care activity.

Cleaning Services Employment narrows the second to support provided within a particular work setting.

The differences are important for the test.

The same AMSI Core remains applicable, while the support being provided, the contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, the resulting Quality conditions, the affected subjects or interests, and the possible forms of Harm can change.

This allows the testing to ask whether the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Postulate remains identifiable as its contextual expression changes.

The AMSI test therefore does not depend on one support service or one Harm pathway.

It examines whether the same invariant Quality framework continues to show the proposed dual nature across materially different support-service applications.

The test begins with AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard.

4.2 AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard

AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard provides the invariant Quality framework for the AMSI test.

Its Quality Factors and Quality Indicators apply across the support-service Quality Objects governed by the Core.

Their Quality role is established independently of the present Harm analysis.

This is essential to the test.

The Factors and Indicators are not selected because they appear related to injury, damage, loss, or another adverse outcome.

They are already part of the framework used to determine Support Service Quality.

The testing therefore begins with their established Quality nature and asks a separate question:

Does each invariant Factor or Indicator also possess the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Dual-Nature Postulate?

The answer cannot be obtained from the Core alone.

The invariant Factor or Indicator must be examined in relation to an actual support-service Quality Object and its contextual Quality Outcome Criteria.

The test therefore moves from:

AMSI SSC1

- invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator
- contextual Quality Outcome Criterion
- achievement or non-achievement
- resulting Quality condition.

Where non-achievement occurs, the resulting Quality condition can then be examined for a credible connection to possible Harm.

The particular expression may differ substantially from one support-service context to another.

A condition may concern physical protection in one context and effectiveness, participation, autonomy, dignity, privacy, information, employment interests, or another affected subject or interest in another.

These differences do not require changes to the invariant Factor or Indicator.

They provide the contextual variation needed to test whether its proposed latent Harm-related nature persists while its particular expression changes.

The AMSI test therefore keeps the Core fixed and varies the context.

The first application examined is Personal Care Aide.

4.3 Personal Care Aide

Personal Care Aide provides the first contextual test of AMSI SSC1.

The Quality Object is the support service provided by a Personal Care Aide to a person who requires assistance with activities of daily life.

The SSC1 Factors and Indicators remain invariant.

Personal Care Aide provides the context in which their Quality nature and latent Harm-related nature can be examined through applicable Quality Outcome Criteria.

The test begins with Quality.

For each applicable Factor or Indicator, the contextual Quality Outcome Criteria establish what the support is required to achieve.

Where a criterion is not achieved, the first result is a Quality deficiency.

The analysis then identifies the resulting Quality condition and asks whether that condition can support a credible pathway to possible Harm.

Personal Care Aide makes this distinction especially visible.

A support deficiency may affect whether required assistance is provided, whether it is provided effectively, whether it responds to the person's actual support needs, whether relevant information is communicated, or whether the support respects the person's participation, autonomy, dignity, and privacy.

These are first Quality questions.

Depending on the particular condition and context, however, non-achievement may also become relevant to possible Harm.

The resulting condition may affect physical well-being, psychological or social well-being, autonomy, dignity, privacy, material interests, or another identifiable subject or interest.

The particular Harm relationship cannot be assumed from the Factor or Indicator alone.

It must be traced through the contextual Quality Outcome Criterion and the resulting Quality condition.

The test therefore follows the same sequence established in Section 3:

invariant SSC1 Factor or Indicator

→ Personal Care Aide Quality Outcome Criterion

→ non-achievement

→ resulting Quality condition

→ examination of possible Harm connection.

Some resulting conditions may support credible Harm pathways.

Others may remain Quality deficiencies without a demonstrated Harm pathway.

Still others may remain uncertain where the available Evidence does not support a determination.

Personal Care Aide therefore provides a test of whether the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Postulate can be identified without treating every support-service deficiency as Harm-related.

A narrower application provides a more specific test.

That application is Bathing Support.

4.4 Bathing Support

Bathing Support provides a narrower test within the Personal Care Aide context.

The activity is specific, but it can involve several support needs at the same time.

A person may require assistance with entering or leaving the bathing area, maintaining balance, washing, drying, positioning, handling personal items, or completing other parts of the activity.

The person may also depend on the aide for appropriate communication, attention to changing support needs, privacy, dignity, and participation in decisions about the support being provided.

The SSC1 Factors and Indicators remain invariant.

What becomes more specific are the contextual Quality Outcome Criteria and the resulting conditions that can follow when those criteria are not achieved.

For example, non-achievement may result in inadequate physical support, failure to respond to an identified support need, loss of privacy, unnecessary dependence, ineffective communication, or interruption of the intended activity.

Each is first a Quality condition.

The Harm question is separate.

Where the resulting condition is capable of supporting a credible Harm pathway, the latent Harm-related nature of the applicable Factor or Indicator becomes visible in this context.

Possible pathways may concern physical injury, loss of dignity or privacy, psychological distress, reduced autonomy, or another identifiable form of injury, damage, or loss.

The existence of such a pathway must be established from the resulting condition.

It cannot be assumed simply because bathing is an activity in which Harm may occur.

This distinction is important to the test.

The analysis does not begin with a possible fall, injury, or other adverse outcome and work backward to find an SSC1 Factor or Indicator.

It begins with an independently established SSC1 Quality requirement, determines what its non-achievement produces in the Bathing Support context, and then examines whether the resulting condition supports a credible Harm pathway.

Bathing Support therefore provides a focused test of the same proposition examined at the broader Personal Care Aide level:

the invariant Factor or Indicator retains its Quality nature, while its latent Harm-related nature can take a particular form through context.

The next test moves to a materially different support-service Quality Object: Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching.

4.5 Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching

Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching provides a materially different test of AMSI SSC1.

The Quality Object is a support service provided to help a person participate in employment and perform the work for which support is required.

The SSC1 Factors and Indicators remain invariant.

The context, however, changes substantially from Personal Care Aide.

Job coaching takes place in relation to employment, assigned work, the person's support needs, the work environment, workplace requirements, communication, supervision, and interaction with other people and systems.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria must therefore reflect what the support is required to achieve in that setting.

Non-achievement may result in conditions such as ineffective support, failure to respond to an identified support need, inadequate communication, interference with work participation, reduced independence, or inability to perform required work as intended.

These are first Quality conditions.

The Harm question follows.

Depending on the resulting condition and context, a credible Harm pathway may involve physical well-being, psychological or social well-being, employment interests, income, dignity, autonomy, participation, or another identifiable subject or interest.

The pathway may also be indirect.

A support deficiency may first affect the person's ability to perform or participate at work and only then create conditions through which injury, damage, or loss can become possible.

This makes Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching an important test of the Postulate.

The possible Harm is not limited to immediate physical injury.

The test must remain capable of identifying other credible forms and pathways of Harm while still requiring an evidence-supported connection to the resulting Quality condition.

The analysis therefore follows the same method:

invariant SSC1 Factor or Indicator

- Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Quality condition
- examination of possible Harm connection.

The Core has not changed.

The Quality Object and contextual expression have.

If the same invariant Factors and Indicators continue to show both their independently established Quality nature and a latent Harm-related nature in this materially different support-service context, that provides additional within-Core support for the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The test can be narrowed further through a particular employment application.

That application is Cleaning Services Employment.

4.6 Cleaning Services Employment

Cleaning Services Employment provides a narrower test within Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching.

The work may involve cleaning assigned areas, using tools and materials, following work routines, responding to instructions, coordinating tasks, and working around other people and workplace activities.

The worker may require job-coaching support to learn, organize, perform, or adapt these activities.

The SSC1 Factors and Indicators remain invariant.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria become more specific to the worker, the assigned work, the support needs, and the workplace in which the support is provided.

Non-achievement may result in conditions such as incomplete or incorrect work, ineffective support, unmet support needs, misunderstanding of instructions, inappropriate use of tools or materials, interference with work routines, reduced independence, or difficulty responding to changes in the workplace.

These are first Quality conditions.

The analysis then asks whether a particular resulting condition can support a credible Harm pathway.

The possible pathways can differ substantially.

A condition affecting the performance of a work task may create a pathway to physical injury or property damage.

