



AF 9100:2026

Aerospace Quality Management System

PROCEDURE

Workforce Competence, Awareness and Task Authorization

AF-PR-9100-008

FIRST EDITION

30 September 2026 | English master text

Publication identity and application

Control	Publication value
Title	Workforce Competence, Awareness and Task Authorization
Document code	AF-PR-9100-008
Edition / language	FIRST EDITION / English master text
Companion edition identity	30 September 2026
Controlling source	AF 9100:2026 — FIRST EDITION — 29 September 2026
Responsible owner function	Competence manager and employing technical authority
Primary source anchors	7.2, 7.3, 26, AB, AE
Delivery status	Prepared implementation companion. Actual approval, adoption, effectivity and operational decisions are recorded separately.

Use and document-control boundary

This companion implements the supplied AF 9100 requirement basis without changing the original standard. Its process allocation, examples, checklists and record design are authored implementation material. Actual mission or product limits, specialist procedures, permissions and genuine observations must be completed before consequential use. Applicable source minima and independent decision conditions cannot be reduced by this companion.

The printed edition date identifies the companion series; it is not evidence that later preparation, review or operational decisions occurred on that date. New support codes in this set are proposed allocations for controlled registration. Established AF-IG-9100-001, AF-FAQ-9100-001 and AF-TR-9100-001 identities are retained; earlier files, the corporate master list and ASTRA codes are not overwritten.

Equivalent combined or digital records are permitted when all required fields, relationships, authority and history remain intact. A completed PDF field or typed name is not evidence of an authenticated approval. Blank records in this delivery contain no invented applicant, signature, event or result.

Contents and reading route

Publication identity and application	2
Contents and reading route	3
1 Scope, responsibility and source priority	4
2 Trigger, inputs and handover	4
3 Operating sequence	4
4 Decision, interruption and escalation	5
5 Required records and receiving checks	5
6 Worked case and adverse challenge	5
Appendix A — Controlling source and evidence	7
Source tables — complete field and decision payloads	14
Appendix B — Local implementation and release	16

Select actual scope → complete application criteria → use the applicable procedure and technical book → capture authentic evidence → evaluate every applicable condition → obtain the required independent decision. Document availability does not establish implementation or conformity.

1 Scope, responsibility and source priority

Applies to the responsible function and exact evaluated object selected from the source. Use only the duties triggered by actual activity and retained responsibility.

Boundary	Required implementation decision
Object and route	Identify ORG, PRD, SVC, PRC, PER, SUB or CAB separately. Combined records do not merge outcomes.
Activity	Apply source technical modules by performed or retained responsibility, including relevant outsourced work.
Authority	Technical release, employer task permission, independent attestation and statutory authorization remain distinct.
Source priority	AF 9100:2026 and all compatible binding obligations control. This companion does not import ASTRA programme rules or external normative schemes.

2 Trigger, inputs and handover

Trigger: New assignment, changed task, inactivity, renewal or adverse performance.

Accountable process owner: Competence manager and employing technical authority. Actual named appointments and deputies are maintained locally.

Input to verify	Required output / receiving function
Exact request, object and source profile	Accepted scope and controlled work package, or a reasoned hold/refusal.
Current people, authority, data and equipment	Authorized assignment and evidence-access boundary.
Original execution, adverse evidence and source history	Attributable result, identified limitations and required action.
Relevant source clocks and actual event times	Genuine due/completion history and timely recipient communication.

3 Operating sequence

3.1 Analyze the actual task

Identify outputs, decisions, equipment, hazards, instructions, language and essential practical steps. Separate employee task permission, independent personnel certification and assessment-role credentials.

3.2 Verify entry evidence

Check identity, relevant education and experience, required licenses and restrictions. Evaluate temporary staff and contractors against the same actual task needs.

3.3 Close capability gaps

Plan instruction and supervised work. Record the work actually performed and assistance received. Attendance and years of service are inputs, not automatic proof of current performance.

3.4 Observe and evaluate

Use preset criteria, representative tasks and anomalies. Retain independent results for mandatory components and every essential practical step; add AB/AE controls when those routes apply.

