

REEDLEYS · MASTER STANDARD

Recognition Standards

The evidence-based framework behind every Reedleys rating, for organizations and individual professionals.

1.0
VERSION

Jul 28, 2026
EFFECTIVE

AAA - D
RATING SCALE

2 × 15
CRITERIA

A Reedleys rating is an independent recognition rating. It is not a credit rating, government accreditation, professional license, or guarantee of future performance. Recognition confirms that an assessment was completed and a result published.

What's inside

Ten sections define what Reedleys examines, what evidence is accepted, and how a result is recorded for every criterion.

1

Purpose & System

How the recognition framework is structured

2

The Rating Scale

15 levels from AAA to D

3

Assessment Principles

Ten principles that govern every review

4

Evidence & Verification

What may be submitted and how it is checked

5

Assessment Outcomes

Meets, Partially, Does Not, Not Applicable

6

Standards & Ratings

How criteria connect to the final rating

7

Organization Standard

15 criteria across three levels

8

Professional Standard

15 criteria across three levels

9

Reassessment & Records

Updates, status, and record keeping

10

Definitions

Key terms used across the standard

One system, three moving parts

A transparent, repeatable framework for reviewing organizations and individual professionals. Requirements are applied proportionately to size, industry, and career stage.

ONE SHARED SCALE

**AAA**

HIGHEST

D

LOWEST

The same AAA to D scale applies to both profile types. Each rating carries a consistent meaning.

TWO APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- **Organizations**
Organization Recognition Standard

- **Professionals**
Professional Recognition Standard

Recognized status confirms that the applicable assessment was completed and a result published.

THREE LEVELS EACH

L1 Foundation Identity, accuracy, transparency

L2 Established Service clarity, reputation, resolution

L3 Advanced Authorization, stability, maturity

Fifteen levels of recognition

The published rating reflects the quality, completeness, consistency, relevance, and credibility of evidence across applicable criteria. Recognition is not limited to high ratings, a lower rating transparently records a weaker result.

- Top
- Strong
- Good
- Developing
- Improvement
- Limited

AAA Superior	AA+ Exceptional
AA Excellent	A+ Very Strong
A Strong	BBB+ Very Good
BBB Good	BB+ Satisfactory
BB Developing	B+ Improvement Needed
B Below Expectations	CCC Marginal
CC Limited	C Very Limited
D Unsatisfactory	

Ten principles behind every review

**Relevance**

Evidence must relate directly to the applicant, profile type, and the period reviewed.

**Verifiability**

Evidence should be confirmable through an issuer, official source, or secure system.

**Currentness**

Time-sensitive information must be current, history may explain continuity or remediation.

**Consistency**

Claims, records, and public information should carry no unexplained contradictions.

**Proportionality**

Depth of evidence is adjusted to size, profession, jurisdiction, risk, and career stage.

**Applicability**

Not Applicable is used only when a criterion genuinely does not relate, Reedleys decides.

**Opportunity to clarify**

Applicants may explain discrepancies or add information before the outcome is finalized.

**Privacy & minimization**

Only information reasonably necessary is requested, sensitive detail may be redacted.

**Independence**

Fees pay for access to assessment and plan features, not for a rating or outcome.

**No unsupported inference**

Rumor, anonymous allegation, or isolated snippets are not treated as established fact.

Uploaded is not the same as accepted

Applications are completed online. Reedleys weighs source, authenticity, ownership, date, scope, relevance, completeness, consistency, and whether an item can be independently verified.



What may be used

Applicant evidence, secure identity or domain verification, official and public records, issuer verification, controlled sites and profiles, and platform records.



How it is judged

An item is not accepted merely because it is uploaded. Reedleys may request more where evidence is unclear, incomplete, outdated, or cannot be connected to the applicant.



Redaction & translation

Applicants may redact unnecessary personal detail while leaving identity, issuer, date, and status visible. Certified translation may be required for high-impact evidence.

Four outcomes per criterion



Meets

The requirement is satisfied by evidence that is relevant, sufficiently complete, current where necessary, consistent, and reasonably verifiable.



Partially Meets

Meaningful alignment, but evidence is incomplete, limited, outdated, inconsistently applied, or affected by a non-material issue.



Does Not Meet

The requirement is absent, materially incomplete, misleading, contradicted, unverifiable, or affected by a significant unresolved issue.



Not Applicable

The criterion genuinely does not apply. Reedleys must approve this, and it must not be used to avoid a relevant requirement.

Partially Meets is not automatically a failure - it records that credible evidence exists but the criterion is not fully satisfied. **Not Applicable is neutral** and is excluded or adjusted within the model, it is never treated as Meets.

Ratings are not a checkbox count

The rating weighs the importance of each criterion, the number that apply, the quality and credibility of evidence, consistency across the application, and the seriousness of any weakness.



Foundation carries weight

Foundation Standards matter most, they establish identity, profile accuracy, transparency, and essential customer information. Established and Advanced Standards distinguish stronger systems, reliability, authorization, and maturity.