A condition affecting communication or understanding may contribute to incorrect action or failure to respond appropriately to a workplace situation.

A condition that repeatedly interferes with work performance may create a pathway to employment-related or economic loss.

A condition affecting the way support is provided may create a pathway to loss of dignity, autonomy, participation, or another identifiable interest.

These possibilities are not assumed merely because the worker receives support or performs cleaning work.

Each Harm relationship must be traced through the applicable Quality Outcome Criterion and the resulting Quality condition.

The test therefore remains:

invariant SSC1 Factor or Indicator

- Cleaning Services Employment Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Quality condition
- Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

The same Factor or Indicator may also be expressed differently in another employment setting.

That difference does not change its invariant position within SSC1.

It shows why the particular expression of latent Harm potential must be determined through context.

Cleaning Services Employment therefore extends the AMSI test from the broader Job Coaching Quality Object to a specific type of employment while preserving the same Core and the same testing method.

The combined AMSI findings can now be examined across Personal Care Aide, Bathing Support, Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching, and Cleaning Services Employment.

4.7 What the AMSI Test Shows

The AMSI test examines the Dual-Nature Postulate within one invariant Core across materially different support-service contexts.

AMSI SSC1 remains unchanged throughout the test.

Its Factors and Indicators retain their independently established Quality functions when examined through:

- Personal Care Aide;
- Bathing Support;
- Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching; and
- Cleaning Services Employment.

The contexts, however, produce different Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, affected subjects or interests, and possible forms of Harm.

Across these applications, the tested SSC1 Factors and Indicators continue to show the two natures proposed by the Postulate.

Their Quality nature remains identifiable independently of Harm.

Their latent Harm-related nature can also be expressed through contextual non-achievement and the resulting Quality conditions.

The particular expression is not uniform.

Depending on the context, possible Harm may concern physical well-being, psychological or social well-being, autonomy, dignity, privacy, participation, employment interests, economic interests, property, or another identifiable subject or interest.

The pathways may also differ.

Some may be direct.

Others may develop indirectly, through time, through interaction among several conditions, or through effects on another part of the person's support or environment.

This variation does not require the SSC1 Factors or Indicators themselves to change.

It supports the distinction at the center of the Postulate:

the latent Harm potential belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator within its applicable Core; its particular expression is contextual.

The AMSI test also shows an important boundary.

Not every Quality deficiency produces a demonstrated Harm pathway.

A resulting Quality condition may remain a Quality deficiency without demonstrated Harm.

Its relationship to possible Harm may also remain uncertain where the available Evidence is insufficient.

These outcomes do not need to be converted into Harm-related findings to preserve the Postulate.

Within the AMSI applications examined, no tested invariant Factor or Indicator was found to contradict the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The AMSI test therefore supports the Postulate within the tested scope.

It does not establish universal validity.

AMSI remains one platform, one Core, and one broad field of Quality Objects: support services.

A stronger test requires movement outside that field to a separately developed Core for a fundamentally different class of Quality Object.

The Infrastructure Quality Initiative (IQI) provides that independent test.

5 Testing Through Energy Infrastructure

5.1 Infrastructure Quality Initiative (IQI)

The second test of the Dual-Nature Postulate is conducted through the Infrastructure Quality Initiative (IQI).

This test moves outside support services to a fundamentally different class of Quality Object: physical energy infrastructure.

IQI provides an independent test because its Core was developed for determining Infrastructure Quality.

Its Quality Factors and Quality Indicators were not transferred from AMSI and were not developed for the purpose of demonstrating the Dual-Nature Postulate.

Their Quality functions therefore stand independently of the Harm analysis conducted here.

The IQI test asks the same question asked through AMSI:

Do independently established invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators also possess the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Postulate?

The testing uses five natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects:

- onshore natural gas production zones;
- main pipelines;
- local distribution networks;
- underground gas storage; and
- liquefied natural gas infrastructure.

These Quality Objects differ substantially in their Intended Functions, physical systems, operating conditions, interfaces, and possible forms of Harm.

The IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core remains applicable across them.

Its Factors and Indicators remain invariant.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria change according to the Infrastructure Quality Object being examined.

This allows two forms of testing.

First, the IQI Core can be tested across materially different infrastructure Quality Objects while the Core remains invariant.

Second, the IQI results can be compared with the independently developed AMSI results.

The purpose is not to determine whether infrastructure produces the same forms of Harm found in support services.

Nor is it to find IQI Factors or Indicators equivalent to those in AMSI.

The test is methodological.

It asks whether the same underlying relationship appears independently:

invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator

→ independently established Quality nature

→ contextual Quality Outcome Criterion

→ resulting Quality condition

→ examination of latent Harm-related nature through a possible Harm pathway.

If that relationship remains identifiable through IQI, the Dual-Nature Postulate has survived testing through a second, independently developed Quality framework for a fundamentally different class of Quality Object.

The test begins with the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

5.2 IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core

The IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core provides the invariant Quality framework for the IQI test.

Its Quality Factors and Quality Indicators establish the common requirements used to determine the Quality of energy Infrastructure Quality Objects within the scope of the Core.

Their Quality functions were established independently of the present Quality–Harm testing.

This independence is essential.

The IQI Factors and Indicators are not selected because they correspond to known infrastructure hazards or because their non-achievement appears capable of causing Harm.

The test begins with their established role in Infrastructure Quality Determination.

The Context Guides then provide the contextual Quality Outcome Criteria needed for particular classes of infrastructure.

The relationship is therefore:

IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core

→ invariant Quality Factor or Quality Indicator

→ contextual Quality Outcome Criterion

→ achievement or non-achievement

→ resulting Quality condition.

Only after the resulting Quality condition is identified does the test examine its possible relationship to Harm.

This preserves the same methodological separation used in the AMSI test.

The Core determines what remains invariant.

The Context Guide provides the Quality Outcome Criteria appropriate to the particular Infrastructure Quality Object.

The Infrastructure Quality Object exists independently of the Context Guide. The Guide does not define or create the physical infrastructure being examined.

This distinction is important because the same invariant Factor or Indicator can be expressed differently across different Infrastructure Quality Objects.

A main pipeline, local distribution network, underground gas storage facility, LNG facility, and onshore production zone have different physical systems, functions, operating conditions, and interfaces.

Their contextual Quality Outcome Criteria and resulting Quality conditions therefore differ.

Their possible Harm pathways may also differ.

The test asks whether, despite those differences, the invariant IQI Factors and Indicators continue to show both:

their independently established Quality nature;

and

their latent Harm-related nature when expressed through context.

The five Infrastructure Quality Objects provide materially different contexts for examining that question.

The first is onshore natural gas production zones.

5.3 Onshore Natural Gas Production Zones

Onshore natural gas production zones provide the first contextual test of the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

The Infrastructure Quality Object includes the physical infrastructure through which natural gas is produced and prepared for transfer to the next part of the natural gas system.

The invariant IQI Factors and Indicators remain unchanged.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria reflect the Intended Function, physical systems, operating conditions, interfaces, and other characteristics of the production-zone infrastructure.

The test begins with those Quality requirements.

Where an applicable Quality Outcome Criterion is not achieved, the first result is a Quality deficiency.

The analysis then identifies the resulting Quality condition.

Depending on the Factor, Indicator, and context, the condition may concern the ability of infrastructure to perform its Intended Function, its physical integrity, capacity, reliability, operability, interfaces, resilience, or another dimension represented by the IQI Core.

These are first Infrastructure Quality conditions.

The Harm question follows.

A resulting Quality condition may remain a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway.

Where the condition is Harm-capable, the analysis must identify a credible pathway through which injury, damage, or loss can become possible.

The affected subject or interest may include people, infrastructure or other property, the environment, continuity of infrastructure function, or another identifiable subject or interest.

The pathway may arise directly from the resulting condition or through interaction with other physical systems, operating conditions, interfaces, or events.

The analysis therefore follows:

invariant IQI Factor or Indicator

- production-zone Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Infrastructure Quality condition
- Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

The existence of natural gas hazards does not itself demonstrate the Postulate.

The test does not begin with a known accident, release, equipment failure, or other harmful event and then search backward for an IQI Factor or Indicator that could explain it.

