



JUSTIFICATION OF THE WQI CORE EVIDENCE QUALITY FACTORS AND INDICATORS

WHOLE QUALITY JUSTIFICATION WQI_EQJ1

Cross-Domain Methodological Justification and Comparative Stress Testing
of the WQI Evidence Quality Core Architecture

Article — September 2026

WHOLE QUALITY INSTITUTE

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Abstract.....	4
1. Purpose and Scope.....	4
1.1 Questions addressed.....	4
1.2 Exclusions	5
2. Evidence Within Whole Quality Determination.....	5
2.1 Evidence is not the actual condition	5
2.2 Evidence is not the Finding	5
2.3 Evidence is not the Quality State.....	6
2.4 Evidence and Quality Outcome Criteria	6
3. Evidence as a Quality Object.....	6
3.1 Relational character of Evidence Quality.....	6
3.2 Evidence about Evidence and the stopping principle.....	6
4. From the Intended Function of Evidence to the Three Factors.....	7
5. Justification Method	7
5.1 Functional derivation	7
5.2 Failure-mode test.....	7
5.3 Distinction test	7
5.4 Removal test.....	7
5.5 Absorption test.....	8
5.6 Missing-function test.....	8
5.7 Cross-domain stress test.....	8
6. Justification of the Three Evidence Quality Factors.....	8
6.1 Evidence Sufficiency	8
6.2 Evidence Trustworthiness	8
6.3 Evidence Applicability.....	9
6.4 Factor-level conclusion.....	9
7. Justification of the Ten Evidence Quality Indicators	9
7.1 Coverage	9
7.2 Completeness.....	9
7.3 Resolution.....	10
7.4 Source Reliability.....	10
7.5 Validity	10
7.6 Accuracy.....	10

7.7 Evidence Integrity	10
7.8 Subject Applicability.....	11
7.9 Context Applicability	11
7.10 Determination Applicability	11
7.11 Indicator-level conclusion	11
8. Interaction, Non-Substitutability, and Non-Compensation	11
8.1 Why no universal weighting is established	12
9. Cross-Domain Stress Testing	12
9.1 Why materially different applications are methodologically useful	12
9.2 What changes across domains	12
9.3 What remains invariant.....	12
10. Evidence Quality, Uncertainty, and Traceability.....	13
10.1 Evidence Quality and Uncertainty	13
10.2 Evidence Quality and Traceability	13
11. Missing-Function Review	13
12. Necessary but Not Closed	14
12.1 Conservative expansion	14
12.2 Conservative simplification	14
13. Conditions for Controlled Revision.....	14
13.1 Candidate conditions for revision	14
13.2 Revision principles.....	15
14. Conclusions.....	15
References.....	15
Copyright and Use Notice	17

Abstract

Prepared from the WQI Evidence Quality Core and cross-domain testing of how Evidence Quality works in materially different applications.

This article explains why the WQI Evidence Quality Core uses three Evidence Quality Factors and ten Evidence Quality Indicators. It tests whether this structure remains useful when the kinds of Evidence and the situations in which Evidence is used are very different.

The starting question is simple: what must be examined before Evidence can responsibly support a Finding? The analysis identifies three different questions. Is enough of the necessary Evidence available? Can the Evidence be trusted to represent what it is intended to show? Does the Evidence apply to the subject and use for which it is needed? These questions are represented by Evidence Sufficiency, Evidence Trustworthiness, and Evidence Applicability.

The article then examines the ten Indicators within these three Factors. It tests whether each Indicator serves a distinct purpose, whether any can be removed or combined without losing an important question, and whether the architecture leaves a recurring Evidence Quality problem unaddressed. The same tests are applied across materially different technical and human-service settings.

The analysis supports the present three-Factor and ten-Indicator structure. The conclusion is intentionally limited: the architecture is supported at the present WQI Methodological Resolution, but it remains open to controlled revision if future work identifies a genuine missing function, redundancy, or structural problem.

1. Purpose and Scope

This article explains and justifies the structure of the WQI Evidence Quality Core.

The Core uses three Evidence Quality Factors—Evidence Sufficiency, Evidence Trustworthiness, and Evidence Applicability—and ten Evidence Quality Indicators. The Core Standard establishes this architecture. This article asks why these Factors and Indicators are needed, why they should remain distinct, and whether the structure continues to work across very different applications.