Higher ratings need breadth

Higher ratings require broad alignment, strong evidence, and no material contradiction. A significant identity, authorization, deception, safety, or integrity issue can reduce the rating even where other criteria are met.

The exact model may include weighting, caps, quality review, and consistency controls. Reedleys keeps internal scoring guidance to protect integrity, but the public meaning of each criterion and outcome stays consistent with this document.

SECTION 7 · STANDARD A

Organization Recognition Standard

Applies to companies, partnerships, registered organizations, sole proprietorships operating as businesses, non-profits, agencies, and local service providers. It evaluates transparency, public information, service clarity, authorization, reputation, standing, and quality maturity.

LEVEL 1

Foundation

Identity, accurate public information, profile completeness, digital presence, and core customer policies.

Criteria 01 - 05

LEVEL 2

Established

Service clarity, supporting experience, reputation, communication, and resolution capability.

Criteria 06 - 10

LEVEL 3

Advanced

Authorization, reliability, standing, stability, development, quality control, and maturity.

Criteria 11 - 15

Explore each criterion

Select any criterion to see its requirement, what Reedleys reviews, accepted and not-accepted evidence, and the four assessment outcomes.

01. Verified Ownership & Legal Identity

The organization must be a genuine operating entity or recognized business form, and the applicant must demonstrate authority to create, claim, or manage its Reedleys profile. The legal or registered identity must be connected to any public trading name used on the profile.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Legal or registered name, entity type, registration number, and current operating status where registration applies.
- The relationship between the registered entity, any trading name, and the name displayed publicly.
- The applicant's authority as an owner, officer, director, authorized employee, or appointed representative.
- Consistency between registry information, domain ownership, business email, website, and submitted profile details.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Government or official registry record, certificate of incorporation, organization filing, business license, or equivalent public registration.
- ✓ DBA, assumed-name, or trading-name filing that links the public brand to the legal entity.
- ✓ Officer, director, ownership, or authorized-representative record; signed authorization from a verifiable company officer.
- ✓ Domain verification, email at the organization's domain, or another secure ownership-control method used by Reedleys.
- ✓ For business forms not required to register, other credible evidence showing genuine operation and control, reviewed proportionately.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ A self-written statement without independent or technical support.
- ✗ Unverifiable screenshots, cropped records, or documents with the source, entity name, status, or date removed.
- ✗ Expired, dissolved, revoked, or inactive records presented as current without a clear explanation.
- ✗ Control of an unrelated social media page, generic email address, or third-party directory listing alone.
- ✗ An application submitted by a person who cannot demonstrate authority to represent the organization.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

The organization's identity is verifiable, the public name is properly connected to it, and the applicant's authority is established.

Partially Meets

The entity is verifiable, but the trading-name connection or applicant authority is incomplete, indirect, or requires clarification.

Does Not Meet

The organization's existence or the applicant's authority cannot be verified, or material identity information is contradictory or misleading.

Not Applicable

Not normally available. Every organization must establish a genuine identity and authorized profile control.

02. Accurate Business Information

Core business information displayed on Reedleys must be current, materially complete, and consistent with reliable public or applicant-provided sources. The organization must not present a virtual, temporary, or service-area arrangement in a misleading way.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Business name, address or service area, telephone number, email, website, operating status, and principal location.
- Business category, services offered, opening hours, geographic coverage, and number of locations where stated.
- Consistency across the Reedleys profile, official website, public registry, maps, and other reliable public sources.
- Whether any address, contact point, or location description could create a false impression of a staffed office or physical presence.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Current official website and controlled business contact channels.
- ✓ Official registry, licensing, tax, or government business records where relevant and lawfully available.
- ✓ Lease, utility, insurance, invoice, or other operational record, with unnecessary sensitive information redacted.
- ✓ Verified map profile, location page, service-area statement, or other controlled public listing.
- ✓ Written explanation and supporting evidence for recent moves, rebranding, mergers, or other legitimate discrepancies.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Inactive telephone numbers, undeliverable email addresses, or websites unrelated to the applicant.
- ✗ An unstaffed mailbox, registered-agent address, or virtual office represented as a full operating location without disclosure.
- ✗ Conflicting names, addresses, categories, or operating-status claims left unexplained.
- ✗ Copied directory information that the organization does not control and cannot confirm.
- ✗ Keyword-stuffed locations or services not genuinely offered.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Core information is current, consistent, sufficiently complete, and supported by reliable sources.

Partially Meets

Most information is accurate, but minor gaps, stale details, or non-material inconsistencies remain.

Does Not Meet

Material business information is missing, outdated, unverifiable, contradictory, or likely to mislead profile visitors.

Not Applicable

Not normally available for core identity and contact fields; individual subfields may be not applicable to the business model.