It begins with independently established Infrastructure Quality requirements and examines what their non-achievement can produce.

This preserves the independence of the Quality nature from the Harm analysis.

Onshore natural gas production zones therefore provide the first IQI test of whether invariant infrastructure Quality Factors and Indicators can also express the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The next test moves downstream to main pipelines.

5.4 Main Pipelines

Main pipelines provide the second contextual test of the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

The Infrastructure Quality Object is the physical pipeline infrastructure through which natural gas is transported between major parts of the natural gas system.

The invariant IQI Factors and Indicators remain unchanged.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria reflect the Intended Function, physical configuration, operating conditions, interfaces, environment, and other characteristics of main pipeline infrastructure.

The test again begins with Quality.

Where an applicable Quality Outcome Criterion is not achieved, the analysis first identifies the resulting Infrastructure Quality condition.

The condition may concern physical integrity, functional performance, capacity, reliability, operability, interfaces, resilience, or another dimension represented by the IQI Core.

The existence of such a condition establishes a Quality issue.

It does not by itself establish a Harm pathway.

The analysis must separately determine whether the resulting condition is Harm-capable and whether a credible pathway to possible Harm can be demonstrated.

For example, a condition affecting physical integrity may remain within acceptable functional boundaries in one situation.

In another, the condition may support a pathway through which loss of containment, damage to infrastructure, environmental damage, interruption of function, or injury to people can become possible.

A condition affecting capacity or reliability may produce a different pathway, such as inability of the infrastructure to perform its required function when needed, with possible consequences elsewhere in the connected system.

An interface-related condition may create a pathway that develops not within the pipeline alone but through interaction with another infrastructure segment, operating system, or external condition.

The test therefore remains:

invariant IQI Factor or Indicator

- main pipeline Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Infrastructure Quality condition
- Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

These pathways do not need to resemble those identified for an onshore production zone.

The physical infrastructure, Intended Function, operating conditions, and interfaces are different.

What remains under test is whether the same invariant IQI Factors and Indicators continue to possess their established Quality nature while their latent Harm-related nature can take a different contextual form.

Main pipelines therefore provide a second within-Core infrastructure test.

The next test moves from long-distance transport infrastructure to the natural gas local distribution network.

5.5 Local Distribution Networks

Local distribution networks provide the third contextual test of the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

The Infrastructure Quality Object is the physical infrastructure through which natural gas is distributed from the upstream supply interface toward end-use connections.

The invariant IQI Factors and Indicators remain unchanged.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria reflect the Intended Function, configuration, operating conditions, Boundaries and Interfaces, Failure Modes, and other characteristics of the local distribution network.

The test again begins with Quality.

Where an applicable Quality Outcome Criterion is not achieved, the first finding is a Quality deficiency.

The analysis then identifies the resulting Infrastructure Quality condition.

That condition may concern integrity, functional performance, capacity, reliability, operability, interfaces, resilience, or another dimension represented by the IQI Core.

Only then is the possible Harm connection examined.

A local distribution network is especially useful for this test because a resulting Quality condition may remain local or may interact with connected infrastructure, buildings, end-use systems, people, property, or the surrounding environment.

A condition affecting integrity may, where a credible pathway is demonstrated, support possible injury, property damage, environmental damage, or loss of infrastructure function.

A condition affecting capacity or reliability may support a different pathway through interruption or inadequacy of the required infrastructure function.

A condition at a Boundary or Interface may create a pathway through interaction between the distribution network and another physical system.

These possibilities do not mean that every distribution-network Quality deficiency is Harm-capable.

The relationship must be established from the particular Quality Outcome Criterion and resulting Quality condition.

The test therefore follows:

invariant IQI Factor or Indicator

→ local distribution network Quality Outcome Criterion

→ non-achievement

→ resulting Infrastructure Quality condition

→ Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated

→ credible Harm pathway

→ possible Harm.

The possible Harm pathway may differ from those identified for a production zone or main pipeline.

Scale may also differ.

A condition may remain limited to one part of the network, or its effects may extend through connected infrastructure and interfaces.

The Factor or Indicator itself does not change.

The local distribution network test therefore provides another materially different context in which the invariant Quality nature is preserved while the particular expression of latent Harm potential can change.

The next test examines underground gas storage, where the Infrastructure Quality Object includes both subsurface and surface infrastructure.

5.6 Underground Gas Storage

Underground gas storage provides the fourth contextual test of the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

The Infrastructure Quality Object includes the subsurface and surface physical infrastructure required to store natural gas and return it to the connected natural gas system.

The invariant IQI Factors and Indicators remain unchanged.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria reflect the Intended Function, subsurface and surface configuration, operating conditions, Boundaries and Interfaces, Failure Modes, and other characteristics of underground gas storage.

The test again begins with Quality.

Where an applicable Quality Outcome Criterion is not achieved, the first result is a Quality deficiency.

The analysis then identifies the resulting Infrastructure Quality condition.

That condition may concern integrity, functional performance, capacity, reliability, operability, interfaces, resilience, or another dimension represented by the IQI Core.

The possible Harm connection is examined only after that condition has been identified.

Underground gas storage provides a distinctive test because the Infrastructure Quality Object extends across subsurface and surface infrastructure.

A resulting condition may arise within either part or through their interaction.

A condition affecting integrity may, where a credible pathway is demonstrated, support possible loss of containment, damage to infrastructure or property, environmental damage, injury to people, or loss of required infrastructure function.

A condition affecting capacity, reliability, or operability may support a different pathway through inability to store, retain, withdraw, or deliver natural gas as required.

A condition affecting a Boundary or Interface may create a pathway through interaction among subsurface infrastructure, surface facilities, wells, connected pipelines, or another physical system.

These possibilities do not establish Harm merely because a Quality deficiency exists.

The test remains:

invariant IQI Factor or Indicator

- underground gas storage Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Infrastructure Quality condition
- Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

The pathway may develop immediately or over time.

A resulting condition may remain latent until another physical condition, operating circumstance, interaction, or Lifecycle change allows an existing Harm pathway to proceed.

This distinction is important.

The later circumstance does not create the latent Harm potential of the Factor or Indicator.

Nor does it necessarily create the Harm pathway.

It may instead provide the conditions under which an existing pathway can proceed toward realized Harm.

Underground gas storage therefore extends the IQI test into an Infrastructure Quality Object whose contextual expression includes both subsurface and surface systems while the invariant Core remains unchanged.

The final IQI contextual test examines liquefied natural gas infrastructure.

5.7 Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure

Liquefied natural gas infrastructure provides the fifth contextual test of the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

The Infrastructure Quality Object includes the physical infrastructure used for LNG processing, storage, transfer, regasification, send-out, and the interfaces among these functions where they are within the applicable infrastructure Boundary.

The invariant IQI Factors and Indicators remain unchanged.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria reflect the Intended Function, physical configuration, operating conditions, Boundaries and Interfaces, Failure Modes, and other characteristics of LNG infrastructure.

The test again begins with Quality.

Where an applicable Quality Outcome Criterion is not achieved, the first result is a Quality deficiency.

The analysis then identifies the resulting Infrastructure Quality condition.

That condition may concern integrity, functional performance, capacity, reliability, operability, interfaces, resilience, or another dimension represented by the IQI Core.

Only after the resulting condition is identified is its possible connection to Harm examined.

LNG infrastructure provides a distinctive context because different physical processes, storage systems, transfer systems, and connected infrastructure can interact within the same Infrastructure Quality Object.

A condition affecting integrity may, where a credible pathway is demonstrated, support possible injury, damage to infrastructure or other property, environmental damage, or loss of required infrastructure function.

A condition affecting capacity, reliability, or operability may support a different pathway through inability of the infrastructure to perform its Intended Function when required.

A condition affecting a Boundary or Interface may create a pathway through interaction among processing, storage, transfer, regasification, send-out, or connected physical systems.

These possibilities do not make every LNG Quality deficiency Harm-capable.

The relationship must be established from the applicable Quality Outcome Criterion through the resulting Quality condition.

The test therefore follows:

invariant IQI Factor or Indicator

- LNG infrastructure Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Infrastructure Quality condition
- Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

The resulting pathway may differ from those identified for production zones, main pipelines, local distribution networks, or underground gas storage.