To test this, the analysis uses contrasting application environments. Some involve physical assets, measurements, operating data, changing configurations, and long Lifecycles. Others involve observations, service records, changing human conditions, support arrangements, and organizational or service connections. The examples are different by design so that the architecture is not justified from only one type of application.

The examples are not used to create universal technical requirements. They are used to test whether the same basic Evidence Quality questions remain necessary when the Evidence, subject, conditions, methods, and consequences change.

1.1 Questions addressed

- Why does Evidence Quality require a structured architecture rather than a single undifferentiated judgment?
- Why are Evidence Sufficiency, Evidence Trustworthiness, and Evidence Applicability necessary and distinguishable?
- Why are the ten Indicators necessary at the present Methodological Resolution?
- Can any Indicator be removed or absorbed into another without loss of important visibility?
- Do interactions among Factors or Indicators make any of them redundant?

- Does the architecture omit a recurring Evidence Quality function revealed by materially different applications?
- Which parts of the architecture are invariant, and which parts must remain Context-specific?
- How should the architecture remain open to controlled revision without becoming unstable?

1.2 Exclusions

This article does not establish legal rules of evidence or prescribe domain-specific thresholds, sampling frequencies, measurement procedures, audit protocols, certification requirements, record-retention periods, or Quality Outcome Criteria. These remain matters for the applicable laws, regulations, standards, contracts, technical practices, or other justified sources.

It also does not determine the Quality State of any particular Quality Object. Its purpose is to justify the architecture used to determine what Evidence can responsibly support.

2. Evidence Within Whole Quality Determination

Whole Quality separates three things: the actual condition being examined, the Evidence available about that condition, and the Finding that the Evidence can support. They are connected, but they are not the same.

The actual condition exists whether or not it has been fully observed or documented. Evidence provides information about that condition. A Finding states what that Evidence can responsibly establish.

Keeping these separate prevents two opposite errors. Weak or missing Evidence does not automatically mean that the underlying condition is poor. Extensive or favorable-looking documentation does not automatically mean that the underlying condition is good.

2.1 Evidence is not the actual condition

Infrastructure illustrates this clearly. A pipeline may contain a defect that has not yet been detected, while a repair may have been properly completed even if part of its documentation has been lost. Support services show the same methodological problem in a different form: a required support activity may have occurred despite incomplete documentation, or records may continue to show an arrangement that no longer reflects actual service conditions.

Accordingly, absence of Evidence is not automatically Evidence of absence. Where Evidence is inadequate, the responsible result may be a bounded, unresolved, or undetermined condition rather than an unsupported conclusion about the Quality Object.

2.2 Evidence is not the Finding

An individual measurement, observation, record, photograph, assessment, or service note is not itself the broader Finding for which it may be used. A wall-thickness measurement at one location can support a Finding about that measurement at that location and time, but it does not automatically establish the condition of an entire pipeline segment. A documented support activity can support a Finding that the activity occurred for the identified person and setting, but it does not automatically establish adequate realization of an entire service period.

The scope of a Finding therefore cannot responsibly exceed the scope that the Evidence can support.

2.3 Evidence is not the Quality State

Evidence contributes to Quality determination through Evidence-Supported Findings. Those Findings are interpreted in relation to applicable Quality Factors, Quality Indicators, Quality Outcome Criteria, Critical Conditions, and other methodological constraints before they contribute to the Quality State of the underlying Quality Object.

High-quality Evidence can support an unfavorable Finding. Conversely, weak Evidence can appear favorable while being incapable of supporting a favorable Quality Claim. Evidence Quality and Object Quality therefore answer different questions.

2.4 Evidence and Quality Outcome Criteria

Evidence concerns what the actual condition is. Quality Outcome Criteria concern the expected, required, acceptable, unacceptable, or otherwise relevant condition against which observations are interpreted. Evidence cannot substitute for the Applicable Basis or Quality Outcome Criteria, and requirements cannot substitute for Evidence concerning actual condition.

3. Evidence as a Quality Object

Evidence can itself be examined as a Quality Object when the determination concerns how well the Evidence realizes its Intended Function. The Intended Function of Evidence is to support a Finding about the actual condition of a defined Quality Object.

This does not mean that every use of Evidence requires a separate formal Evidence Quality State. It means that the Evidence being relied upon can be bounded and examined through the same Whole Quality logic of Intended Function, Quality Factors, Quality Indicators, applicable criteria, Evidence, and Findings.