03. Complete Business Profile

The public profile must provide enough clear information for a reasonable visitor to understand what the organization does, where it operates, how to contact it, and what principal services or products it offers.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Business summary, category selection, service or product descriptions, contact methods, service area, and availability information.
- Whether descriptions are specific, understandable, and appropriate to the organization's actual activities.
- Use of images, portfolio items, highlights, and other profile fields where they materially help users understand the organization.
- Whether important limitations, eligibility rules, or operating conditions are disclosed.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ A completed Reedleys profile with specific, internally consistent information.
- ✓ Official website service pages, brochures, catalogs, menus, rate sheets, or controlled marketplace profiles.
- ✓ Current photographs, portfolio materials, case summaries, or organization-produced explanatory materials.
- ✓ Information supplied through the Reedleys application and confirmed by the applicant.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Placeholder text, empty required fields, or a profile consisting only of a name and contact link.
- ✗ Generic descriptions that could apply to any organization and do not explain the actual offering.
- ✗ Unsupported superlatives, guarantees, or comparative claims presented as facts.
- ✗ Copied content that misrepresents another organization's services, history, or achievements.
- ✗ Categories or services selected solely to appear in unrelated searches.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

The profile is complete, specific, understandable, and gives users the information reasonably needed to evaluate the organization.

Partially Meets

The profile is usable but lacks some non-critical detail, supporting context, or clarity.

Does Not Meet

The profile is materially incomplete, vague, misleading, or does not accurately describe the organization's activities.

Not Applicable

Not normally available. A complete public profile is a core part of Reedleys Recognition.

04. Public Digital Presence

The organization must maintain at least one accessible, controlled digital presence that enables the public to confirm its identity, contact information, and principal activities. Any website claimed as official must be operational and clearly connected to the organization.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Official website, verified business profile, controlled marketplace profile, or comparable public digital presence.
- Domain control, security and accessibility, working navigation, contact details, and clear ownership or brand connection.
- Consistency of identity, services, location, and contact information across controlled channels.
- Whether the digital presence is maintained, functional on common devices, and free from obvious deceptive or unsafe behavior.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ An operational official website with organization identity, service information, and contact details.
- ✓ A verified and controlled business profile on a reputable platform when a standalone website is not reasonably necessary.
- ✓ Domain-control verification, DNS record, business email, platform ownership verification, or administrative access confirmation.
- ✓ Current public social or marketplace profiles that clearly identify the organization and support its stated activity.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Parked, expired, malware-flagged, inaccessible, or permanently unfinished websites.
- ✗ An unclaimed directory entry or social page that the organization cannot control.
- ✗ A domain that redirects to an unrelated organization or contains materially different identity information.
- ✗ Private-only profiles that cannot be reasonably reviewed by the public or Reedleys.
- ✗ Fabricated engagement, copied websites, or deceptive pages designed primarily to imitate another organization.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

An accessible and controlled public digital presence clearly confirms the organization and its activities.

Partially Meets

A genuine digital presence exists, but it has limited information, maintenance issues, or minor inconsistencies.

Does Not Meet

No credible controlled public presence can be confirmed, or the claimed presence is inactive, unsafe, unrelated, or misleading.

Not Applicable

Available only in exceptional cases where public digital presence is genuinely inappropriate; Reedleys must approve the exception.

05. Core Customer Policies

The organization must make applicable customer-facing policies available before or at the point a customer commits to a purchase or service. Policies must identify the organization and explain relevant privacy, payment, cancellation, refund, return, delivery, complaint, or service terms.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Which policies are relevant to the organization's products, services, sales channel, and jurisdiction.
- Accessibility, clarity, organization identity, effective date, contact route, and consistency between policies.
- Whether the policy language matches actual checkout, booking, quotation, or service practices.
- Whether material customer rights, restrictions, fees, deadlines, and exclusions are stated clearly.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Published website policy pages, booking terms, checkout terms, customer agreements, service contracts, or order documentation.
- ✓ Privacy, cancellation, refund, return, delivery, complaint, warranty, or service policies tailored to the organization.
- ✓ Platform-hosted terms where the organization sells through a third-party marketplace and the applicable terms are clear.
- ✓ Internal policy material when it is also communicated to customers through an appropriate channel.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Generic template text containing another organization's name, wrong jurisdiction, or inapplicable terms.
- ✗ Policies hidden after purchase or available only when specifically requested, where advance disclosure is reasonably expected.
- ✗ Contradictory refund, cancellation, pricing, or privacy statements across different channels.
- ✗ Policies that reserve unlimited discretion while omitting material customer conditions.
- ✗ A claim that no policies are needed when the business model clearly creates customer obligations or handles personal data.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

All material policies applicable to the business model are clear, accessible, consistent, and connected to actual customer practices.

Partially Meets

Most applicable policies are available, but one or more contain limited detail, accessibility issues, or minor inconsistencies.

Does Not Meet

Material policies are absent, misleading, contradictory, copied without adaptation, or not made available at an appropriate time.

Not Applicable

Individual policy types may be not applicable when the related activity does not occur; the criterion as a whole is rarely not applicable.