The affected subject or interest, form of possible Harm, Scale, and conditions of materialization may also differ.

The invariant Factor or Indicator does not change.

LNG infrastructure therefore completes the five contextual IQI tests.

Together, these tests allow the same invariant IQI Core to be examined across materially different natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects while their contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, and possible Harm pathways change.

The combined IQI findings can now be examined.

5.8 What the IQI Test Shows

The IQI test examines the Dual-Nature Postulate through one invariant Core across five materially different natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects.

The IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core remains unchanged throughout the test.

Its Factors and Indicators retain their independently established Quality functions when examined through:

- onshore natural gas production zones;
- main pipelines;
- local distribution networks;
- underground gas storage; and
- liquefied natural gas infrastructure.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, however, change with the Infrastructure Quality Object.

The resulting Quality conditions also change.

So can the affected subjects or interests, possible forms of Harm, Scale, Harm pathways, and conditions of materialization.

Across these differences, the same underlying relationship remains identifiable:

invariant Quality Factor or Indicator

- contextual Quality Outcome Criterion
- non-achievement
- resulting Infrastructure Quality condition
- Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

The Quality nature of the tested Factors and Indicators remains independently established.

Their latent Harm-related nature can also be expressed through the different infrastructure contexts.

The particular expression is not uniform.

For example, non-achievement related to integrity may produce different resulting conditions and different Harm pathways in a production zone, main pipeline, local distribution network, underground gas storage system, or LNG infrastructure.

The Factor or Indicator remains invariant.

Its contextual expression changes.

The same distinction applies to the other dimensions represented by the IQI Core.

The IQI test also confirms an important boundary.

Not every Infrastructure Quality deficiency produces a demonstrated Harm pathway.

A resulting condition may remain a Quality deficiency without demonstrated Harm.

Its relationship to possible Harm may also remain uncertain where the available Evidence is insufficient.

These results must remain visible rather than being converted into Harm-related findings merely to support the Postulate.

Within the five Infrastructure Quality Objects examined, the testing supports the proposition that invariant IQI Factors and Indicators possess both their independently established Quality nature and a latent Harm-related nature.

The testing also supports the distinction between latent Harm potential and its contextual expression.

The latent Harm potential does not originate in the production zone, pipeline, distribution network, storage system, or LNG facility.

It belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator within the applicable Core.

Context reveals its particular expression.

The IQI test therefore supports the Dual-Nature Postulate within the tested infrastructure scope.

It does not establish universal validity.

Its importance for the present research is different.

IQI was developed independently from AMSI, for a fundamentally different class of Quality Object, using a different Core with different Factors and Indicators.

The next test therefore compares the AMSI and IQI results to determine what remains common across the two independently developed Quality frameworks.

6 Cross-Platform Testing

6.1 Why AMSI and IQI Provide Independent Tests

The AMSI and IQI tests are useful together because they were developed for substantially different classes of Quality Objects.

AMSI addresses support services. IQI addresses physical energy infrastructure.

Their Cores were developed independently. Their Factors, Indicators, contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, Evidence, resulting Quality conditions, and possible Harm pathways are not required to match.

The cross-platform test is therefore not a repetition of the same test in a second setting.

Nor does it depend on finding equivalent Factors or Indicators in the two Cores.

The shared element is the proposition being tested.

In each platform, the Quality nature of the Factor or Indicator must first be established independently of Harm.

The same separate question can then be asked:

Does the invariant Factor or Indicator also possess the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Dual-Nature Postulate?

Within AMSI, that question is tested through the Support Service Core Standard and different support-service contexts.

Within IQI, it is tested through the independently developed Infrastructure Standard — Core and different natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects.

The same testing method can therefore be applied without requiring the two platforms to share the same internal structure.

This independence strengthens the test.

If the Postulate were supported only within one Core or one class of Quality Object, its broader status would remain more uncertain.

Support across two independently developed Cores provides a stronger test of whether the proposed relationship extends beyond one platform.

Two platforms, however, are still a limited basis for a universal proposition.

The cross-platform comparison therefore provides additional evidence, not final proof.

The next step is to examine the differences between the Quality Objects and Cores more directly.

6.2 Different Quality Objects and Independent Cores

The AMSI and IQI tests begin with fundamentally different Quality Objects.

AMSI concerns support services provided to people.

IQI concerns physical energy infrastructure.

These Quality Objects differ in their Intended Functions, physical or service characteristics, Boundaries, Interfaces, operating contexts, Evidence, and possible consequences of non-achievement.

The Cores used to determine their Quality were also developed independently.

AMSI SSC1 establishes the invariant Factors and Indicators for its applicable class of support-service Quality Objects.

The IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core establishes the invariant Factors and Indicators for its applicable class of Infrastructure Quality Objects.

The cross-platform test does not require those Factors and Indicators to be the same.

It requires each to have an independently established Quality function within its own Core.

The testing then asks whether the same Factor or Indicator also possesses latent Harm potential within the scope of that Core.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, affected subjects or interests, and possible Harm pathways may therefore differ substantially between AMSI and IQI.

Those differences do not prevent comparison.

They make it possible to ask whether the same methodological proposition remains identifiable despite major differences in the Quality Objects and the Cores used to determine their Quality.

The comparison must therefore preserve the independence of the two frameworks rather than force structural similarity between them.

6.3 No Required One-to-One Correspondence Between Factors and Indicators

The cross-platform test does not require a one-to-one correspondence between AMSI and IQI Factors or Indicators.

A Factor in AMSI does not need an equivalent Factor in IQI.

An AMSI Indicator does not need a matching IQI Indicator.

The two Cores were independently developed for different classes of Quality Objects.

Their internal structures therefore reflect the Quality requirements of those different classes.

Requiring identical Factors or Indicators would test structural similarity between the Cores.

That is not what the Dual-Nature Postulate proposes.

The Postulate applies to each invariant Quality Factor and Quality Indicator within its applicable Core.

The relevant question is therefore not:

Does AMSI contain an element equivalent to this IQI element?

The relevant question is:

Does an independently established Factor or Indicator retain its Quality nature while also possessing latent Harm potential within the scope of its own Core?

This question is asked separately in AMSI and IQI.

The resulting Quality conditions do not need to match.

The affected subjects or interests do not need to match.

The Harm pathways and possible forms of Harm do not need to match.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria do not need to match.

Those differences are expected because the Quality Objects and Cores are different.

What matters is whether the relationship proposed by the Postulate remains identifiable:

independently established Quality nature

+

latent Harm-related nature

+

contextual expression of latent Harm potential.

This allows the cross-platform test to preserve the independence of both Cores.
Neither AMSI nor IQI needs to be modified to resemble the other in order to support the test.
The absence of one-to-one correspondence is therefore not a weakness in the comparison.
It is part of what makes the two platforms useful as independent tests.
The next step is to identify what does remain invariant.

6.4 What Remains Invariant

The AMSI and IQI tests contain substantial differences.

What remains common is the methodological relationship.

First, each platform establishes a Core for a defined class of Quality Objects.

Second, the Factors and Indicators within that Core are invariant.

Third, each Factor and Indicator has an independently established Quality nature that does not depend on a Harm pathway.

Fourth, the Dual-Nature Postulate proposes that each invariant Factor and Indicator also possesses latent Harm potential within the scope of its applicable Core.

That potential does not originate in context.

Fifth, context provides the Quality Outcome Criteria through which achievement or non-achievement is determined for the particular Quality Object.

A resulting Quality condition can then be identified.

Only after that Quality condition is established is its possible connection to Harm examined.

The common relationship can therefore be stated as:

applicable Core

- invariant Quality Factor or Indicator
- independently established Quality nature
- contextual Quality Outcome Criterion
- achievement or non-achievement
- resulting Quality condition
- examination of latent Harm-related nature
- Harm-capable condition, where demonstrated
- credible Harm pathway
- possible Harm.

The content of each step can differ substantially between AMSI and IQI.

The relationship itself remains the same.

Another invariant boundary also remains visible.

Quality non-achievement does not automatically establish a Harm pathway.

A resulting Quality condition may support a credible Harm pathway, remain a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway, or remain uncertain in relation to possible Harm.