3.5 Issue bounded employer authority

Identify person, task, product or process, location or equipment, supervision, actual effective period and review date. Do not substitute a generic badge for authorization to release work.

3.6 Maintain and restrict

Monitor practice, changes, errors and observations. Apply the source inactivity and review minima; restrict affected work immediately when capability is not supported and require observed reactivation.

4 Decision, interruption and escalation

Unverified competence, a failed essential step or lack of actual task authority prevents independent task performance.

State or event	Action and limit
Evidence valid and criteria met	Record the bounded result and pass it to the authorized receiving function; do not enlarge scope.
Evidence missing, invalid or inconclusive	Keep the dependent conclusion not yet demonstrated / HOLD, preserve the reason and define competent next work.
Valid evidence demonstrates failure	Record nonconformity and protect the affected population; follow actual technical disposition and source status controls.
Trigger genuinely absent	Record the exclusion and its approved responsibility basis. Resource shortages do not justify N/A.
Interrupted or changed work	Preserve prior state and actual configuration; complete impact and revalidation before claiming completion.

5 Required records and receiving checks

Document	Record purpose
AF-FR-9100-003	Competence, Independence and Assignment
AF-FR-9100-010	Personnel Credential and Employer Task Authority
AF-FR-9100-031	Knowledge, Development and Observed Practice

At handover the receiver checks object, scope, current version, original evidence, open conditions, true event chronology and the action they may authorize. An email sent, field marked complete or invoice paid is not acceptance of that handover.

6 Worked case and adverse challenge

Synthetic scenario: A candidate scores 86% knowledge and 92% practical but releases an indeterminate C2 result.

Required reasoning: The essential hold step fails. Preserve the refusal and obtain remediation plus equivalent direct demonstration; do not average the two scores into authorization.

Challenge before local use	Expected behavior
Missing essential input	Dependent conclusion remains held; no favorable default.
Wrong configuration or performer	Detect the mismatch and reassess relevant evidence.
Expired or conflicted authority	Block the prohibited assignment or decision; later renewal cannot validate earlier unauthorized work.

Challenge before local use	Expected behavior
Failed mandatory condition with high total score	No compensation; preserve the failure and required action.
Correction without original history	Reject an apparent closure that erases relevant earlier evidence.

Appendix A — Controlling source and evidence

Source: AF 9100:2026, Aerospace Quality Management System, FIRST EDITION, 29 September 2026; supplied 131-page PDF. Source page references below locate the original publication. These excerpts are read with the complete applicable standard; local implementation sequences do not replace it.

7.2 Competence, qualification and authorization

SOURCE p. 17 | Normative when applicable

7.2(a) Competence requirements shall be defined for roles affecting conformity and assurance, including temporary staff, contractors, reviewers, programmers, inspectors and release personnel. Competence shall be evaluated through suitable education, experience, supervised practice, demonstration or examination appropriate to the task.

7.2(b) Where a license or formal qualification is required, validity and scope shall be verified. Authorization shall identify the specific task, product or process and any limitations. Training attendance alone shall not establish competence. Reassessment shall follow significant technology change, extended inactivity or evidence of deficient performance.

7.2(c) Auditor and assessment-role competence shall meet Annex AB where those functions are performed. Personnel certification shall follow Clause 26 and Annex AE; employer task authorization shall remain specific to actual work. Contractors and temporary personnel shall meet the same relevant competence and authorization controls as employees.

Required evidence: Role competence criteria; assessments; qualifications; task-authorization register; reassessment records.

7.3 Awareness and human-performance conditions

SOURCE p. 18 | Normative when applicable

7.3(a) Personnel shall understand relevant policies, objectives, current instructions, their contribution to product safety and mission outcomes, ethical expectations and the consequences of nonconforming work. Communication shall be adapted to language, literacy, shift patterns and remote working.

7.3(b) The organization shall identify work conditions that increase error, including fatigue, interruption, confusing interfaces, inaccessible tools, time pressure and poor handovers. Controls shall address the system conditions as well as individual skill. Investigations shall not use “operator error” as a sufficient root-cause conclusion.

Required evidence: Awareness evaluation; human-factor assessments; shift handover and error-prevention controls.

