



ACCREDITATION SANS FRONTIÈRES

ASF Surveyor Training Standard

Eligibility, training, competency assessment, and ongoing currency for ASF-accredited surveyors

Version 2 · 2026

Paris · Geneva · Tbilisi

Document Control

Document Title	ASF Surveyor Training Standard
Document Reference	ASF-SURV-STD-v2
Version / Edition	Version 2
Status	Published
Date of Publication	12 September 2026
Place of Publication	Paris, France
Issuing Authority	ASF International Standards Council, Accréditation Sans Frontières
Language of Origin	English
Effective Date	12 September 2026
Next Scheduled Review	12 September 2029
Supersedes	Version 1

Table of Contents

1. About This Standard
Domain A — Surveyor Eligibility and Candidacy
Domain B — Training Programme Design and Content
Domain C — Training Delivery and Trainee Management
Domain D — Assessment of Competence
Domain E — Ongoing Currency and Re-Certification
Domain F — Programme Governance and Quality Improvement
References
Annex A — Surveyor Candidate Application Form
Annex B — Training Programme Accreditation Self-Assessment
Annex C — Competency Assessment Record
Annex D — Currency Maintenance Log
Index

Foreword

Every ASF standard exists to answer one question honestly: can the organization, program, or individual it governs actually do what it claims? This standard turns that same question on ASF itself, and on the people who carry out its assessments. A facility accredited by a surveyor who was never genuinely trained, or whose competence was never actually verified, has not really been assessed — it has been visited.

This standard exists because Accréditation Sans Frontières (ASF) recognized a genuine gap in its own architecture: standards for organizations, and standards for the training that prepares professionals, without a parallel standard for the training and ongoing competence of the surveyors who conduct ASF's own assessments. Both the International Society for Quality in Health Care External Evaluation Association (ISQua EEA) and Health Standards Organization (HSO) / Accreditation Canada treat this as a distinct, essential accreditation function in its own right — not an internal HR matter, but a published, evidence-based standard [1–4].

This standard is governed by the same International Standards Council, the same three-year revision cycle, and the same methodology set out in ASF's How ASF Develops and Revises Standards manual. It is the fourth pillar of ASF's accreditation architecture, alongside organizational standards, standards development itself, and continuing education — not a subordinate document to any of them.

About This Standard

Scope

This standard applies to every individual who conducts an assessment on ASF's behalf against any ASF-published standard — organizational or training — whether employed directly by ASF, contracted, or seconded from a partner organization. It also applies to any organization ASF authorizes to deliver surveyor training on its behalf.

Two Distinct International Standards, Two Distinct Functions

This standard is grounded in two genuinely different ISO instruments, each governing a different function, deliberately not conflated. ISO 21001 governs how an educational organization manages itself as an institution — curriculum design, learner-centered process, continual improvement — and grounds Domain B's programme design requirements [5]. ISO/IEC 17024, revised in 2026, is the distinct international standard specifically for bodies certifying individual persons: it covers certification-scheme development, the certification process itself, and ongoing surveillance and recertification of the certified individual, and grounds Domains A, D, and E of this standard, which govern the surveyor as a certified individual, not a training organization [10]. A training programme can be excellent and still fail to produce a genuinely certified individual if these two functions are confused with one another — which is precisely why ISO maintains them as separate standards rather than one.

Structure

This standard is organized into six domains, following the structure ISQua EEA applies to its own Surveyor Training Programme accreditation [1–2], adapted for ASF's specific scale and practice:

- Domain A — Surveyor Eligibility and Candidacy
- Domain B — Training Programme Design and Content
- Domain C — Training Delivery and Trainee Management
- Domain D — Assessment of Competence
- Domain E — Ongoing Currency and Re-Certification
- Domain F — Programme Governance and Quality Improvement

Each standard in this document follows the same format used across ASF's organizational standards: a numbered requirement, explanatory text, and the specific evidence ASF's Council or its delegated reviewer expects to see demonstrated — not merely asserted.

Domain A — Surveyor Eligibility and Candidacy

Before any training begins, a candidate surveyor must meet a defined eligibility bar. Training cannot substitute for genuine prior experience; it can only build on it.

Standard A1 Minimum Professional Experience

A candidate surveyor holds a minimum of three years of relevant professional experience in a health, social care, or training-provider setting comparable to the type of organization or program ASF standards govern, consistent with the experience threshold ISQua EEA applies to its own non-staff surveyors [3].