This common methodological structure does not require common Factors, Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, or forms of Harm.

What changes with context can now be distinguished from what remains invariant.

6.5 What Changes With Context

The Dual-Nature Postulate does not require the contextual expression of latent Harm potential to remain the same.

It can change substantially.

The contextual Quality Outcome Criteria change with the Quality Object.

The resulting Quality conditions can therefore also change.

So can:

- the affected person, property, environment, infrastructure, function, interest, or other subject;
- the form of possible injury, damage, or loss;
- the sequence or connection forming the Harm pathway;
- the Scale at which the pathway operates;
- the interaction with other conditions or systems; and
- the conditions required for the pathway to proceed to realized Harm.

These differences are visible within a single Core.

Within AMSI SSC1, the same invariant Factor or Indicator may have one contextual expression in Personal Care Aide and another in Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching.

Even within those Quality Objects, Bathing Support and Cleaning Services Employment can produce more specific expressions.

The same occurs within IQI.

An invariant IQI Factor or Indicator may be expressed differently through an onshore production zone, main pipeline, local distribution network, underground gas storage system, or LNG infrastructure.

The differences become still greater when AMSI and IQI are compared.

A support-service Quality condition and an infrastructure Quality condition may have little physical or operational similarity.

Their possible Harm pathways may also be entirely different.

That does not require a change in the Postulate.

The Postulate concerns the existence of the two natures.

It does not require their contextual expressions to be identical.

This distinction is central to the cross-platform test:

latent Harm potential is not created by context;

its particular expression is revealed through context.

The same distinction must also be maintained between contextual expression and materialization.

Context can reveal how latent Harm potential is expressed through a resulting Quality condition and a credible Harm pathway.

Conditions of materialization determine whether an existing pathway proceeds to realized Harm.

The cross-platform test therefore permits substantial contextual variation while preserving the invariant relationship being tested.

The remaining question is what the combined AMSI and IQI results show about the Dual-Nature Postulate.

6.6 What the Cross-Platform Test Shows

The cross-platform test brings together two independently developed Quality frameworks applied to fundamentally different classes of Quality Objects.

AMSI tests the Dual-Nature Postulate through support services.

IQI tests it through physical energy infrastructure.

The two platforms do not share the same Factors, Indicators, contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, or possible Harm pathways.

Despite these differences, the same underlying relationship remains identifiable in both.

First, the Quality nature of the tested Factors and Indicators remains independently established.

It does not depend on Harm.

Second, their latent Harm-related nature can be expressed through contextual Quality Outcome Criteria and resulting Quality conditions.

Third, the particular expression of latent Harm potential changes with context without requiring the invariant Factor or Indicator to change.

Fourth, non-achievement does not automatically establish a Harm pathway.

In both platforms, a resulting Quality condition may:

- support a credible Harm pathway;
- remain a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway; or
- remain uncertain in relation to possible Harm where the available Evidence is insufficient.

These distinctions remain necessary in both support services and energy infrastructure.

The cross-platform test therefore supports the proposition that the two natures are not limited to one particular Core, one class of Quality Object, or one form of possible Harm.

It also supports the distinction between what is invariant and what is contextual.

Within each applicable Core, the latent Harm potential belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator.

Context reveals its particular expression.

Conditions of materialization determine whether an existing Harm pathway proceeds to realized Harm.

The result is significant because AMSI and IQI were not constructed as matching frameworks.

The same methodological relationship appears despite their independent development and substantial differences.

This provides broader support for the Dual-Nature Postulate than either platform can provide alone.

It does not establish universal validity.

Two independently developed Cores remain a limited basis for a universal proposition.

Additional testing within existing Cores and through other independently developed Cores remains necessary.

Within the scope examined here, however, the Dual-Nature Postulate survives both the within-Core and cross-platform tests.

The findings from those tests can now be stated more directly.

7 Findings

7.1 Quality Nature Remains Independently Established

The first finding concerns the Quality nature of the tested Factors and Indicators.

Across both AMSI and IQI, their Quality function remains independently established.

They were not selected because they could be connected to Harm.

They were established as elements required for determining the Quality of the applicable class of Quality Objects.

This remains true whether or not a Harm pathway is later demonstrated.

Within AMSI SSC1, the Factors and Indicators continue to perform their Quality function across Personal Care Aide, Bathing Support, Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching, and Cleaning Services Employment.

Within the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core, the Factors and Indicators continue to perform their Quality function across the five tested natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects.

A resulting Quality condition therefore does not become a Quality condition because it is Harm-capable.

It is first a Quality condition because an applicable Quality Outcome Criterion has or has not been achieved.

The Harm question follows separately.

This separation is essential to the validity of the test.

If the Quality nature depended on a demonstrated Harm pathway, the test would become circular.

A Factor or Indicator could be selected because it appeared related to Harm and then used as evidence that Quality possesses a Harm-related nature.

The testing does not follow that approach.

It begins with independently established Quality Factors and Indicators and preserves their Quality function regardless of the later Harm finding.

The first part of the Dual-Nature Postulate therefore remains supported throughout the tested applications:

the Quality nature of the invariant Factor or Indicator exists independently of its latent Harm-related nature.

The next finding concerns whether that second nature can be identified through context.

7.2 Latent Harm-Related Nature Is Observable Through Context

The second finding concerns the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Postulate.

Across the tested AMSI and IQI applications, this second nature can be identified through context.

The Factors and Indicators do not need to change.

Their contextual Quality Outcome Criteria establish what achievement requires for the particular Quality Object.

Where a criterion is not achieved, a resulting Quality condition can be identified.

That condition provides the point from which the possible Harm connection can be examined.

Across the tested applications, resulting Quality conditions were capable, where supported, of being traced to credible pathways toward possible Harm.

The particular pathways differed.

Within AMSI, possible Harm could concern physical well-being, psychological or social well-being, autonomy, dignity, privacy, participation, employment, economic interests, or another identifiable subject or interest.

Within IQI, possible Harm could concern people, infrastructure or other property, the environment, infrastructure function, economic interests, or another identifiable subject or interest.

The differences are important.

They show that the latent Harm-related nature does not depend on one particular form of Harm.

Nor does it depend on one particular type of Quality Object.

The testing therefore supports the second part of the Dual-Nature Postulate within the applications examined.

The invariant Factors and Indicators possess latent Harm potential that can take identifiable form through contextual Quality Outcome Criteria and resulting Quality conditions.

This does not mean that every non-achievement produces a Harm pathway.

It means that the proposed latent Harm-related nature can be identified without changing the independently established Quality nature of the Factor or Indicator.

The finding therefore concerns the existence of the second nature, not an assumption that Harm must follow every Quality deficiency.

A further distinction is necessary.

Although the latent Harm-related nature can be identified through context, it does not originate in context.

That distinction is examined next.

7.3 Context Reveals but Does Not Create Latent Harm Potential

The third finding concerns the relationship between latent Harm potential and context.

The testing supports a clear distinction:

latent Harm potential belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator within the scope of its applicable Core;

context reveals its particular expression.

Context does not create that potential.

This distinction is visible in both AMSI and IQI.

Within AMSI SSC1, the same invariant Factor or Indicator can be expressed through different Quality Outcome Criteria in Personal Care Aide and Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching.

Bathing Support and Cleaning Services Employment provide still more specific expressions.

Within IQI, the same invariant Factor or Indicator can be expressed differently through a production zone, main pipeline, local distribution network, underground gas storage system, or LNG infrastructure.

The resulting Quality conditions and possible Harm pathways can therefore differ substantially.

Those differences do not mean that latent Harm potential appears only when a particular context produces it.

The potential already belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator within its applicable Core.

Context makes its particular form identifiable.

The distinction can be stated as:

invariant Factor or Indicator

→ latent Harm potential within the applicable Core

→ contextual Quality Outcome Criterion

→ resulting Quality condition

→ particular expression of possible Harm connection.

This also prevents confusion between contextual expression and materialization.

A context may reveal a resulting Quality condition and a credible Harm pathway.

Realized Harm still requires the conditions necessary for that existing pathway to proceed to injury, damage, or loss.

Those conditions do not create the latent Harm potential.

They determine whether an existing Harm pathway proceeds to realized Harm.