06. Clear Service Information

Services or products must be described accurately enough for a potential customer to understand the scope, intended outcome, main limitations, delivery method, and any important eligibility or geographic conditions.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Service names, descriptions, deliverables, exclusions, location or delivery method, and expected customer responsibilities.
- Consistency between the Reedleys profile, website, advertisements, quotations, and customer terms.
- Whether regulated, specialized, or outcome-based services are presented with appropriate limits and without unsupported guarantees.
- Whether material differences between packages, plans, products, or service levels are explained.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Official service pages, catalogs, menus, product pages, proposal templates, scope-of-work documents, or public profile descriptions.
- ✓ Written service specifications, package comparisons, eligibility guidance, or customer onboarding material.
- ✓ Examples, portfolio items, or case summaries that accurately illustrate the stated scope.
- ✓ Clear disclosures explaining exclusions, dependencies, or limits on results.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Vague labels with no explanation of what is included.
- ✗ Claims of guaranteed results where the outcome depends on external factors or cannot reasonably be guaranteed.
- ✗ Hidden material exclusions or conditions revealed only after commitment.
- ✗ Services listed outside the organization's actual competence, authorization, geographic reach, or operating capacity.
- ✗ Inconsistent descriptions that materially change the customer's likely understanding.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Service information is specific, accurate, consistent, and discloses material scope and limitations.

Partially Meets

The main offering is understandable, but some deliverables, exclusions, conditions, or distinctions require greater clarity.

Does Not Meet

Service information is materially vague, misleading, inconsistent, or unsupported.

Not Applicable

Not applicable only where the organization has no customer-facing product or service offering; Reedleys must confirm.

07. Transparent Pricing or Quote Process

The organization must publish prices where practical or explain clearly how prices, estimates, fees, subscriptions, or quotations are calculated and communicated before a customer becomes committed.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Published prices, starting prices, ranges, mandatory fees, taxes, deposits, recurring charges, and cancellation costs where relevant.
- Quotation steps, information required from the customer, validity period, approval process, and handling of changes or additional work.
- Consistency between advertising, website, checkout, invoice, contract, and actual quoted terms.
- Whether optional and mandatory costs are distinguished and material conditions are visible.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Public price list, menu, rate card, checkout page, subscription table, or product catalog.
- ✓ Written quotation policy, estimate template, proposal, pricing calculator, or documented quote workflow.
- ✓ Sample invoices or completed quotations with personal and commercially sensitive details redacted.
- ✓ Clear disclosure that pricing is custom, together with the factors used and the process for obtaining a binding quote.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Advertising a price that is not reasonably available or omits unavoidable charges.
- ✗ Unexplained fees added after the customer has accepted the service.
- ✗ Price information that conflicts materially across public channels.
- ✗ A statement that all pricing is confidential without any explanation of the quotation process.
- ✗ Expired promotions or misleading “from” prices used as the normal expected price.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Pricing or the quotation process is clear, timely, consistent, and discloses material fees and conditions.

Partially Meets

The pricing approach is genuine but has limited detail, minor inconsistencies, or incomplete fee disclosure.

Does Not Meet

Pricing is materially opaque, misleading, contradictory, or likely to create unexpected obligations.

Not Applicable

Not applicable only where no payment, fee, or commercial quotation is involved.

08. Customer Communication Standards

The organization must provide accessible communication channels and use reasonable, professional practices for enquiries, updates, changes, delays, and customer support.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Published contact methods, expected response times where stated, availability, escalation routes, and communication ownership.
- How the organization confirms bookings, orders, quotations, material changes, delays, or cancellations.
- Clarity, professionalism, accessibility, and consistency of customer communications.
- Evidence of processes for protecting personal information and keeping appropriate communication records.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Published contact and support information, service-level commitments, help-center content, or customer communication policy.
- ✓ Email or message templates, ticketing workflow, booking confirmations, status updates, or escalation procedures.
- ✓ Redacted examples demonstrating timely and professional communication.
- ✓ Training material or internal guidance used by customer-facing staff.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Contact channels that are inactive, unmonitored, or regularly fail without an alternative.
- ✗ Claims of response times that are not supported by the organization's process or available evidence.
- ✗ Abusive, discriminatory, threatening, or deceptive customer communication.
- ✗ Unexplained material changes communicated only after they take effect.
- ✗ Publishing private customer information or using communications in a way inconsistent with stated privacy practices.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Communication channels and processes are accessible, professional, timely, and appropriate to the organization's operating model.

Partially Meets

Basic communication is available, but response expectations, updates, escalation, or recordkeeping are inconsistently defined.

Does Not Meet

Communication is materially inaccessible, unreliable, misleading, unprofessional, or unsupported by a credible process.

Not Applicable

Not normally available for customer-facing organizations; limited sub-elements may be not applicable.

09. Complaint & Resolution Process

Customers must have a reasonable way to raise a complaint, service problem, or dispute, and the organization must have a documented method for acknowledging, reviewing, responding to, and closing the matter.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Complaint channels, response ownership, target times, escalation, decision-making, remedies, and closure records.
- Whether the process is proportionate to the organization's size, risk, and customer volume.
- Consistency between public policy and actual handling practices.
- How recurring issues are identified and used to improve service.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Published complaint policy, service-resolution procedure, escalation map, or customer support workflow.
- ✓ Ticketing or case-management records, with personal information redacted.
- ✓ Redacted examples showing acknowledgement, investigation, response, remedy, and closure.
- ✓ Internal logs, root-cause reviews, refund or remediation records, and management oversight evidence.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ No accessible route for complaints or a requirement that customers communicate only through public reviews.
- ✗ Automatic rejection of complaints without review.
- ✗ Policies that prevent reasonable escalation or impose undisclosed barriers.
- ✗ Fabricated resolution records, selective examples that omit known material issues, or altered correspondence.
- ✗ Retaliation against customers for making a good-faith complaint.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

A clear, proportionate process exists and evidence shows complaints can be acknowledged, reviewed, resolved, and learned from.