Evidence of compliance:

- Candidate curriculum vitae showing a minimum of three years' relevant professional experience
- Documented verification of the candidate's prior role and employer

Standard A2 Senior-Level or Leadership Experience, Assessed by Responsibility Not Title

A candidate surveyor has held a role carrying senior management, clinical leadership, quality improvement, or equivalent leadership-level responsibility, reflecting the judgment required to assess an organization's or program's own governance and leadership, not only its technical compliance [3]. This requirement is assessed by the genuine scope of responsibility actually held, not by whether the candidate's employing system uses a formal title matching well-resourced health systems' organizational structures — a community health lead carrying real decision-making responsibility in a resource-constrained or humanitarian setting satisfies this standard on the same basis as a named department head in a large hospital.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documented evidence of the genuine scope of responsibility held, described in terms of actual decisions and accountability, not job title alone
- A reference or attestation from a supervising authority confirming that scope

Standard A3 Standards Familiarity

A candidate surveyor has direct experience with standards development, revision, or a comparable structured quality framework — whether through ASF's own field consultation process (Section 12, Stage 5 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards), a comparable body's standards committee, or equivalent structured quality-improvement work [3].

Evidence of compliance:

- Documentation of prior participation in a standards development, revision, or quality-framework process

Standard A4 Non-Discrimination and Lived-Experience Recruitment

ASF's surveyor recruitment is conducted consistent with the non-discrimination principle in Section 2.2 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards, and specifically welcomes candidates with lived experience of the settings ASF's standards govern — not solely clinical or managerial credentials — following the same deliberate recruitment practice HSO / Accreditation Canada applies to ensure culturally responsive and safe assessment [4].

Evidence of compliance:

- A published, open call for surveyor candidates, consistent with Annex B of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards
- Documented outreach to lived-experience and underrepresented candidate populations

Standard A5 Conflict of Interest Screening at Candidacy

Every surveyor candidate completes the same Conflict of Interest Declaration (Annex A of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards) required of Council and Revision Panel candidates, reviewed under the identical two-person severity-assessment process described in Section 10 of that manual, before being admitted to training.

Evidence of compliance:

- A completed, reviewed Conflict of Interest Declaration for every admitted candidate
- Documentation of the two-person review and its outcome

Standard A6 Distinct Eligibility Tracks for Staff and Non-Staff Surveyors

Eligibility is assessed differently depending on whether a candidate is an ASF staff member or a non-staff, volunteer, or seconded surveyor, following the same distinction Accreditation Canada applies between its staff and non-staff surveyor

eligibility criteria [4]. A non-staff candidate additionally demonstrates recent, active experience within an external evaluation or comparable assessment context, since a non-staff surveyor's competence cannot be assumed from ASF's own internal oversight of an employee.

Evidence of compliance:

- A clear statement of which eligibility track (staff or non-staff) applied to each candidate
- For non-staff candidates, documented evidence of recent external assessment experience

Domain B — Training Programme Design and Content

A surveyor training programme is itself a curriculum, and is designed with the same rigor ASF requires of any training standard under Part IV of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards — outcomes defined before content, consistent with ISO 21001's own discipline [5].

Standard B1 Learning Outcomes Defined Before Content

The training programme defines the specific competencies a certified surveyor must demonstrate — not merely the topics a course will cover — before curriculum content, activities, or assessment methods are designed, following the same outcomes-first discipline required of any ASF training standard [5].

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented set of surveyor competencies, agreed before curriculum design began
- Evidence that assessment methods (Domain D) were designed to verify these specific competencies

Standard B2 Core Curriculum Domains

At minimum, the training programme covers: interpretation and application of ASF standards; evaluation of documentary and observed evidence; structured interview technique; objective, evidence-based report writing; and cultural safety and non-discrimination in the conduct of an assessment, consistent with the non-discrimination principle in Section 2.2 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards.

Evidence of compliance:

- A curriculum map showing each core domain and its associated learning activities
- Sample training materials for each domain

Standard B3 Defined Programme Duration and Format

The training programme specifies a minimum structured learning duration proportionate to its scope — informed by comparable practice such as Accreditation Canada's own new-surveyor training, delivered as fifteen to twenty hours of structured, self-directed learning culminating in a graded assignment and final assessment [4] — adapted to ASF's own scale and the specific standard-type (organizational or training) the surveyor will assess.