The testing therefore supports the proposition that latent Harm potential is invariant within the scope of the applicable Core while its particular expression is contextual.

This finding does not mean that every contextual Quality deficiency produces a Harm pathway.

That boundary is examined next.

7.4 Not Every Quality Deficiency Produces a Harm Pathway

The fourth finding establishes an important boundary.

Non-achievement of a Quality Outcome Criterion produces a Quality deficiency.

It does not automatically establish a Harm pathway.

This distinction remained necessary throughout both the AMSI and IQI tests.

After a resulting Quality condition is identified, the possible Harm connection must be examined separately.

Three outcomes are possible.

The resulting Quality condition may support a credible Harm pathway.

It may remain a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway.

Or the possible Harm connection may remain uncertain because the available Evidence does not support a determination.

Preserving these different outcomes is necessary for a valid test of the Dual-Nature Postulate.

If every Quality deficiency were automatically treated as Harm-capable, the existence of the second nature would be assumed rather than tested.

The same applies to the next step.

A Harm-capable condition does not itself establish that a Harm pathway has already been demonstrated.

The pathway requires an evidence-supported sequence or connection through which the condition can lead to injury, damage, or loss affecting an identifiable subject or interest.

The testing therefore preserves the boundary:

Quality non-achievement

- resulting Quality condition
- separate examination of possible Harm connection
- Harm-capable condition, where supported
- credible Harm pathway, where demonstrated
- possible Harm.

Where the connection is not demonstrated, the Quality deficiency remains valid as a Quality finding.

It does not need to be converted into a Harm finding.

This result is consistent across the tested support-service and energy-infrastructure applications.

The Dual-Nature Postulate therefore does not mean that every Quality deficiency produces a Harm pathway.

It means that each invariant Factor and Indicator possesses latent Harm potential, while the existence and form of a particular Harm pathway must be determined from the contextual condition and supporting Evidence.

The Harm pathways that are demonstrated can also differ substantially even when they express the same underlying Postulate.

That finding is examined next.

7.5 Different Harm Pathways Can Express the Same Underlying Postulate

The fifth finding concerns the differences among Harm pathways.

The testing does not show one common Harm pathway across AMSI and IQI.

Nor does the Dual-Nature Postulate require one.

Different Quality Objects can produce different resulting Quality conditions, affect different subjects or interests, and support different forms of possible Harm.

This variation occurs even within the same Core.

Within AMSI, a Quality condition may support a pathway affecting physical well-being, dignity, autonomy, participation, employment, economic interests, or another identifiable subject or interest.

Within IQI, a Quality condition may support a pathway affecting people, infrastructure or other property, the environment, infrastructure function, economic interests, or another identifiable subject or interest.

The pathways can also differ in their sequence, Scale, and conditions of materialization.

These differences do not represent different versions of the Postulate.

They are different contextual expressions of the same proposed relationship:

an invariant Quality Factor or Indicator

→ independently established Quality nature

+

latent Harm-related nature

→ contextual expression

→ resulting Quality condition

→ credible Harm pathway, where demonstrated

→ possible Harm.

The common feature is therefore not the pathway itself.

It is the presence of latent Harm potential in an independently established invariant Quality Factor or Indicator and its capacity to take particular form through context.

Cross-platform testing strengthens this finding because AMSI and IQI use independently developed Cores and address fundamentally different classes of Quality Objects.

The fact that different Harm pathways can emerge without requiring the underlying Postulate to change supports the distinction between invariant latent Harm potential and contextual expression.

At the same time, the finding remains limited to the applications tested.

Different pathways across AMSI and IQI provide broader support for the Postulate, but they do not establish that the same relationship will necessarily be demonstrated in every Quality Core or every context.

The current status of the Dual-Nature Postulate can now be stated.

7.6 Current Status of the Dual-Nature Postulate

The testing presented in this publication supports the Dual-Nature Postulate within the applications examined.

Within AMSI, the tested SSC1 Factors and Indicators retain their independently established Quality nature while also showing contextual expressions of latent Harm potential.

The same result appears independently within IQI across the five tested natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects.

The cross-platform comparison provides additional support because the two Cores were developed independently for fundamentally different classes of Quality Objects.

No tested result requires the Postulate to be rejected or revised at this stage.

The testing also establishes important limits on that finding.

It does not show that every Quality deficiency produces a Harm pathway.

It does not show that every Harm-capable condition proceeds to realized Harm.

It does not require the same Factors, Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, Harm pathways, or forms of Harm across different Cores.

Most importantly, testing through two platforms does not establish universal validity.

The current finding is therefore:

the Dual-Nature Postulate is supported within the tested AMSI and IQI applications and remains consistent across the two independently developed Cores.

This is meaningful evidence in support of the Postulate.

It is not final proof.

The Postulate remains open to additional testing through new contexts, additional Quality Objects, and other independently developed Cores.

Such testing must continue to permit negative and uncertain results.

A future failure to demonstrate the proposed latent Harm-related nature would require examination of whether the limitation arises from the tested context, the applicable Core, the available Evidence, or the Postulate itself.

The present testing therefore supports continued use of the Dual-Nature Postulate as a WQI methodological proposition while preserving its testable status.

The limits of the current testing are examined next.

8 Limits of Current Testing

8.1 Limits of AMSI Tests

The AMSI testing provides support for the Dual-Nature Postulate within the support-service applications examined.

Its scope remains limited.

The testing uses one Core: AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard.

Within that Core, it examines Personal Care Aide and Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching, with the narrower applications of Bathing Support and Cleaning Services Employment.

These applications provide meaningful contextual differences, but they do not represent every type of support service governed by SSC1.

Other support-service Quality Objects may involve different Intended Functions, support needs, environments, relationships, Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, and affected subjects or interests.

They may therefore reveal expressions of latent Harm potential that are not visible in the current tests.

The present testing also does not establish that every possible Harm pathway within the tested applications has been identified.

A resulting Quality condition may support more than one pathway.

Some pathways may depend on circumstances, interactions, or changes that are not apparent in the Evidence available for a particular determination.

The AMSI findings therefore support the Postulate within the tested scope without establishing complete identification of its possible contextual expressions.

Additional testing within SSC1 remains important.

If latent Harm potential belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator within the scope of the Core, that potential should continue to be identifiable as the same Factors and Indicators are examined through additional support-service Quality Objects and contexts.

The particular expressions may change.

The underlying dual nature should remain.

A future AMSI application that repeatedly fails to demonstrate the proposed latent Harm-related nature of an otherwise valid invariant Factor or Indicator would therefore require examination.

Such a result could indicate a limitation in the tested context, the available Evidence, the Core, or the Postulate itself.

The present AMSI testing should therefore be treated as support for the Dual-Nature Postulate within the applications examined, not as proof across all support services.

8.2 Limits of IQI Tests

The IQI testing provides an independent test of the Dual-Nature Postulate through physical energy infrastructure.

Its scope also remains limited.

The testing uses one Core: the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

Within that Core, it examines five natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects:

- onshore natural gas production zones;
- main pipelines;
- local distribution networks;
- underground gas storage; and
- liquefied natural gas infrastructure.

These Quality Objects differ substantially in their physical characteristics, Intended Functions, Boundaries, Interfaces, operating conditions, and Lifecycle circumstances.

That variation strengthens the within-Core test.

It does not make the test complete.

The five Quality Objects represent only part of the infrastructure governed by the IQI Core.

Additional natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects may produce different contextual Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, Harm pathways, affected subjects or interests, and forms or Scale of possible Harm.

The current testing also does not establish that every possible Harm pathway within the five tested Quality Objects has been identified.

Infrastructure conditions can involve multiple physical systems, Interfaces, operating states, environmental conditions, and Lifecycle stages.

A resulting Quality condition may therefore support pathways that are not visible in the particular context or Evidence examined.

The IQI findings should consequently be understood as testing the Postulate through the existing applications, not as a complete map of possible Harm pathways across energy infrastructure.

Additional testing within the IQI Core remains important.

If latent Harm potential belongs to an invariant Factor or Indicator within the scope of that Core, it should remain identifiable when the same Factor or Indicator is examined through additional Infrastructure Quality Objects.

Its particular expression may change.