3.1 Relational character of Evidence Quality

Evidence Quality is not an absolute property independent of use. The same Evidence may be strong for one Finding and inadequate for another. A photograph may establish a visible condition at one location and time while being incapable of establishing the condition of an inaccessible component or a whole system. A service observation may establish what occurred in one setting while being insufficient to characterize an extended support arrangement.

This relational character is essential to the justification. The question is not simply whether Evidence is 'good.' The question is whether the Evidence can responsibly support this particular Finding about this defined subject, under these conditions, for this determination.

3.2 Evidence about Evidence and the stopping principle

Determining Evidence Quality itself requires support. A measurement may require information about instrument identification, calibration, method, range, uncertainty, operator competence, location, environmental conditions, data transfer, and preservation. A service assessment may require information about who performed it, what was observed, the method used, limitations, completeness, alteration history, and whether it concerns the relevant person, setting, and period.

This creates an apparent recursion because Evidence is used to determine Evidence Quality. The recursion is not unlimited. Whole Quality requires the evidentiary basis to be examined to the level necessary to support the intended determination and its declared Methodological Resolution, with relevant limitations and Uncertainty kept visible.

4. From the Intended Function of Evidence to the Three Factors

The three Factors are derived from materially different ways in which Evidence can fail to realize its Intended Function.

Evidence may fail because the necessary evidentiary basis is not available at the required extent or detail. Evidence may fail because what is available cannot be trusted as a truthful representation of what it is intended to represent. Evidence may also be sufficient and trustworthy in itself yet fail because it does not apply to the subject, Context, or determination for which it is being used.

These failure families produce three distinct questions:

1. Evidence Sufficiency — Is the necessary Evidence available at the required extent and detail?
2. Evidence Trustworthiness — Can the Evidence be trusted as a truthful representation of what it is intended to represent?
3. Evidence Applicability — Does the Evidence properly apply to what it is being used to support?

The Factors interact, but the failure represented by one Factor cannot be fully described by another. More Evidence does not cure invalid Evidence. Accurate Evidence about the wrong subject does not become applicable because it is accurate. Evidence that applies to the correct subject does not become sufficient merely because it is relevant.

5. Justification Method

The justification uses a set of complementary tests. No single example or domain establishes invariance. The architecture is supported only where the same determination functions remain necessary as Evidence forms, Quality Objects, Contexts, methods, and Scales change.

5.1 Functional derivation

Each Factor and Indicator must connect to the Intended Function of Evidence. A concept that is useful for administration or documentation but does not preserve a distinct Evidence Quality determination function is not sufficient merely because it is practically important.

5.2 Failure-mode test

The analysis asks whether a recognizable way in which Evidence can fail to support a Finding is made visible by the architecture. The aim is not to catalogue every technical failure but to preserve the methodological function needed to recognize it.

5.3 Distinction test

Neighboring concepts are compared to determine whether they answer materially different questions. Frequent interaction is not treated as evidence of redundancy.

5.4 Removal test

For each Factor and Indicator, the analysis asks what becomes invisible if the element is removed. If removal causes a recurring and important evidentiary failure to disappear from the architecture, the element is supported as necessary at the present Methodological Resolution.

5.5 Absorption test

The analysis asks whether the function of one element can be fully absorbed by another without loss. Partial overlap or causal interaction is not enough. Absorption is justified only if the distinction itself contributes no necessary visibility.

5.6 Missing-function test

An internally coherent architecture may still be incomplete. The analysis therefore asks whether a recurring way in which Evidence can fail to support a Finding is not represented by any existing Factor or Indicator. A missing function must remain visible rather than being forced into the current structure simply to protect the 3/10 model.

5.7 Cross-domain stress test

Cross-domain testing uses materially different test environments. Infrastructure applications emphasize physical condition, measurement, long Lifecycles, distributed assets, technical Interfaces, changing configurations, and historical Evidence. Personal and social support-service applications emphasize person-specific requirements, human observation, service records, changing needs and settings, organizational Interfaces, and the relationship between documented activity and actual support results.

If the same determination function remains necessary across these differences, while its technical implementation changes, that supports functional invariance.

6. Justification of the Three Evidence Quality Factors

6.1 Evidence Sufficiency

Evidence Sufficiency preserves the question of whether the necessary Evidence exists at the required extent, completeness, and detail. Without this Factor, an Evidence set could be accurate, valid, well preserved, and applicable to the correct subject yet still be incapable of supporting the intended Finding because too little of the relevant condition has been examined.