Partially Meets

A process exists but lacks detail, consistent records, escalation, target times, or evidence of systematic use.

Does Not Meet

No credible process exists, or complaints are handled in a materially unfair, inaccessible, deceptive, or retaliatory way.

Not Applicable

Not applicable only where the organization has no external customers or service users; Reedleys must confirm.

10. Public Reputation & Review Integrity

The organization's public reputation must be assessed using a balanced review of available feedback, and any reviews displayed or solicited by the organization must be handled without fabrication, undisclosed manipulation, or suppression of legitimate criticism.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Public review patterns, volume, recency, consistency, rating distribution, and material recurring themes.
- Organization responses to positive and negative feedback and evidence of issue resolution.
- Whether testimonials, ratings, endorsements, and review invitations appear genuine and appropriately disclosed.
- Relevant public mentions, consumer warnings, professional records, or substantiated complaints, interpreted in context.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Public reviews from identifiable platforms, direct customer feedback records, and verified Reedleys reviews.
- ✓ Redacted complaint and resolution evidence connected to recurring public concerns.
- ✓ Review-invitation policy, testimonial consent, moderation rules, or third-party review management records.
- ✓ Context explaining unusual events, legacy ownership, impersonation, review bombing, or verified corrective action.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Purchased, fabricated, self-posted, or undisclosed incentivized reviews.
- ✗ Review gating that selectively invites only satisfied customers while suppressing others.
- ✗ Threats, retaliation, false legal claims, or disclosure of private information in response to criticism.
- ✗ Misrepresenting reviews from another entity, location, or prior owner as current evidence.
- ✗ Deleting or concealing material negative feedback from submitted evidence without explanation.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Available reputation evidence is broadly consistent, review practices appear genuine, and material concerns are addressed responsibly.

Partially Meets

Reputation is mixed or limited, but the organization demonstrates credible review practices and some evidence of responsible response.

Does Not Meet

Material patterns of unresolved concerns, deceptive review practices, fabricated feedback, or serious unexplained inconsistencies are identified.

Not Applicable

Available only when insufficient public or direct feedback exists to support a fair assessment; lack of reviews is not automatically negative.

11. Licenses, Registrations & Insurance

Where the organization's activity requires or publicly claims a license, registration, permit, certification, bond, or insurance coverage, the relevant credential must be current, connected to the correct entity, and appropriate to the work offered.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Regulatory or professional license, permit, registration, insurance, bond, or certification requirements relevant to the stated activity and location.
- Credential holder, number, scope, status, issue and expiration dates, restrictions, and public verification where available.
- Consistency between the credential and the services, locations, personnel, or claims displayed.
- Whether customers are told about material limits or exclusions when appropriate.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Official registry record, regulator verification page, current license or permit, insurance certificate, bond, or accreditation/certification record.
- ✓ Confirmation from the issuing body or authorized verification service.
- ✓ Policy declarations or certificate of insurance with sensitive pricing and unrelated data redacted.
- ✓ Written explanation where a credential is not legally required, supported by the relevant classification or official guidance.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Expired, suspended, revoked, restricted, or unrelated credentials presented as fully current.
- ✗ A credential held by another entity or person without a valid relationship to the applicant or the work offered.
- ✗ Edited documents, unverifiable numbers, self-issued certificates, or decorative badges without a credible issuer.
- ✗ Claims of being "licensed," "insured," "certified," or "accredited" without identifying the basis.
- ✗ Using a credential beyond its geographic, professional, or operational scope.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

All applicable claimed or required credentials are current, verifiable, correctly scoped, and connected to the organization.

Partially Meets

Most credentials are valid, but minor scope, renewal, documentation, or connection issues require clarification.

Does Not Meet

A material required or claimed credential is missing, expired, unverifiable, misleading, or outside the relevant scope.

Not Applicable

Applicable when the activity does not require and the organization does not claim any license, registration, permit, insurance, bond, or certification.