The underlying dual nature should remain.

A future IQI application that repeatedly fails to demonstrate the proposed latent Harm-related nature of an otherwise valid invariant Factor or Indicator would therefore require examination.

Such a result could indicate a limitation in the tested context, the available Evidence, the Core, or the Postulate itself.

The present IQI testing therefore provides independent support for the Dual-Nature Postulate across the five tested natural gas Infrastructure Quality Objects.

It does not establish the Postulate across all energy infrastructure.

8.3 Limits of Cross-Platform Testing

Testing through both AMSI and IQI provides broader support for the Dual-Nature Postulate than testing through either platform alone.

The two platforms address fundamentally different classes of Quality Objects and use independently developed Cores.

This makes their comparison meaningful.

It does not make the testing universal.

Two platforms remain a limited basis for a proposition intended to apply across independently developed Quality Cores.

Other Cores may contain different Factors, Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, affected subjects or interests, and forms of possible Harm.

They may reveal relationships that are not visible in either AMSI or IQI.

The cross-platform test also does not require equivalent Factors or Indicators.

Nor does it require equivalent Harm pathways or forms of Harm.

The proposed invariant is the dual nature of each Quality Factor and Quality Indicator within its applicable Core.

Its particular Harm-related expression remains contextual.

The current testing therefore supports the Postulate because the same methodological relationship remains identifiable despite substantial differences between AMSI and IQI.

It does not establish that the relationship will necessarily be demonstrated in every independently developed Core.

Testing through additional Cores is therefore necessary.

Such testing must preserve their independence.

A new Core should not be designed or modified merely to reproduce the AMSI or IQI results.

Its Factors and Indicators must first be justified by their own Quality functions.

Their latent Harm-related nature can then be tested separately.

A failure to demonstrate that second nature must remain a possible result.

If such a failure occurs, the analysis must distinguish among possible explanations involving the context, the available Evidence, the completeness of the Core, and the Postulate itself.

The present cross-platform findings should therefore be treated as meaningful support for the Dual-Nature Postulate, not as final proof of universal validity.

8.4 Incomplete Identification of Harm Pathways

The current testing does not claim to identify every Harm pathway associated with the tested Factors and Indicators.

The purpose of the test is narrower.

It asks whether the latent Harm-related nature proposed by the Dual-Nature Postulate can be demonstrated through context.

For that purpose, identifying a credible Harm pathway can support the test.

It does not establish that all possible pathways have been found.

A single resulting Quality condition may support more than one Harm pathway.

Different pathways may also become identifiable under different operating conditions, Lifecycle stages, environments, Interfaces, support needs, or other contextual circumstances.

Some may affect different subjects or interests.

Some may lead to different forms or Scale of possible Harm.

Other pathways may remain unidentified because the available Evidence does not reveal them.

This limitation is important.

Failure to identify a particular Harm pathway is not evidence that no other pathway exists.

At the same time, a pathway cannot be assumed merely because one might exist.

The testing must remain evidence-supported.

The appropriate result may therefore be:

- a demonstrated Harm pathway;
- no demonstrated Harm pathway on the available Evidence; or
- uncertainty about a possible Harm pathway.

These outcomes must remain visible.

The Dual-Nature Postulate cannot be protected by inventing additional pathways when the Evidence does not support them.

Nor should the testing require an exhaustive inventory of every possible pathway before the Postulate can receive support within a tested application.

The present findings therefore concern demonstrated contextual expressions of latent Harm potential.

They do not claim complete identification of all Harm pathways that may exist within AMSI, IQI, or the particular Quality Objects examined.

This limitation also defines what the current testing does not establish more broadly.

8.5 What Current Testing Does Not Establish

The limits identified above define what can and cannot be concluded from the current testing.

The testing does not establish universal validity of the Dual-Nature Postulate.

It does not establish that every independently developed Quality Core will necessarily support the Postulate.

It does not establish that every Quality deficiency produces a Harm-capable condition.

It does not establish that every Harm-capable condition has a demonstrated Harm pathway.

It does not establish that every demonstrated Harm pathway will proceed to realized Harm.

It does not establish that all possible Harm pathways have been identified.

It does not establish that the same Factors, Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, Harm pathways, affected subjects or interests, or forms of Harm must appear across different Quality Objects or Cores.

The testing also does not determine Risk merely because possible Harm has been identified.

Risk requires consideration of probability and severity using an applicable method.

Nor does the testing determine Safety merely because a Risk has been identified.

A Safety determination requires applicable criteria for judging whether that Risk is acceptable or tolerable.

These questions remain distinct from the present test.

What the current testing does establish is narrower.

Within the AMSI and IQI applications examined, independently established invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators continue to show the two natures proposed by the Postulate:

- a Quality nature; and
- a latent Harm-related nature.

Their particular Harm-related expressions vary with context.

No result from the current testing requires the Postulate to be rejected or revised at this stage.

That finding provides support for continued testing.

It does not close the question.

The next stage is therefore to extend the test deliberately into additional contexts, Quality Objects, and independently developed Cores.

9 Further Testing

9.1 Additional Contexts Within Existing Core

The first direction for further testing is to examine the same invariant Factors and Indicators through additional contexts within an existing Core.

This is a direct test of the proposed invariance of latent Harm potential.

If a Factor or Indicator possesses latent Harm potential within the scope of its applicable Core, that potential should not disappear merely because the context changes.

Its particular expression, however, may change substantially.

Different contexts may establish different Quality Outcome Criteria.

Their non-achievement may produce different resulting Quality conditions.

Those conditions may support different Harm pathways, affect different subjects or interests, or lead to different forms or Scale of possible Harm.

Additional contextual testing should therefore preserve the same sequence used in the current research:

invariant Factor or Indicator

- independently established Quality nature
- contextual Quality Outcome Criterion
- resulting Quality condition
- examination of possible Harm connection
- Harm-capable condition, where supported
- credible Harm pathway, where demonstrated
- possible Harm.

The testing should not begin with an expected Harm pathway and then construct the contextual Quality Outcome Criterion around it.

The Quality requirement must remain independently justified.

The Harm question follows.

Additional contexts are particularly useful where they differ materially from those already examined.

Such differences increase the opportunity to test whether the proposed latent Harm-related nature remains identifiable when its contextual expression changes.

A negative or uncertain result must also remain possible.

If the proposed second nature cannot be demonstrated in a new context, that result should be preserved for further examination rather than explained away.

Additional contextual testing can therefore strengthen the Postulate, reveal its limits, or identify questions requiring deeper examination.

The next direction extends the test from additional contexts to additional Quality Objects within an existing Core.

9.2 Additional Quality Objects Within Existing Core

The second direction for further testing is to examine additional Quality Objects governed by an existing Core.

This extends the test beyond changes in context within Quality Objects already examined.

The Core remains unchanged.

Its Factors and Indicators remain invariant.

What changes is the Quality Object through which they are tested.

This is particularly important for Cores that govern a broad class of Quality Objects.

Within AMSI SSC1, additional types of support services can test whether the same invariant Factors and Indicators continue to show both their Quality nature and latent Harm-related nature.

Within the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core, additional types of energy infrastructure can provide the same test across physical systems not included in the current research.

Each additional Quality Object may require different contextual Quality Outcome Criteria.

It may produce different resulting Quality conditions and reveal different Harm pathways, affected subjects or interests, forms of possible Harm, and conditions of materialization.

Those differences are expected.

The test is not whether the new Quality Object reproduces the findings of an earlier one.

The test is whether the invariant Factor or Indicator continues to possess both natures proposed by the Postulate when examined through the new Quality Object.

This distinction also provides a way to test the completeness of the Core.

If an important Quality function repeatedly appears in additional Quality Objects but cannot be represented by the existing Factors and Indicators, the issue may indicate a gap in the Core rather than a failure of the Dual-Nature Postulate.

That possibility must be examined separately.

Additional Quality Objects therefore serve two related purposes.

They broaden the test of the Postulate within an existing Core, and they can expose possible limits in the Core itself.

Neither result should be predetermined.

The next direction provides a stronger test by moving beyond existing Cores altogether.

9.3 Testing Through Other Independently Developed Cores

The third direction for further testing is to examine the Dual-Nature Postulate through other independently developed Quality Cores.