Infrastructure examples include a precise measurement at one location being used to characterize a long pipeline segment, a short operating period being used to characterize long-term performance, or an inspection program leaving inaccessible areas unexamined. Support-service examples include one accurate service observation being used to characterize an entire support period or a detailed note documenting an activity while omitting other required support conditions.

These are not primarily Trustworthiness failures: the Evidence may be true. They are not primarily Applicability failures: the Evidence may concern the correct subject and Context. The missing function is whether enough of the necessary Evidence is available at the required extent and detail. Evidence Sufficiency is therefore necessary and distinct.

6.2 Evidence Trustworthiness

Evidence Trustworthiness preserves the question of whether the Evidence can be trusted as a truthful representation of what it is intended to represent. Quantity and relevance do not answer this question.

Infrastructure may provide broad monitoring coverage while the measurement system is unreliable, invalid, inaccurate, or its records have been altered. Support services may provide extensive records that originate from a weak source, use an unsuitable assessment method, inaccurately represent what occurred, or have lost evidentiary integrity.

Trustworthiness therefore concerns a different failure family from Sufficiency and Applicability. Increasing the volume of untrustworthy Evidence does not cure the problem. Nor does correct subject applicability establish that the representation itself is truthful.

6.3 Evidence Applicability

Evidence Applicability preserves the relational question of whether otherwise sufficient and trustworthy Evidence properly applies to the subject, Context, and determination for which it is used.

A complete and accurate historical infrastructure record may concern a component that has since been replaced. A technically trustworthy test may have been performed under operating conditions materially different from the present determination. A reliable support-service record may concern the wrong person, setting, time period, or service arrangement. In each case the Evidence may be genuine and well documented but still unsuitable for the intended Finding.

Applicability cannot be absorbed into Sufficiency because the problem is not necessarily missing Evidence. It cannot be absorbed into Trustworthiness because the Evidence may truthfully represent exactly what it purports to represent. The failure lies in the relationship between that Evidence and the use being made of it.

6.4 Factor-level conclusion

The three Factors preserve three necessary and non-equivalent determination functions: adequacy of evidentiary extent and detail, trustworthiness of representation, and applicability to the intended evidentiary use. Removal or merger of any one would conceal a recurring class of Evidence failure observed across materially different applications.

7. Justification of the Ten Evidence Quality Indicators

7.1 Coverage

Coverage asks whether Evidence extends across the relevant parts, conditions, periods, events, or other aspects that must be examined. Its distinctive function is extent.

Infrastructure may require geographic, component, operating-condition, or Lifecycle coverage. Support services may require coverage across people, settings, shifts, support activities, events, or periods. The technical expression changes, but the determination function remains the same.

Coverage cannot be replaced by Completeness. Evidence may cover every required area while omitting an important record or observation within that area. It also cannot be replaced by Resolution: broad coverage may still be too coarse, while high-resolution Evidence may cover only a narrow portion of the subject.

7.2 Completeness

Completeness asks whether the important Evidence needed within the applicable scope is present rather than missing. Its distinctive function is necessary content.

A dataset may have broad geographic coverage yet omit a required variable. A service file may span the entire review period yet omit incident information, a required assessment, or documentation needed for the Finding. Completeness therefore remains distinct from Coverage and Resolution.

7.3 Resolution

Resolution asks whether the Evidence provides the detail or discrimination required for the Methodological Resolution of the intended determination.

A network-level infrastructure dataset may be adequate for a system trend but too coarse for a component-level Finding. A support-service summary may be adequate for a broad administrative description but insufficient to distinguish whether a person-specific requirement was realized in a particular setting. Resolution therefore preserves the level-of-detail question that neither Coverage nor Completeness can replace.

7.4 Source Reliability

Source Reliability asks whether the origin from which Evidence is obtained can be relied upon for the intended evidentiary use. The source may be a person, organization, system, instrument, database, process, or other origin.

The Indicator is necessary because Evidence can be extensive, applicable, and apparently precise while originating from a source with characteristics that undermine reliance. Source Reliability is not identical to Validity or Accuracy. A generally reliable source may produce invalid or inaccurate Evidence in a particular case, while a source with limitations may sometimes produce an accurate result.