Evidence of compliance:

- A published programme schedule stating total structured learning hours
- Confirmation of the assignment and assessment components within that duration

Standard B4 Certification Represents Verified Skill, Not Attendance

Completion of the training programme alone does not constitute certification. Consistent with the ILO Human Resources Development Recommendation, 2004 (No. 195), which treats certification of skill as a substantive right connected to demonstrated competence rather than an administrative outcome of course attendance [6], certification is issued only on successful completion of the competency assessment defined in Domain D.

Evidence of compliance:

- Programme documentation explicitly distinguishing course completion from certification
- A record of the specific competency assessment each certified surveyor passed

Standard B5 Programme Accreditation by the Council

The training programme itself — not only the individuals who complete it — is accredited by the ASF International Standards Council, following the same two-tier model ISQua EEA applies in distinguishing accreditation of a surveyor training programme from certification of an individual surveyor [1–2]. Programme accreditation follows the standard revision and external-review procedures in Sections 7.5 and 12 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards.

Evidence of compliance:

- A current Council decision accrediting the training programme
- Evidence the programme has been reviewed on the same cycle as ASF's published standards

Domain C — Training Delivery and Trainee Management

How a surveyor training programme is actually delivered — who teaches it, how trainees from different countries and resource settings are supported, and what technology-enhanced delivery genuinely requires — is governed with the same rigor as its content.

Standard C1 Trainer Qualification

Anyone delivering ASF surveyor training is themselves a certified, currently active ASF surveyor or has equivalent documented assessment experience, and has completed a specific train-the-trainer component distinct from surveyor certification itself. A trainer who has never conducted a real assessment cannot credibly teach the professional judgment Domain D requires trainees to demonstrate.

Evidence of compliance:

- Trainer credentials confirming current surveyor certification or equivalent experience
- Evidence of train-the-trainer completion, distinct from the surveyor training record itself

Standard C2 Trainee Cohort Management Across Countries and Resource Settings

The training programme is designed and delivered for trainees across multiple countries, languages, and resource settings, not defaulted to the assumptions of a single well-resourced context, following the same multi-country, multi-language delivery discipline UNITAR applies across its training activities, guided by its own Quality Assurance Framework [7]. Cohort composition is monitored for genuine geographic and resource-setting diversity, not merely formal eligibility to enrol.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented trainee cohort record showing country and setting diversity across recent programme cycles
- Programme materials available in more than one working language where this would otherwise exclude eligible candidates

Standard C3 Technology-Enhanced and Blended Delivery Standards

Where training is delivered online, remotely, or in blended format, the programme meets a defined quality standard for technology-enhanced learning — informed by the Open ECBCheck peer-review quality framework UNITAR itself helped develop and continues to apply to its own e-learning activities [7] — covering platform accessibility, learner engagement design, and technical support, not merely content uploaded to a delivery platform.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documentation of the specific quality criteria applied to online or blended components
- Evidence of platform accessibility testing, including for low-bandwidth environments

Standard C4 Trainee Support and Reasonable Accommodation

The training programme provides reasonable accommodation for a trainee's disability, in meeting format, materials format, or working arrangement, consistent with Section 2.2 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards, and maintains a documented process for a trainee to request such accommodation without it affecting their assessment outcome.

Evidence of compliance:

- A published accommodation request process available to every trainee
- Records confirming accommodations provided did not affect competency assessment scoring

Domain D — Assessment of Competence

This is the domain the rest of this standard exists to serve. A training programme that satisfies every requirement in Domains B and C still fails ASF's purpose if it cannot actually verify that a trainee can survey competently, under real conditions, when it matters.

Standard D1 Competency Assessment Through Observed Performance

Competency assessment includes structured role-play or simulated survey exercises with direct observation, not written or knowledge-recall assessment alone — following the methodology jointly developed by WHO and UNICEF under the Ensuring Quality in Psychosocial and Mental Health Care (EQUIP) initiative, which pairs baseline role-play assessment before training with continuous observed feedback during training and a final competency assessment through direct observation [8]. A baseline assessment is conducted before formal training begins, to identify each trainee's starting competency rather than assuming a uniform starting point.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documented baseline role-play or simulation assessment conducted before training begins
- Observation records from at least one simulated survey exercise per trainee, scored against defined competency criteria

Standard D2 Defined Pass Threshold and Retake Policy

The competency assessment applies an explicit, published pass threshold, and a maximum number of permitted attempts, following the discipline of UNITAR's own certification policy, which sets a defined pass threshold and permits a maximum of three attempts at objective assessment of learning [7]. A trainee who does not meet the threshold within the permitted attempts is not certified, and the specific competency gap is documented and shared with the trainee.