12. Operational Reliability

The organization must demonstrate a reasonable ability to deliver its stated services or products consistently, manage foreseeable disruption, and meet material commitments appropriate to its size and operating model.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Operational processes, staffing or contractor arrangements, capacity, scheduling, fulfillment, service continuity, and quality controls.
- Order, booking, project, or service records showing delivery against stated commitments.
- Handling of delays, supply issues, staff absence, system failure, or other foreseeable disruption.
- Dependence on key individuals, platforms, suppliers, or subcontractors and any reasonable continuity measures.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Standard operating procedures, scheduling or project systems, fulfillment records, service logs, or delivery metrics.
- ✓ Redacted customer records, completed work evidence, inventory or supplier arrangements, and capacity plans.
- ✓ Business continuity, backup, incident, subcontractor, or escalation procedures proportionate to the organization.
- ✓ Quality checks, completion sign-off, service monitoring, or management review records.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Unsubstantiated claims of guaranteed availability or performance.
- ✗ Isolated examples presented as proof of a consistent operating system when broader evidence is requested.
- ✗ Records that appear fabricated, selectively altered, or unrelated to the services assessed.
- ✗ Material recurring delivery failures left unexplained or without corrective action.
- ✗ Operating beyond demonstrated capacity in a way likely to mislead customers.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Credible evidence demonstrates consistent delivery, appropriate capacity, and proportionate controls for foreseeable disruption.

Partially Meets

The organization appears operationally capable, but evidence is limited, uneven, or lacks mature continuity and monitoring controls.

Does Not Meet

Material reliability concerns, recurring failures, inadequate capacity, or unsupported operating claims are identified.

Not Applicable

Not normally available; the form and depth of evidence are adjusted proportionately to the operating model.

13. Public Compliance & Standing

The organization must not present a materially misleading picture of its public legal, regulatory, or registration standing. Relevant, lawfully available records must be considered in context, with an opportunity for the applicant to explain, correct, or dispute information.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Current entity status, regulator or licensing status, material public enforcement records, sanctions, disqualifications, or restrictions relevant to the assessed activity.
- Public insolvency, dissolution, tax-lien, judgment, or equivalent records where lawfully available and materially relevant.
- The age, jurisdiction, finality, relevance, and seriousness of any record, including evidence of appeal, settlement, correction, or remediation.
- Consistency between public standing and claims made on the Reedleys profile.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Official registry, court, regulator, licensing, or government public records.
- ✓ Formal notices, decisions, clearance letters, settlement documents, appeal records, or evidence of satisfied obligations.
- ✓ Written applicant explanation supported by independent documentation.
- ✓ Professional legal or regulatory confirmation where appropriate and voluntarily supplied.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Anonymous allegations, unverified social media posts, rumor, or search-result snippets without a reliable source.
- ✗ Irrelevant personal information or records unrelated to the organization or assessed activity.
- ✗ Presenting unresolved allegations as established fact.
- ✗ Concealing or materially misdescribing a relevant final public record after being asked to clarify it.
- ✗ Using this criterion as a credit score, legal opinion, or guarantee of compliance.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

No material relevant standing issue is identified, or any identified issue is transparently explained and credibly resolved or managed.

Partially Meets

A relevant issue exists but is limited, historical, under documented remediation, or insufficiently serious to determine the criterion negatively.

Does Not Meet

A material final or current issue directly relevant to trust or service delivery is identified and remains unexplained, unresolved, or misrepresented.

Not Applicable

Available where no relevant public record system exists or no standing requirement can reasonably apply; absence of a record is assessed cautiously.

14. Evidence of Stability

The organization must provide proportionate evidence that its identity, operations, and public information are sufficiently consistent to support confidence in continued service. New organizations are assessed on coherence and readiness rather than age alone.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Length and continuity of operation, operating history, changes of name or ownership, location continuity, and consistency of public records.
- Patterns of service delivery, recurring customers, contracts, projects, transactions, or other sustained activity.
- Financial and operational indicators voluntarily provided and relevant to continuity, without treating the result as a credit rating.
- Explanations for recent formation, restructuring, rapid growth, dormant periods, or material changes.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Historical registry records, archived website pages, dated contracts, invoices, project records, tax or accounting confirmations, or operating reports.
- ✓ Customer or supplier history, recurring-service records, payroll or contractor records, and continuity plans with sensitive data redacted.
- ✓ Evidence of funding, insurance, staffing, equipment, systems, or signed work sufficient to support a new organization's readiness.
- ✓ Documented explanation of merger, acquisition, rebranding, succession, or relocation.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ An arbitrary claim of years in business without dated support.
- ✗ Using the history of an unrelated predecessor, employer, franchise, or owner as the organization's own history without disclosure.
- ✗ Fabricated transaction volume, customer counts, financial figures, or project records.
- ✗ Unexplained repeated dissolutions, identity changes, or gaps that materially affect confidence.
- ✗ Treating organization age alone as proof of reliability or as an automatic barrier to a strong outcome.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

The evidence shows coherent continuity, credible operating history or readiness, and no material unexplained instability.

Partially Meets

The organization is genuine and operational, but the available history is short, uneven, or only partly documented.

Does Not Meet

Material instability, unexplained identity changes, unsupported history, or serious continuity concerns are identified.

Not Applicable

Not applicable is rarely used; new organizations are assessed using readiness and consistency evidence rather than excluded.