7.5 Validity

Validity asks whether the Evidence represents what it is intended to show. Its distinctive question is whether the means of representation is fit for the claimed evidentiary meaning.

A technically precise measurement may measure a different characteristic from the one claimed. A service assessment may consistently record an activity but fail to represent the support result that the Finding concerns. Validity therefore differs from Accuracy: a method can produce highly repeatable or numerically accurate outputs for the wrong construct or condition.

7.6 Accuracy

Accuracy asks whether what the Evidence shows is represented without important error. Its distinctive function is correctness of representation.

The distinction from Validity is necessary. Validity concerns whether the Evidence represents the intended thing; Accuracy concerns whether that represented thing is shown without important error. Merging the two would conceal the difference between a wrong means of representation and an erroneous result within an otherwise valid means.

7.7 Evidence Integrity

Evidence Integrity asks whether Evidence has remained materially intact and free from unauthorized, unexplained, or quality-relevant alteration, loss, substitution, or distortion through its evidentiary lifecycle.

A record may have originated from a reliable source, used a valid method, and been accurate when created, yet later be altered, truncated, substituted, corrupted, or separated from essential metadata. Integrity therefore cannot be absorbed into Source Reliability, Validity, or Accuracy.

7.8 Subject Applicability

Subject Applicability asks whether Evidence concerns the Quality Object, part, condition, event, or period that is actually the subject of the Finding.

A correct record about a different pipeline segment or a reliable service record about a different person does not become applicable merely because it is trustworthy. Subject Applicability preserves the 'right subject' question.

7.9 Context Applicability

Context Applicability asks whether Evidence remains applicable under the conditions and circumstances in which the Finding is made.

Infrastructure conditions may include operating state, environment, configuration, Lifecycle stage, loading, or other circumstances. Support-service conditions may include setting, support arrangement, staffing, person-specific circumstances, time period, or other contextual conditions. Evidence about the correct subject may still fail because the relevant Context has changed.

7.10 Determination Applicability

Determination Applicability asks whether what the Evidence represents can properly support the particular Finding or Quality Determination for which it is used.

This is the final evidentiary-use question. Evidence may concern the correct subject and Context yet support only a narrower Finding than the one proposed. A single accurate measurement may apply to the correct component under the correct conditions but still be unsuitable for a system-wide conclusion. A service observation may concern the correct person and setting but be unsuitable for a conclusion about long-term realization.

7.11 Indicator-level conclusion

The ten Indicators preserve distinguishable questions: Coverage = extent; Completeness = necessary content; Resolution = detail; Source Reliability = dependable origin; Validity = representation of the intended thing; Accuracy = correctness of representation; Evidence Integrity = preserved evidentiary condition; Subject Applicability = right subject; Context Applicability = right conditions; Determination Applicability = right evidentiary use.

Removal and absorption testing across materially different applications does not identify an Indicator that can be eliminated without loss of important visibility. The testing also does not identify a recurring missing function that presently requires an eleventh invariant Indicator.

8. Interaction, Non-Substitutability, and Non-Compensation

Evidence Quality is multi-dimensional. An item or body of Evidence can be strong in one dimension and limited in another. Interaction among Factors and Indicators is expected, but interaction does not make them interchangeable.

A loss of Evidence Integrity may create a later Completeness problem. Poor Source Reliability may increase concern about Accuracy. Limited Coverage may increase Uncertainty. These causal relationships do not collapse the underlying determination functions.

The architecture therefore rejects automatic compensation. Extensive Coverage does not compensate for invalid Evidence. High Accuracy does not compensate for wrong Subject Applicability. Strong

Integrity does not compensate for insufficient Resolution. A large quantity of Evidence does not compensate for a source or method that cannot support the intended representation.

8.1 Why no universal weighting is established

The Core architecture does not establish a universal numerical weighting among the Factors or Indicators. Their importance depends on the Finding, Quality Object, Context, Applicable Basis, and Methodological Resolution. In some determinations, a limitation in one Indicator may be decisive; in others, it may bound the Finding without preventing a narrower conclusion.

This preserves the difference between methodological architecture and context-specific decision criteria.

9. Cross-Domain Stress Testing

9.1 Why materially different applications are methodologically useful

Cross-domain stress testing is methodologically useful when it exposes the Evidence Quality architecture to materially different classes of Quality Object and Evidence rather than repeatedly testing it within one technical field.