Evidence of compliance:

- A published pass threshold and maximum-attempts policy, applied consistently across cohorts
- Documented competency-gap feedback provided to any trainee who does not pass

Standard D3 Assessment of Professional Judgment, Not Only Knowledge

At least one competency assessment component specifically evaluates a trainee's professional judgment under ambiguous or contested conditions — for instance, an interview scenario where evidence is incomplete or a facility representative disputes a finding — reflecting the shared emphasis Joint Commission and ISQua place on a surveyor's actual judgment in the field, not only their recall of standard text [1–2, 9].

Evidence of compliance:

- At least one scored assessment scenario specifically designed to test judgment under ambiguous or contested evidence

Standard D4 Independent Verification of the Assessment Outcome

A pass or fail competency decision is confirmed by a second, independent assessor who did not conduct the original observed assessment, mirroring the two-person verification model applied throughout ASF's own governance — including the conflict of interest severity review in Section 10 and the appeal review process in Section 14 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documented second-assessor confirmation for every competency decision, pass or fail
- Evidence the second assessor was not involved in the original observed assessment

Standard D5 Language Access in the Competency Assessment Itself

A candidate is assessed in a language in which they are genuinely fluent, not merely a language they can follow for training purposes. Consistent with UNESCO's own recognition principle that fair evaluation depends on genuinely comparable conditions, not superficially equal ones [11], a competency assessment conducted in a candidate's non-native language, without qualified interpretation or an equivalent accommodation, does not reliably measure the candidate's actual judgment — it measures their fluency in a second language under pressure.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented language of assessment for each candidate, confirmed as a language of genuine fluency
- Evidence of qualified interpretation or equivalent accommodation where a language mismatch would otherwise occur

Standard D6 Inter-Rater Reliability, Not Only Single-Case Verification

Beyond the case-by-case second-assessor confirmation required under Standard D4, the training programme periodically tests whether different assessors, scoring the same recorded or simulated performance independently, reach consistent conclusions — following the same inter-rater reliability discipline Joint Commission applies to its own surveyor consistency [9]. A programme where individual pass/fail decisions are each verified, but where assessors as a group score identical performances inconsistently, has not actually established a reliable standard of judgment.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented inter-rater reliability exercise conducted at least annually across the assessor pool
- Results showing the degree of agreement achieved, and any corrective action taken where agreement was low

Domain E — Ongoing Currency and Re-Certification

Certification is not permanent. A surveyor who passed a competency assessment three years ago and has not conducted an assessment since is not a currently competent surveyor — they are a formerly assessed one.

Standard E1 Minimum Annual Survey Activity

A certified surveyor conducts a minimum of ten days of active survey work per year, approximately equivalent to two full assessments, in order to remain in active certified status — following the minimum activity threshold Accreditation Canada applies to its own surveyor workforce [4]. Activity is documented per surveyor and reviewed annually by the Council officer responsible for surveyor records.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented annual survey-activity log for every certified surveyor
- Confirmation the ten-day minimum was met, or a recorded exception under Standard E4

Standard E2 Continuing Professional Development for Active Surveyors

A certified surveyor maintains ongoing continuing professional development relevant to assessment practice, consistent with the CPD framework in Section 16.8 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards — which may include formal, credit-bearing activity or structured, self-directed learning, provided it is documented and its outcomes are genuinely verifiable, not merely claimed.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented CPD record for each surveyor, updated at least annually
- Evidence that claimed CPD activity is verifiable, not self-reported without support

Standard E3 Periodic Re-Assessment

A certified surveyor undergoes formal re-assessment of competence — not merely a review of activity records — no less often than every three years, aligned with the same revision cycle that governs ASF's published standards under Section 12 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards. Re-assessment applies the same observed-performance standard defined in Domain D, not a lesser paperwork-only review.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented re-assessment record for every surveyor, completed within the three-year window
- Confirmation the re-assessment method matched the original Domain D standard