This provides a stronger test than adding contexts or Quality Objects within AMSI or IQI.

A new Core may govern a fundamentally different class of Quality Objects.

Its Factors and Indicators may therefore differ substantially from those of AMSI SSC1 and the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

Those differences should be preserved.

A new Core should not be designed, selected, or modified to reproduce the structure or results of AMSI or IQI.

Its Factors and Indicators must first be derived and justified through the Quality requirements of its own class of Quality Objects.

Only after their Quality nature has been independently established should their latent Harm-related nature be tested.

The question remains:

Does each independently established invariant Quality Factor and Quality Indicator also possess latent Harm potential within the scope of its applicable Core?

Testing then follows the same methodological sequence:

independently developed Core

- invariant Factor or Indicator
- independently established Quality nature
- contextual Quality Outcome Criterion
- resulting Quality condition
- examination of possible Harm connection
- Harm-capable condition, where supported
- credible Harm pathway, where demonstrated
- possible Harm.

The new Core does not need to contain Factors or Indicators equivalent to those in AMSI or IQI. Its Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, affected subjects or interests, Harm pathways, and forms of possible Harm may also be different.

Such differences make the test more independent.

If the Dual-Nature Postulate continues to operate through Cores developed for substantially different classes of Quality Objects, the evidentiary basis for the broader proposition becomes stronger.

If it does not, the negative result is equally important.

The reason for that result must then be examined rather than assuming that the Postulate remains valid.

Testing through additional independently developed Cores is therefore necessary before the current cross-platform findings can support a broader claim of invariance.

The next question is how to distinguish a possible challenge to the Postulate from a gap in the Core being tested.

9.4 Distinguishing Challenge to the Postulate From a Gap in the Core

A negative result does not automatically mean that the Dual-Nature Postulate has failed.

It may instead reveal a problem in the Core being tested.

This distinction is important because the Postulate concerns invariant Quality Factors and Quality Indicators within an applicable Core.

If the Core does not adequately represent the Quality requirements of its class of Quality Objects, testing the Postulate through that Core may produce a misleading result.

Suppose a recurring Quality condition with a credible Harm connection cannot be traced to any existing Factor or Indicator.

The first question should not be whether the Postulate is false.

The first question should be whether an important Quality function is missing from the Core.

If the missing function is independently necessary for Quality Determination across the applicable class of Quality Objects, the result may indicate a gap in the Core.

The Core should then be examined on its own methodological basis.

The opposite situation is different.

An existing Factor or Indicator may continue to perform a valid and necessary Quality function across materially different contexts while repeated testing fails to demonstrate its proposed latent Harm-related nature.

That result would bear more directly on the Dual-Nature Postulate.

The distinction can therefore be stated as:

missing or inadequate Quality function

→ possible gap in the Core;

valid invariant Quality function

+

repeated inability to demonstrate latent Harm-related nature

→ possible challenge to the Postulate.

Other explanations must also remain possible.

A negative result may arise because the context is too narrow, the applicable Quality Outcome Criterion is inadequate, or the available Evidence does not support a determination.

These possibilities should be examined before attributing the result either to the Core or to the Postulate.

The purpose is not to protect either one from challenge.

It is to identify what the Evidence actually challenges.

A genuine test therefore requires separate examination of:

- the validity and completeness of the applicable Core;
- the contextual Quality Outcome Criteria;
- the resulting Quality condition;
- the available Evidence; and
- the proposed latent Harm-related nature of the Factor or Indicator.

Only after these possibilities are distinguished can a negative result be interpreted appropriately.

This distinction prepares the final testing question: what findings could actually limit, revise, or falsify the Dual-Nature Postulate?

9.5 Conditions That Could Limit, Revise, or Falsify the Postulate

The Dual-Nature Postulate must remain open to findings that do not support it.

Otherwise, it would function as an assumption rather than a testable methodological proposition.

A single uncertain result would not necessarily falsify the Postulate.

The uncertainty may arise from limited Evidence, an inadequate contextual Quality Outcome Criterion, an incomplete understanding of the Quality condition, or a possible gap in the applicable Core.

Such limitations must first be examined.

A stronger challenge would arise where an invariant Factor or Indicator:

- has a valid and independently established Quality function;
- remains necessary across materially different Quality Objects or contexts within its applicable Core;
- is tested through appropriate contextual Quality Outcome Criteria;
- is supported by adequate Evidence; and
- repeatedly shows no credible latent Harm-related nature.

Such a result could challenge the proposition that every invariant Quality Factor and Quality Indicator possesses both natures.

The significance of the result would depend on its scope.

A limitation confined to a particular context may require qualification of the Postulate's contextual application.

A recurring limitation affecting a particular Factor or Indicator within an otherwise valid Core may require revision of the Postulate.

A repeated failure across independently developed Cores could provide stronger grounds for rejecting the proposed universality of the dual nature.

The same discipline applies to results that support the Postulate.

Repeated positive findings strengthen its evidentiary basis.

They do not make future negative findings irrelevant.

Testing must therefore remain capable of producing three broad outcomes:

- continued support for the Postulate;
- evidence requiring limitation or revision of the Postulate; or
- evidence sufficient to falsify the Postulate as presently stated.

No outcome should be predetermined.

The Postulate should remain only as strong and as broad as the accumulated Evidence permits.

The current AMSI and IQI testing supports it within the applications examined.

Further testing will determine whether that support continues across additional contexts, Quality Objects, and independently developed Cores.

10 Conclusion

This publication tested the Dual-Nature Postulate through two independently developed Quality Cores applied to fundamentally different classes of Quality Objects.

The Postulate states:

Every invariant Quality Factor and Quality Indicator possesses both a Quality nature and a latent Harm-related nature.

The first test used AMSI SSC1 — Support Service Core Standard.

The second used the IQI Infrastructure Standard — Core.

Across the applications examined, the Quality nature of the tested Factors and Indicators remained independently established.

Their Quality function did not depend on Harm.

The testing then examined their second proposed nature.

Through contextual Quality Outcome Criteria and resulting Quality conditions, latent Harm potential could be expressed through credible Harm pathways where supported by Evidence.

The particular expressions differed substantially.

Different Quality Objects produced different Quality Outcome Criteria, resulting Quality conditions, affected subjects or interests, Harm pathways, forms of possible Harm, and conditions of materialization.

Those differences did not require the invariant Factors or Indicators to change.

The testing therefore supports a central distinction:

latent Harm potential belongs to the invariant Factor or Indicator within the scope of its applicable Core;

context reveals its particular expression;

and conditions of materialization determine whether an existing Harm pathway proceeds to realized Harm.

The testing also supports an important boundary.

Quality non-achievement does not automatically establish a Harm pathway.

A resulting Quality condition may support a credible Harm pathway, remain a Quality deficiency without a demonstrated Harm pathway, or remain uncertain in relation to possible Harm.

These outcomes must remain distinct.

The AMSI and IQI findings support the Dual-Nature Postulate within the applications examined.

Their cross-platform consistency provides broader support because the two Cores were developed independently and govern fundamentally different Quality Objects.

The result is not universal proof.

Testing through two Cores remains limited.

The Postulate must remain open to additional testing, limitation, revision, or falsification.

Future testing should therefore continue within existing Cores, extend to additional Quality Objects, and examine other independently developed Cores without modifying them merely to preserve the Postulate.

The current result can be stated simply:

the Dual-Nature Postulate remains supported by the present within-Core and cross-platform tests.

Its broader validity remains a question for continuing WQI research.

COPYRIGHT AND USE NOTICE

© 2026 Whole Quality Institute (WQI). All rights reserved.

This publication is part of the methodological work of the Whole Quality Institute.

The concepts, terminology, architecture, classifications, and methodological structures presented in this publication may be referenced for research, education, professional discussion, and standards-development purposes with appropriate attribution to the Whole Quality Institute and this publication.

Reproduction, modification, publication, or incorporation of substantial portions of this publication into another standard, methodology, commercial product, or derivative work requires authorization from the Whole Quality Institute.

Reference:

Whole Quality Institute (WQI).

Quality and Harm: Testing the Dual-Nature Postulate.

Research and Justification WQI_DNP1.

First Edition — September 2026.