One class of application includes physical assets, distributed networks, measurements, tests, operating data, models, engineering analyses, maintenance histories, remote sensing, long Lifecycles, configuration changes, and technical Interfaces. A materially different class includes person-specific requirements and preferences, observations, service records, schedules, Support Worker information, support results, incidents, communications, changing service conditions, and organizational or service Interfaces.

The difference is methodologically valuable. An Indicator that appears necessary only because one application uses technical measurements should not be treated as invariant unless its determination function remains necessary where Evidence is primarily observational, documentary, or person-specific. Conversely, an Indicator associated with human observation should remain meaningful when Evidence is produced by instruments, systems, tests, or engineering analyses. Across these materially different conditions, the same determination functions remain recognizable while their technical expression changes.

9.2 What changes across domains

- Evidence forms and sources
- technical methods and technologies
- applicable laws, regulations, contracts, and professional practices
- Quality Outcome Criteria
- Scale and Methodological Resolution
- time horizons and Lifecycle conditions
- the nature of Interfaces
- the consequences of evidentiary limitation
- the practical methods used to examine each Indicator

9.3 What remains invariant

- the need to examine evidentiary extent, necessary content, and detail
- the need to examine origin, validity, accuracy, and integrity

- the need to examine subject, Context, and determination applicability
- the separation of Evidence Quality from Object Quality
- the separation of Evidence Quality from Uncertainty and Traceability
- the principle that the Finding cannot responsibly exceed what the Evidence can support

The cross-domain conclusion is therefore functional rather than technical: invariance belongs to the determination function, not to identical Evidence forms, methods, criteria, technologies, or implementation.

10. Evidence Quality, Uncertainty, and Traceability

10.1 Evidence Quality and Uncertainty

Evidence Quality asks whether the Evidence can responsibly support the Finding being made. Uncertainty asks what remains not fully known, resolved, or determinable. The concepts interact but are not equivalent.

Strong Evidence may still leave Uncertainty because some conditions remain inaccessible or future behavior remains unknown. Conversely, limitations in Coverage, Source Reliability, Resolution, or Applicability may create or increase Uncertainty. Evidence Quality therefore does not function as a mechanism for eliminating all Uncertainty.

10.2 Evidence Quality and Traceability

Traceability makes the methodological path visible: from Applicable Basis and Quality Outcome Criteria through Evidence and Evidence-Supported Findings to the resulting determination and bounded Quality Claim. A fully traceable record may still be inaccurate, invalid, incomplete, or about the wrong subject.

Traceability therefore cannot substitute for Evidence Quality, and Evidence Quality cannot substitute for Traceability. The two functions should remain distinct and mutually supporting.

11. Missing-Function Review

A central safeguard against confirmation bias is to ask whether the current architecture fails to make visible a recurring way in which Evidence can fail to support a Finding.

Across the cross-domain stress testing, many technical and practical problems were examined: sparse historical records, common-source repetition, conflicting records, inaccessible conditions, changed configurations, person-specific changes, changing service arrangements, measurement limitations, assessment limitations, preservation problems, Interfaces, different Scales, and different periods.

These conditions generated important Evidence Quality problems, but the recurring determination functions could be examined through the existing Factors and Indicators, often in interaction. The testing did not identify a recurring eleventh Indicator or fourth Factor necessary at the present Methodological Resolution.

This conclusion is bounded. Failure to identify a missing function in the present testing is not proof that no future Quality Object or domain can expose one.

12. Necessary but Not Closed

The present analysis supports the WQI Evidence Quality architecture as necessary, coherent, and presently sufficient at the intended Methodological Resolution. That conclusion does not mean that the architecture is permanently closed.

A controlled architecture must be stable enough to support consistent vocabulary, comparable determinations, training, applied standards, Context Guides, and Traceability. At the same time, it must remain open to evidence that an existing element is redundant, a boundary is structurally unclear, a recurring function is missing, or a new class of Quality Object exposes a limitation not visible in current testing.

The governing position is therefore: necessary does not mean immutable.

12.1 Conservative expansion

A new Evidence form, technology, professional term, or domain-specific problem does not automatically justify a new Core Indicator. A proposed addition should represent a recurring determination function that is not already visible through the existing architecture and that survives distinction, removal, absorption, and cross-context testing.