26.1 Role analysis and competence criteria

SOURCE p. 46 | Normative when applicable

26.1(a) The responsible organization shall analyze the tasks, decisions, hazards, tools, interfaces and consequences associated with each role. Criteria shall identify required knowledge, practical skill, experience, communication and ethical behavior. Prerequisites shall be relevant to the actual tasks rather than selected solely by title or seniority.

26.1(b) Roles involving technical review, inspection, testing, special processing, maintenance, software release, safety, cybersecurity or conformity decisions shall include the ability to recognize limitations and escalate work beyond personal competence. Auditors and decision makers shall additionally meet Annex AB.

Required evidence: Job/task analysis; role profile; required competences; relevant prerequisites and assessment methods.

26.2 Development and verified competence

SOURCE p. 46 | Normative when applicable

26.2(a) The organization shall address competence gaps through suitable education, training, supervised practice or experience and verify the result. Training attendance, a degree or length of service alone shall not establish current task competence.

26.2(b) Assessment shall use evidence representative of the work, including practical demonstration where performance can affect an assured outcome. A competence assessor shall be qualified for the task and sufficiently independent to avoid approving inadequate performance under delivery pressure.

Required evidence: Gap assessment; development activities; observed demonstration; competent assessor conclusion.

26.3 Personnel certification and fair assessment

SOURCE p. 46 | Normative when applicable

26.3(a) A personnel-certification scheme shall use the role profile, examination and practical-assessment controls in Annex AE. The candidate shall be informed of scope, prerequisites, methods, passing rules, restrictions, conduct expectations and appeal rights before assessment.

26.3(b) Methods shall be fair and accessible without weakening essential competence. Language and accommodations shall be suitable for the work. Unsupported assumptions about personal attributes shall not replace task-relevant evidence. A candidate who fails an essential practical control shall not pass through a high aggregate score.

Required evidence: Published role profile; candidate information; validated assessment; fair-access arrangements; decision rationale.

26.4 Employer task authorization and supervision

SOURCE p. 46 | Normative when applicable

26.4(a) Before independent work, the employer or responsible technical authority shall issue task authorization specifying the person, task, product or process family, location or equipment limits, required supervision and expiry. The authority shall verify competence and any mandatory license for that exact task.

26.4(b) A personnel certificate may support this decision but shall not itself authorize work on every configuration or in every jurisdiction. Work outside the authorized scope shall require supervision by an appropriately authorized person or a new competence and authorization decision.

Required evidence: Task-authorization register; scope and limitations; competence and license checks; supervision arrangements.

26.5 Continued competence and reassessment

SOURCE p. 46 | Normative when applicable

26.5(a) Continued competence shall be reviewed using relevant practice, professional development, changes in technology, observed performance, errors and complaints. Renewal shall require evidence of current ability, not simply a fee or confirmation of employment.

26.5(b) The time limits and inactivity triggers in Annex AE shall apply to the relevant personnel scope. A significant technology change or evidence of unsafe or unreliable performance shall trigger reassessment immediately, even when a certificate or task authorization has not expired.

Required evidence: Practice and development record; performance review; reassessment; renewal and inactivity decisions.

26.6 Restriction, suspension and restoration

SOURCE p. 46 | Normative when applicable

26.6(a) Where confidence in competence or ethical conduct is lost, the organization shall protect affected work, restrict or suspend the relevant authorization and assess prior outputs. Restrictions shall be proportionate to the affected task but shall not conceal a systemic competence deficiency.

26.6(b) Restoration shall require verified corrective development, necessary reassessment and an authorized decision. Appeals shall be available, but a pending appeal shall not automatically remove a protective restriction. Credential status and employer task authorization shall be updated consistently.

Required evidence: Protective action; affected-work review; reassessment; reasoned restoration or withdrawal; status updates.

26.7 Personnel records and responsible use of credentials

SOURCE p. 47 | Normative when applicable

26.7(a) Records shall preserve identity, assessed scope, criteria, methods, results, assessor and decision identities, restrictions, development and status history. Access and retention shall respect legitimate confidentiality and applicable data obligations.