15. Quality Assurance & Continuous Improvement

The organization must demonstrate proportionate methods for checking service or product quality, learning from outcomes and feedback, correcting recurring problems, and improving relevant processes over time.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Quality standards, checks, approvals, inspections, completion criteria, error handling, and management oversight.
- Use of complaints, reviews, performance information, audits, incidents, or staff feedback to identify improvements.
- Training, policy updates, corrective actions, supplier or subcontractor controls, and follow-up verification.
- Whether quality claims are supported by an active system rather than a one-time statement.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Quality manuals, checklists, inspection or sign-off records, audit reports, KPI dashboards, or management review minutes.
- ✓ Corrective and preventive action records, root-cause analysis, issue logs, and evidence of completed improvements.
- ✓ Staff training records, updated procedures, customer-feedback analysis, and supplier quality controls.
- ✓ External quality certification or audit evidence, when relevant, as one source among the overall evidence.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ General statements such as “quality is our priority” without a functioning process or examples.
- ✗ One-off promotional awards, decorative seals, or self-issued certificates presented as a quality system.
- ✗ Fabricated audits, altered metrics, or selectively reported data that hides material recurring issues.
- ✗ Policies that exist only on paper and are not used in practice.
- ✗ External certification presented as a substitute for evidence across all applicable Reedleys criteria.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

A proportionate, active quality system is evidenced, including monitoring, corrective action, and demonstrable improvement.

Partially Meets

Some quality controls and improvement activity exist, but they are informal, inconsistently documented, or limited in scope.

Does Not Meet

No credible quality-control process is demonstrated, or material issues recur without effective review and corrective action.

Not Applicable

Not normally available; expectations are scaled to the organization’s size, risk, and operating model.

SECTION 8 · STANDARD B

Professional Recognition Standard

Applies to individual professionals offering services or presenting professional experience, qualifications, and credentials through a personal profile. Requirements are scaled fairly for new, part-time, supervised, or lower-risk practice.

LEVEL 1

Foundation

Verified identity, accurate profile, clear service description, contact channels, and core client information.

Criteria 01 - 05

LEVEL 2

Established

Qualifications, experience, reputation, communication, and complaint or resolution practices.

Criteria 06 - 10

LEVEL 3

Advanced

Authorization, reliability, standing, continuing development, and professional maturity.

Criteria 11 - 15

Explore each criterion

The same structure applies, adapted to individual professionals and their career stage, service scope, and risk.

01. Verified Identity

The professional must complete the Reedleys-approved identity verification process and demonstrate that the public profile belongs to the person represented. Identity verification confirms the person, not their qualifications, licensing, competence, or service quality.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Identity verification result from the approved secure provider, including document and face/selfie checks where used.
- Consistency of legal name, profile name, date of birth or other protected verification fields, and public professional identity.
- Use of a professional or preferred name and the documented connection to the verified person.
- Potential impersonation, duplicate profiles, or unauthorized profile control.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Successful verification through the Reedleys-approved identity provider using an accepted government-issued identity document and face/selfie check.
- ✓ Additional secure verification requested by Reedleys when an automated result requires review.
- ✓ Official name-change record or credible evidence connecting a professional or preferred name to the verified identity.
- ✓ Other legally appropriate verification methods approved by Reedleys for jurisdictions where standard documents are unavailable.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Social media accounts, email addresses, business cards, or testimonials as substitutes for identity verification.
- ✗ Identity documents belonging to another person or documents submitted by an unauthorized representative.
- ✗ Edited, expired where unacceptable, incomplete, counterfeit, or unreadable documents.
- ✗ A photograph or selfie without an approved identity-document match.
- ✗ Attempts to create multiple identities or conceal a material identity inconsistency.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Identity and profile ownership are successfully verified through the approved process.

Partially Meets

Identity appears genuine but requires additional review, name-link evidence, or resolution of a minor inconsistency.

Does Not Meet

Identity cannot be verified, the person does not match the profile, or material impersonation or document concerns are identified.

Not Applicable

Not available. Verified identity is a core requirement for an individual professional profile.

02. Accurate Professional Information

The professional's public information must be current, materially complete, and consistent with verified identity, stated services, controlled public profiles, and any supporting records.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Public name, professional title, location or service area, contact methods, website, availability, and operating status.
- Consistency between the Reedleys profile, professional website, public directories, licenses, portfolio, and submitted information.
- Whether titles, honorifics, affiliations, employer references, or business relationships are accurately described.
- Whether personal address or sensitive information is unnecessarily exposed; only appropriate public details are required.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Completed Reedleys profile and verified contact methods.
- ✓ Controlled website, professional profile, employer or practice page, public registry, or licensing record.
- ✓ Current CV, résumé, biography, booking profile, or professional directory entry supported by other evidence.
- ✓ Written explanation and evidence for a recent name, location, employer, or career-status change.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Inflated or false titles, employer relationships, memberships, or locations.
- ✗ Inactive contact details, unrelated websites, or profiles controlled by another person.
- ✗ Conflicting identity, service, experience, or location information left unexplained.
- ✗ Using another professional's biography, portfolio, credentials, or achievements.
- ✗ Presenting a private residential location as a staffed public office without appropriate disclosure.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Public professional information is current, consistent, appropriately complete, and supported by reliable sources.