12.2 Conservative simplification

Simplification should be equally demanding. Validity and Accuracy interact strongly, but merging them would conceal the difference between representing the wrong thing and representing the intended thing with important error. Subject Applicability and Context Applicability interact strongly, but merging them would conceal the difference between the wrong subject and the wrong conditions.

The present architecture is therefore closed enough for controlled use and open enough for research.

13. Conditions for Controlled Revision

Structural revision should occur at the WQI level because the Evidence Quality Core architecture is a WQI-level architecture. Applied initiatives may identify a weakness, but they should not silently redefine the Core.

Revision consideration is justified when structured testing demonstrates a methodological need rather than merely a new example or preferred terminology.

13.1 Candidate conditions for revision

- a recurring Evidence Quality function is identified that cannot reasonably be examined through the existing Factors or Indicators;
- an existing Indicator repeatedly proves non-distinguishable from another across materially different applications;
- an Indicator cannot be meaningfully applied outside a narrow platform despite being claimed as invariant;
- a Factor boundary creates persistent structural ambiguity that clarification cannot resolve;
- removal or absorption testing demonstrates that an existing element contributes no necessary determination visibility;
- a new class of Quality Object exposes a structural failure not visible in current cross-domain testing.

13.2 Revision principles

- clarification should be preferred where clarification resolves the problem;
- platform-specific vocabulary should remain at the applied level when the underlying WQI function is unchanged;
- addition, removal, merger, or split of Indicators should require progressively stronger evidence;
- Factor-level change should require the highest methodological burden;
- cross-context and, where possible, cross-platform testing should precede structural change;
- difficult and contrary cases should remain visible;
- all structural revision should preserve Traceability and backward interpretability.

14. Conclusions

The WQI Evidence Quality architecture is derived from the Intended Function of Evidence: to support a Finding about the actual condition of a defined Quality Object. Evidence can fail to realize that function because the necessary evidentiary basis is insufficient, because the representation cannot be trusted, or because the Evidence does not properly apply to the subject, Context, or determination. These failure families support the three Core Quality Factors: Evidence Sufficiency, Evidence Trustworthiness, and Evidence Applicability.

The ten Indicators provide the present Methodological Resolution needed to examine those Factors without collapsing distinct questions. Coverage, Completeness, and Resolution preserve extent, necessary content, and detail. Source Reliability, Validity, Accuracy, and Evidence Integrity preserve origin, representation, correctness, and evidentiary preservation. Subject Applicability, Context Applicability, and Determination Applicability preserve the relationship between Evidence and the subject, conditions, and particular evidentiary use.

Cross-domain stress testing exposes this architecture to materially different Quality Objects, Evidence forms, Lifecycles, Scales, Interfaces, and human or technical conditions. The same determination functions remain recognizable across these different applications. Their implementation changes, but the Core questions do not.

The combined analysis does not identify a Factor or Indicator that can presently be removed or absorbed without meaningful loss, and it does not identify a recurring missing Evidence Quality function requiring structural expansion at the present WQI Methodological Resolution.

Accordingly, the three-Factor / ten-Indicator architecture is supported for continued WQI use. This support is not a claim of permanent universal completeness. The architecture remains subject to controlled revision if future cross-domain application identifies a recurring missing function, a genuine redundancy, an unresolved boundary failure, or another structural limitation.

The resulting methodological position is concise:

**3 Evidence Quality Factors
10 Evidence Quality Indicators
presently supported as necessary and distinguishable
but not permanently closed to controlled revision.**

References

[1] Whole Quality Institute (WQI). WQI_EQC1 — Evidence Quality Standard - Core. Draft Edition, September 2026.

[2] Whole Quality Institute (WQI). WQI_VOC1 — Whole Quality Root Vocabulary Standard. Revision 2.3, September 2026.

Copyright and Use Notice

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

This document is a WQI methodological article prepared for development, review, research, education, and standards-development purposes. No part of this document may be represented as an independently issued WQI standard unless formally designated and published as such by WQI.

References to WQI, WQI_VOC1, the WQI Evidence Quality Core, Quality Factors, Quality Indicators, and related Whole Quality terminology are used within the WQI methodological framework. Cross-domain examples are included to explain and stress-test the architecture; they do not establish legal, regulatory, engineering, clinical, social-service, certification, or contractual requirements.

Where this article is revised, the revision should preserve Traceability to the WQI Evidence Quality Core, WQI_VOC1, and the methodological basis supporting the cross-domain analysis.