26.7(b) Public verification shall expose only information necessary to confirm the credential and scope. Competence records shall not be altered to imply that a person passed unperformed tests. The holder shall use the credential accurately and report relevant changes under the scheme conditions.

Required evidence: Protected competence dossier; current credential status; accurate claims; controlled access and retention.

AB.1 Role definition and competence domains

SOURCE p. 106 | Normative when applicable

AB.1(a) The provider shall define competence separately for auditor, lead auditor, technical expert, application reviewer, technical reviewer, decision maker and appeal reviewer. Authorization shall state the routes, sectors, methods, criticality limits, languages and any supervision requirements. One role shall not automatically confer the others.

AB.1(b) Required competence shall include interpreting AF requirements and application profiles; process and lifecycle understanding; evidence integrity; sampling; measurement and statistical limitations; configuration and traceability; risk and criticality; human factors; ethics; interview and observation; reporting; finding classification; and recognition of work beyond personal competence.

AB.1(c) Domain-specific competence shall cover the hazards, materials, technologies, operational conditions and approval interfaces relevant to the assignment. For C2 or C3 work, the team shall include a verified technical specialist with relevant recent practice or demonstrated equivalent current competence. Merely adding a specialist's name to the plan shall not satisfy actual participation.

Required evidence: Role competence profiles; sector and method criteria; authorization limits; assigned technical coverage.

AB.2 Knowledge examination and practical evaluation

SOURCE p. 106 | Normative when applicable

AB.2(a) A third-party auditor shall achieve at least 80% in a controlled written examination covering AF interpretation, evidence, scope, findings and decisions, and at least 85% in the practical assessment. Every predefined essential safety, integrity and independence step shall be passed. A high total shall not compensate for falsified evidence, unsupported critical acceptance or failure to escalate an essential hold.

AB.2(b) The practical assessment shall include planning, interviews, observation, sampling, tracing actual or controlled simulated evidence, writing findings and presenting a reasoned conclusion. Competence evaluators shall record observed strengths, deficiencies and authorization limits. Assessment shall be independently reviewed before authorization.

AB.2(c) Assessment questions and case criteria shall be mapped to the competence profile, technically reviewed, secured and periodically evaluated for validity. Reassessment following failure shall use corrected competence and an equivalent controlled assessment, not memorized answers to an unchanged disclosed case.

Required evidence: Examination blueprint; secured questions; scores; essential-step results; practical observations; authorization decision.

AB.3 Experience equivalence and initial assessor development

SOURCE p. 107 | Normative when applicable

AB.3(a) An experience-equivalence route may recognize comparable prior professional audit or technical practice where identity, scope, dates, duration, role and performance are verified. It shall not waive the AF knowledge assessment, witnessed practical demonstration, impartiality or essential competence requirements.

AB.3(b) For the initial development of an AF assessor population, a panel of at least two independent competent professionals shall evaluate each candidate against this annex. Their own relevant technical and assessment competence shall be documented. Reciprocal self-approval, honorary appointments and automatic recognition based on membership shall not be accepted.

AB.3(c) The equivalence record shall identify each criterion satisfied by prior evidence, each remaining gap, the evaluated scope and the reason for the final decision. Unknown or unverifiable audit logs shall not be counted toward the required mentored experience.

Required evidence: Verified experience log; equivalence matrix; independent panel competence; witnessed demonstration; remaining restrictions.

AB.4 Assignment and technical coverage

SOURCE p. 107 | Normative when applicable

AB.4(a) Before each assignment, the provider shall verify role authorization, current competence, sector and criticality coverage, language, methods, physical or remote access and independence. The team shall be able to evaluate each relevant critical process and technical interface; no individual is presumed competent in all sectors covered by this standard.

AB.4(b) A technical expert shall work within a defined assignment and communicate evidence and limitations to the auditor and reviewer. The lead auditor shall integrate the result without overruling a specialist on a technical matter outside the lead auditor's competence. Unresolved disagreement shall be escalated and recorded.

AB.4(c) Classified or otherwise controlled work shall be assigned only to appropriately authorized personnel. Lack of permitted access or competence shall lead to resourcing changes, scope restriction or refusal, not acceptance on the strength of an unsupported management statement.