Standard E4 Suspension and Reinstatement

A surveyor who falls below the minimum activity threshold in Standard E1, or whose re-assessment under Standard E3 is overdue, is suspended from active survey assignments until the shortfall is addressed. Reinstatement requires either demonstrated activity within a defined grace period or a supplementary competency assessment, not an administrative waiver.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented suspension record for any surveyor falling below threshold
- A documented reinstatement decision showing which of the two reinstatement paths was applied

Standard E5 A Stated Position on Surveyor Compensation and Working Conditions

ASF publishes a clear, specific policy on surveyor compensation — whether surveying is compensated by honorarium, consistent with Accreditation Canada's own practice [4], performed as uncompensated volunteer service consistent with the Council's own governance model, or compensated through an employer arrangement — and, in every case, reimburses documented survey-related expenses. Consistent with the decent-work principle underlying ILO Recommendation No. 195 [6], ASF does not leave surveyor compensation undefined or dependent on informal expectation.

Evidence of compliance:

- A published surveyor compensation policy, specifying which model applies and to whom
- A documented expense reimbursement process available to every certified surveyor

Domain F — Programme Governance and Quality Improvement

A surveyor training programme that never examines its own outcomes cannot demonstrate it is producing competent surveyors — only that it is producing certificates.

Standard F1 Programme-Level Outcome Tracking

The training programme tracks defined performance indicators across cohorts — including first-attempt pass rate, retake rate, and, where available, downstream survey quality outcomes for certified surveyors — following the same performance-based, indicator-tracked approach UNITAR applies to its own training activities under its Quality Assurance Framework [7]. Indicators are reviewed at least annually, not only at the point of programme re-accreditation.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented set of tracked programme indicators, updated at least annually
- Evidence indicators are reviewed by programme governance, not only collected

Standard F2 Programme Review Cycle, With a Defined Timeline

The training programme itself is formally reviewed and revised on the same three-year cycle that governs ASF's published standards under Section 12 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards, incorporating the outcome data tracked under Standard F1, field feedback from certified surveyors, and any changes to the standards the programme trains surveyors to assess. Consistent with ISQua EEA's own re-accreditation timeline [1–2], the Council initiates contact with the programme no later than nine months before the current cycle expires, and the review itself is completed no later than three months before expiry, so that no programme lapses into an unaccredited gap between cycles.

Evidence of compliance:

- A documented programme review completed within the three-year cycle
- Evidence that Standard F1 outcome data was considered as part of the review
- Records showing the nine-month and three-month timeline milestones were met

Standard F3 External Review of the Surveyor Training Programme

ASF's surveyor training programme is included within the external review of the Council's own practice required under Section 7.5 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards — examining whether Domains A through E of this standard are genuinely followed in practice, not only documented. This is the same reasoning ASF applies to every organization and program it accredits, applied without exception to its own surveyor training.

Evidence of compliance:

- Documentation confirming the surveyor training programme was included in the most recent external review under Section 7.5
- External review findings specific to surveyor training, addressed in the Annual Activity Report

A standard that accredits organizations, training programmes, and now surveyors, but exempts its own surveyor training from the external review it requires of everyone else, has not closed the loop this document exists to close. Standard F3 is the specific requirement that prevents that exemption from happening by omission.

Standard F4 Certification Portability

A surveyor's ASF certification is issued specifically against this standard, and its portability to another accrediting body or country is not automatic — consistent with UNESCO's own Global Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications, which places portability decisions with the recognizing authority rather than the issuing body [11]. ASF's role is to make that determination genuinely possible: every surveyor certification is published with the specific competencies assessed under Domain D and the evidence standard applied, in a form another accrediting body can actually evaluate, not merely a certificate title and a date.