Required evidence: Assignment review; team coverage matrix; specialist work record; access and conflict checks; disagreement resolution.

AB.5 Impartiality and incompatible activities

SOURCE p. 107 | Normative when applicable

AB.5(a) For third-party evaluation, review and decision, personnel shall not be assigned to a client for which they provided relevant consultancy or held employment within the preceding 24 months. The provider shall also evaluate ownership, financial dependence, family or close relationships and other conflicts that may remain after that period.

AB.5(b) The 24-month rule is not an internal-audit ban on employees. Internal auditors shall instead be independent of the work they evaluate, with suitable reassignment or external support where separation is not feasible. A product release reviewer may be internal, subject to the technical independence required by Annex B.

AB.5(c) An evaluator shall not promise a favorable decision, design the corrective action they will independently certify, accept outcome-linked compensation or suppress evidence at the applicant's request. General explanation of a requirement is permitted; client-specific system design that undermines independence is not.

Required evidence: Conflict declarations; prior-work screening; compensation controls; reassignment decisions; internal independence arrangements.

AB.6 Continuing authorization and observed performance

SOURCE p. 107 | Normative when applicable

AB.6(a) All authorized assessment-role personnel shall complete at least 16 hours of relevant continuing professional development in each 12-month period. Independent auditors shall additionally perform at least four auditor-days across at least two assignments in that period. A lead auditor shall lead at least two complete assignments in each 24-month period.

AB.6(b) Reviewers and decision makers shall complete at least three substantive file reviews or decisions in each 12-month period. Technical experts shall demonstrate current relevant practice and review changes affecting their technical scope. Providers shall assess performance using witnessed work, report quality, decisions, complaints and recurrence of errors.

AB.6(c) An independent auditor shall undergo a witnessed performance review at least once every 24 months. More frequent observation shall be required for a new sector, C2/C3 expansion, significant adverse evidence or deficient performance. Training hours shall not substitute for the required observed competence.

Required evidence: Development and activity logs; witnessed reviews; report-quality checks; ongoing role authorizations.

AB.7 Inactivity, restriction and reactivation

SOURCE p. 107 | Normative when applicable

AB.7(a) When the applicable activity minimum is not met, independent authorization for that role shall be suspended until a competence review and supervised reactivation demonstrate current capability. After more than 12 months without relevant audit practice, an auditor shall complete updated AF learning and a satisfactory witnessed assignment before independent work resumes.

AB.7(b) A serious competence or integrity concern shall trigger immediate assessment of the authorization and earlier affected work. Reinstatement shall require evidence proportionate to the cause, including reassessment where necessary. The original authorization expiry shall not be extended merely by restoration.

AB.7(c) Changes to the standard, sector technology, methods or legal access shall trigger targeted updates. An assessor shall decline tasks outside their authorization and request appropriate technical support. Automated tools may support work but shall not replace the accountable human evaluator or decision maker.

Required evidence: Restriction and inactivity records; reactivation plan; witnessed results; prior-work assessment; restored scope.

AB.8 Competence dossier and approval record

SOURCE p. 108 | Normative when applicable

AB.8(a) The provider shall retain the role profile, verified experience, training, examination and practical results, mentored assignments, competence decisions, technical scope, witnessed performance, development, conflicts and status history. The record shall identify who evaluated, reviewed and authorized each role.

AB.8(b) Certificates or authorization letters shall disclose limitations and shall not imply that a person can audit every AF sector. Evidence of technical competence may be confidential, but the provider shall retain sufficient authorized access to substantiate assignments and respond to complaints.

Required evidence: Complete competence dossier; role and scope register; approval identity; current and historical restrictions.

AE.1 Job and task profile

SOURCE p. 115 | Normative when applicable

AE.1(a) The scheme operator shall approve a job/task profile defining role purpose, tasks, decisions, hazards, technical knowledge, practical skills, ethical behavior, communication, relevant prerequisites, equipment and permitted scope. The analysis shall involve persons competent in the actual work and be reviewed when technology or responsibility changes.

AE.1(b) Profiles may cover engineers, technicians, inspectors, test personnel, special-process operators, maintainers, digital specialists and assurance professionals. A profile shall not certify a protected or licensed professional activity beyond the operator's lawful authority. Auditors and assessment-role personnel shall additionally meet Annex AB.

AE.1(c) The profile shall identify essential practical steps whose failure would compromise safety, evidence integrity or the validity of the technical conclusion. These steps shall be designated before examination and shall not be removed after a candidate fails them.

Required evidence: Approved job/task analysis; competence profile; technical and legal boundaries; essential-step list.

AE.2 Eligibility, identity and candidate information

SOURCE p. 115 | Normative when applicable

AE.2(a) The operator shall verify identity, prerequisites and relevant experience through traceable evidence. The candidate shall receive the profile, methods, passing rules, fees, expected conduct, renewal duties, permitted claims and appeal process before enrollment.

AE.2(b) Eligibility requirements shall be related to competence. Reasonable accommodations shall preserve the competence being assessed and any essential task conditions. Medical or physical criteria shall be required only where law or a justified task need makes them necessary, with confidential handling of the relevant information.

AE.2(c) A supplier of training shall not guarantee certification. The candidate shall not be required to buy a particular course where equivalent verified preparation meets the profile, unless a specific training element is itself technically necessary and transparently justified.

Required evidence: Identity and eligibility verification; candidate information; fair-access review; justified prerequisites.

AE.3 Assessment blueprint and validity

SOURCE p. 115 | Normative when applicable

AE.3(a) The blueprint shall map every required competence to a suitable examination, interview, practical task or verified experience method. Critical practical skills shall be demonstrated, not assessed solely through multiple-choice answers. Technical reviewers shall confirm content validity and representative task coverage.

AE.3(b) Written examinations shall contain at least 40 scored items or an equivalently rigorous, independently approved constructed-response assessment. Item difficulty, scoring consistency, security and relevance shall be reviewed using performance evidence. An examination shall not be considered valid solely because its total scores

are statistically consistent.

AE.3(c) The practical assessment shall use representative equipment, conditions and anomalies within a safe controlled environment. Simulation may be used where it validly demonstrates the skill; the profile shall state limitations and any supervised workplace demonstration still required.

Required evidence: Blueprint; controlled examination; item and scoring review; practical task design; simulation validity.

AE.4 Passing rules and essential practical controls

SOURCE p. 116 | Normative when applicable

AE.4(a) A PER candidate shall achieve at least 80% in the knowledge assessment and at least 85% in the practical assessment, and shall pass every essential practical step. The profile may set more demanding requirements where justified. Scores for separate mandatory components shall not be averaged to offset a failed component.

AE.4(b) A candidate who falsifies material evidence, bypasses an essential safety control or approves a result known to lack required evidence shall fail the affected assessment and undergo an integrity or competence review. The assessment shall be stopped where continuation creates an unacceptable hazard.

AE.4(c) Scoring rubrics shall define observable behavior and tolerances before examination. Borderline cases shall receive an independent review of the actual evidence, not a discretionary pass based on fees, reputation, seniority or workforce shortage.

Required evidence: Component scores; all essential-step results; independent borderline review; reasoned pass or fail.

AE.5 Examiner competence, independence and security

SOURCE p. 116 | Normative when applicable

AE.5(a) Examiners shall demonstrate the technical competence and assessment skill required by the profile. They shall use controlled criteria and record actual observations. A trainer may contribute technical evidence but shall not be the sole practical examiner, reviewer and decision maker for their own candidate or cohort.

AE.5(b) Independent personnel decisions shall be made by a competent person who did not perform the candidate's examination. Conflicts, coaching during assessment, answer disclosure and unauthorized assistance shall be controlled. Identity checks, secure question handling and attributable scoring shall apply to remote and on-site examinations.

AE.5(c) Automated scoring shall be validated for the stated questions and rules. AI-generated assessments, translations or scoring recommendations shall receive competent review. No automated model shall be the sole authority for a competence decision involving an essential practical skill.

Required evidence: Examiner competence; independent decision; secure examination records; conflict and scoring validation.