Evidence of compliance:

- Published certification records specifying the competencies assessed and evidence standard applied
- A stated policy on how ASF responds to a portability inquiry from another accrediting body

References

- [1] ISQua External Evaluation Association. International Accreditation Programme. Dublin: ISQua EEA; 2026.
- [2] ISQua External Evaluation Association. Standards for Surveyor Training Programmes, 4th Edition, Version 1.0. Dublin: ISQua EEA; 2024.
- [3] ISQua External Evaluation Association. Frequently Asked Questions — Surveyor Eligibility. Dublin: ISQua EEA; 2026.
- [4] Accreditation Canada. Become a Surveyor. Ottawa: Accreditation Canada; 2026.
- [5] International Organization for Standardization. ISO 21001:2025, Educational Organizations — Management Systems for Educational Organizations — Requirements with Guidance for Use. Geneva: ISO; 2025.
- [6] International Labour Organization. Human Resources Development Recommendation, 2004 (No. 195). Geneva: ILO; 2004.
- [7] United Nations Institute for Training and Research. Quality Assurance Framework; and Open ECBCheck Quality Standards for Technology-Enhanced Capacity Building. Geneva: UNITAR; 2026.
- [8] World Health Organization; UNICEF. Ensuring Quality in Psychosocial and Mental Health Care (EQUIP): competency-based training and supervision. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
- [9] Joint Commission. Standards. Oakbrook Terrace (IL): The Joint Commission; 2026.
- [10] International Organization for Standardization. ISO/IEC 17024:2026, Conformity Assessment — General Requirements for Bodies Operating Certification of Persons. Geneva: ISO; 2026.
- [11] UNESCO. Global Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education. Paris: UNESCO; 2019.

Annex A — Surveyor Candidate Application Form

Completed by every candidate applying under Domain A. Submitted alongside the Conflict of Interest Declaration (Annex A of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards).

Full name: _____

Country: _____

Standard-type applying to survey (organizational / training): _____

A1 — Professional Experience

Years of relevant professional experience: _____

Employer(s) and role(s): _____

A2 — Leadership Experience

Senior management / clinical leadership role held:

A3 — Standards Familiarity

Prior standards development / revision / quality-framework experience:

A4 — Lived Experience (optional, self-identified)

Candidates are welcome, but never required, to describe lived experience of the settings ASF standards govern.

Application received by (Council officer): _____

Date: _____

Annex B — Training Programme Accreditation Self-Assessment

Completed by any organization seeking Council accreditation of its surveyor training programme under Domain B, Standard B5.

Organization name: _____

Programme name: _____

Domain B Compliance

- ☐ Learning outcomes documented before curriculum design (B1)
- ☐ Core curriculum domains covered in full (B2)
- ☐ Programme duration and format documented (B3)
- ☐ Certification distinguished from course completion (B4)

Domain C Compliance

- ☐ Trainer qualification requirements documented (C1)
- ☐ Multi-country, multi-language cohort management demonstrated (C2)
- ☐ Technology-enhanced delivery meets defined quality criteria (C3)
- ☐ Reasonable accommodation process published (C4)

Supporting Evidence Attached

Submitted by: _____

Date: _____

Council decision (accredited / not accredited / conditional): _____

Annex C — Competency Assessment Record

Completed for every trainee competency assessment under Domain D.

Trainee name: _____

Assessment date: _____

Attempt number (max. 3, per Standard D2): _____

Baseline Assessment (D1)

Baseline role-play / simulation score: _____

Final Competency Assessment (D1)

Observed assessment score: _____

☐ Judgment-under-ambiguity scenario included and scored (D3)

Outcome

☐ Pass — threshold met

☐ Fail — competency gap documented below

Competency gap detail (if applicable):

Independent Verification (D4)

Original assessor: _____

Second, independent assessor: _____

☐ Second assessor confirms the outcome above

Annex D — Currency Maintenance Log

Maintained per certified surveyor under Domain E, reviewed annually.

Surveyor name: _____

Certification date: _____

Annual Activity (E1)

Survey days completed this year (minimum 10): _____

Assessments completed: _____

CPD Record (E2)

Re-Assessment (E3)

Last re-assessment date: _____

Next due (within 3 years): _____

Status

- ☐ Active — all thresholds met
- ☐ Suspended — see reinstatement path (E4)

Reviewed by (Council officer): _____

Date: _____

[END OF FOUNDATION DRAFT. Domains B through F — Training Programme Design, Delivery, Assessment of Competence, Ongoing Currency, and Programme Governance — to be developed next, following the same format and grounding established in Domain A.]

Index

Assessment of Competence, Domain D
Candidacy, Domain A
Competency Assessment Record, Annex C
Currency Maintenance, Domain E, Annex D
Eligibility Criteria, Domain A
Programme Governance, Domain F
Re-Certification, Domain E
Training Delivery, Domain C
Training Programme Design, Domain B