AE.6 Failure, remediation and reassessment

SOURCE p. 116 | Normative when applicable

AE.6(a) The candidate shall receive an understandable outcome and the competence areas needing improvement, without compromising secured examination content. A remediation plan shall address the demonstrated deficiency before reassessment. Repeat assessment shall use equivalent difficulty and representative tasks.

AE.6(b) A failed essential practical step shall be reassessed through direct demonstration; passing an unrelated written test shall not close that deficiency. All earlier attempts shall remain traceable. Administrative re-registration shall not erase an integrity investigation or an existing protective restriction.

AE.6(c) The operator shall define fair reassessment access and controls against repeated guessing. A fixed waiting period is not substituted for evidence of improved competence. Where additional supervised experience is necessary, the required activities and completion evidence shall be specified.

Required evidence: Candidate feedback; remediation evidence; equivalent reassessment; preserved attempt history.

AE.7 Credential scope and employer authorization

SOURCE p. 116 | Normative when applicable

AE.7(a) A personnel credential shall state identity, unique ID, profile and revision, assessed role and technical scope, limitations, decision date, expiry, issuer and verification method. Its maximum ongoing validity shall be 24 months under Annex AG, subject to continued competence and truthful use.

AE.7(b) Employer task authorization shall separately identify the actual task, product or process, site or equipment, competence basis, supervision and validity. Its review interval shall not exceed 12 months and shall be shortened where risk warrants. A credential alone shall not confer employer release authority or required statutory privileges.

AE.7(c) Where the employer changes, the credential may remain valid within its assessed scope, but the new employer shall verify task suitability and issue its own authorization. Significant changes to tools, technical data or task hazards shall trigger review before independent work.

Required evidence: Credential; employer task authorization; role and scope limits; change and transfer verification.

AE.8 Continued practice, inactivity and renewal

SOURCE p. 116 | Normative when applicable

AE.8(a) The credential holder shall complete at least 16 hours of relevant continuing development in each 12-month period and maintain evidence of relevant practice. The profile shall define the minimum practical frequency or supervised demonstration necessary for that role. The operator shall assess actual competence, not training hours alone.

AE.8(b) For C2/C3 tasks, more than six months without relevant practice shall require an observed competence demonstration before independent task authorization resumes. For C0/C1 tasks, the corresponding trigger is more than 12 months. Earlier reassessment shall follow significant change or adverse evidence. Auditor activity rules in Annex AB also apply; the stricter triggered requirement controls.

AE.8(c) Renewal shall review current scope, practice, development, conduct, complaints, changes and performance. It shall include a practical demonstration of essential skills within the preceding six months and a knowledge update covering material changes. New or expanded scope shall receive the necessary initial assessment rather than automatic renewal.

AE.8(d) The operator shall complete PER continuing-scope surveillance at the interval in Annex AG applicable to the assessed role criticality. Surveillance may use verified practice, development and observed performance as specified in the profile; renewal still requires the practical and knowledge evidence stated above.

Required evidence: Practice and development log; inactivity decision; observed essential-skill demonstration; knowledge update; renewal decision.

AE.9 Restriction, records and public verification

SOURCE p. 117 | Normative when applicable

AE.9(a) A competence or integrity concern shall trigger protection of affected work, investigation and a reasoned restriction, suspension or withdrawal decision. Restoration shall require correction and reassessment proportionate to the cause. Employer authorizations and personnel credential status shall be reviewed separately and communicated to authorized recipients.

AE.9(b) Records shall preserve eligibility, examination and practical evidence, scores, attempts, decisions, development and status history. Personal data shall be minimized and protected. Public verification shall disclose only credential identity, scope, issuer, validity and relevant status, not examination answers or sensitive personal records.

Required evidence: Protected dossier; restriction and restoration evidence; current status; permitted verification information.

AE.10 Completed illustrative personnel case

SOURCE p. 117 | Definition, explanation or informative example; no new universal limit

AE.10(a) Candidate PER-EX-017 is assessed for a defined dimensional-inspection role. The knowledge score is 86%, the practical score is 92%, but the candidate releases a C2 item after a result is indeterminate under the pre-agreed rule. "Hold an unresolved critical acceptance result" was an essential practical step. The decision is refusal of the requested credential despite the high aggregate scores.

AE.10(b) After supervised remediation, an equivalent practical assessment demonstrates correct holding, escalation, uncertainty interpretation and traceable reporting. An independent reviewer verifies all required components and the decision maker grants only the assessed inspection scope. The employer must still issue the actual task authorization. These are fictional case records, not credentials issued to a real person.

Source tables — complete field and decision payloads

Table AB-1 — Minimum entry evidence for assessment roles

Source p. 106 | Required structure when applicable

Role	AF entry and demonstration requirements	Authorization limitation
Internal auditor	Task-relevant experience; at least 16 hours of AF/process-audit learning; one complete witnessed internal audit; satisfactory evidence-based reporting.	May audit internally within demonstrated competence; shall not independently audit their own work.
Third-party auditor	At least three years of relevant professional experience, including two years in quality, assurance or the intended technical domain; at least 40 hours of AF audit training; knowledge and practical assessment under AB.2; four mentored complete audits totaling at least 20 auditor-days.	Independent assignments only after witnessed approval and defined route/sector authorization.
Lead auditor	Qualified third-party auditor; additionally three complete audits led under supervision totaling at least 10 auditor-days; demonstrated planning, team direction, conflict handling and integrated reporting.	May lead only within authorized scope; technical gaps require participating specialists.
Technical expert	At least three years of relevant technical practice, normally including two years within the preceding five; verified task demonstration and sufficient AF scheme orientation.	Provides technical conclusions; not automatically an auditor or independent decision maker.
Technical reviewer	Demonstrated AF interpretation and evidence-review competence; technical coverage for the assigned scope; five satisfactorily mentored complete file reviews.	Shall not independently review an evaluation they performed. May combine review and decision if separately authorized.
Decision maker	Verified knowledge of routes, scope, decision rules, impartiality, status and appeals; five satisfactorily mentored complete conformity decisions; access to required technical expertise.	Shall not have performed the evaluation being decided or supplied the relevant consultancy.
Application / appeal reviewer	Demonstrated competence for scope determination and resource review / fair case analysis, AF requirements and independence; observed satisfactory performance.	Appeal reviewer shall be independent of the original evaluation and decision.

Table AE-1 — Illustrative profile blueprint — weights are not universal technical criteria

Source p. 115 | Illustrative or explanatory source table

Competence group	Illustrative knowledge weight	Practical evidence to define in the actual profile
AF scope and work controls	20%	Identify the applicable instruction, current revision, task boundary and authorization.
Role-specific technical competence	30%	Perform the actual task and interpret representative results within the role.

Competence group	Illustrative knowledge weight	Practical evidence to define in the actual profile
Safety and critical limits	20%	Recognize a critical condition, protect the work and escalate appropriately.
Evidence and configuration	15%	Preserve identity, record actual results and trace the configuration.
Ethics and impartial conduct	10%	Refuse falsification or an unsupported approval; disclose conflicts.
Learning and corrective response	5%	Analyze an error, apply correction and recognize the need for reassessment.

Appendix B — Local implementation and release

Readiness condition	Evidence before consequential use
Authority and responsibility	Actual legal operator, owner, competent technical authority, independent reviewer and permitted result class are recorded.
Scope and criteria	Object, configuration, site, period, trigger, every technical value or observable attribute, units and prospective approval are complete.
Evidence and methods	Original accessible evidence, representative observations, valid methods, uncertainty, adverse cases and limitations support the intended conclusion.
People and independence	Competence is current for each task; genuine conflicts, relevant prior work and needed separation have been checked.
Records and tools	Field meanings, unique IDs, original history, access, retention, recovery and actual deployed workflows have passed local validation.
Decision and public use	All relevant blockers are resolved; required independent decision and written permissions precede the exact public claim.
Continuity and handover	Receiving custody, unresolved duties, corrections and historical decisions survive transfer, retirement or provider closure.

Record the completed local readiness and actual authorization in AF-FR-9100-032 or an equivalent controlled record. Preserve the unchanged source standard and each earlier decision basis. A blocked activity may continue only within a genuinely permitted development boundary, not as a provisional conformity certificate.