Partially Meets

Most information is accurate, but minor gaps, stale details, or non-material inconsistencies remain.

Does Not Meet

Material profile information is false, misleading, contradictory, outdated, or unverifiable.

Not Applicable

Not normally available for core identity and contact information; individual fields may be not applicable.

03. Complete Professional Profile

The profile must give a reasonable prospective client enough information to understand the professional's field, services, experience, service area or delivery method, availability, and appropriate contact route.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Professional summary, category, specializations, services, experience overview, location or remote availability, and contact methods.
- Whether the profile distinguishes verified facts, professional claims, and personal marketing statements.
- Use of portfolio, work examples, service details, pricing information, and client guidance where relevant.
- Whether important limitations or scope boundaries are disclosed.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ A fully completed Reedleys professional profile with specific and internally consistent information.
- ✓ Current CV or résumé, professional biography, website, booking page, portfolio, or controlled marketplace profile.
- ✓ Professional photographs, work examples, service descriptions, and applicant-confirmed information.
- ✓ Clear disclosure of career stage, supervised practice, trainee status, or limited scope where applicable.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Placeholder text, empty required fields, or a profile that does not explain the professional activity.
- ✗ Generic claims such as “expert in everything” without a defined field or service scope.
- ✗ Unsupported guarantees, misleading status claims, or titles implying regulated authorization that is not held.
- ✗ Copied biographies, portfolios, testimonials, or achievements belonging to another person.
- ✗ Services selected solely to appear in unrelated searches.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

The profile is complete, specific, understandable, and appropriately represents the professional's activity.

Partially Meets

The profile is usable but lacks some non-critical detail, evidence, scope information, or clarity.

Does Not Meet

The profile is materially incomplete, vague, misleading, or inconsistent with the professional's verified information.

Not Applicable

Not normally available. A complete public profile is a core component of professional recognition.

04. Clear Service Scope

The professional must define the services offered, intended client or use case, delivery method, geographic reach, and material limitations. Services must remain within the professional's demonstrated experience and any applicable legal or licensing scope.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Service names, descriptions, deliverables, typical process, client responsibilities, exclusions, and limits.
- Whether services are provided independently, through an employer, under supervision, or as part of a team.
- Consistency between the profile, website, portfolio, booking pages, and qualifications or licenses.
- Use of protected or regulated titles and whether the stated scope is appropriate.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Public service pages, booking descriptions, proposals, scope-of-work templates, or profile service listings.
- ✓ Written explanation of client type, delivery method, limitations, and referral boundaries.
- ✓ Employer, practice, or platform pages showing the professional's role and authorized services.
- ✓ Relevant portfolio examples that demonstrate the stated service scope.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Offering regulated services without the required authorization or outside an existing license scope.
- ✗ Claims of guaranteed outcomes where results depend on client actions or external factors.
- ✗ Vague services that do not explain what the client receives.
- ✗ Hidden material exclusions or limitations revealed only after commitment.
- ✗ Presenting an employer's or team's full capabilities as the individual's personal competence without clarification.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Services are clearly defined, appropriately limited, and consistent with the professional's evidence and authorization.

Partially Meets

The main scope is understandable, but some deliverables, exclusions, role boundaries, or limitations need clarification.

Does Not Meet

Service claims are materially vague, misleading, unauthorized, inconsistent, or unsupported.

Not Applicable

Not applicable only where the profile does not offer a client-facing service; Reedleys must confirm.

05. Service Terms & Client Information

The professional must communicate the material terms that apply before a client commits, including pricing or quotation, payment, scheduling, cancellation, refunds, rescheduling, confidentiality, deliverables, and other conditions relevant to the service.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Which terms are relevant to the service model and how they are provided to clients.
- Clarity, timing, consistency, and accessibility of terms across booking, website, quotation, invoice, and profile channels.
- Whether fees, deposits, recurring charges, cancellation costs, and material client obligations are disclosed.
- Any confidentiality, privacy, consent, or professional-boundary information appropriate to the service.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Published service terms, booking policy, client agreement, engagement letter, quotation terms, or checkout information.
- ✓ Pricing page, rate card, invoice template, proposal, cancellation or refund policy, and client onboarding material.
- ✓ Platform-hosted terms where services are delivered through a marketplace and the applicable terms are clear.
- ✓ Redacted examples showing that clients receive the terms before commitment.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Hidden fees or conditions introduced after booking or acceptance.
- ✗ Generic templates with another provider's name, wrong jurisdiction, or irrelevant terms.
- ✗ Conflicting cancellation, payment, refund, confidentiality, or service statements across channels.
- ✗ Terms that reserve unlimited discretion while withholding material client obligations.
- ✗ A claim that no terms are needed despite taking payment, appointments, personal information, or ongoing obligations.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

All material client terms are clear, accessible, timely, consistent, and appropriate to the service model.

Partially Meets

Most relevant terms are provided, but some detail, consistency, or pre-commitment disclosure is limited.

Does Not Meet

Material terms are missing, contradictory, misleading, or communicated too late for informed agreement.

Not Applicable

Individual term types may be not applicable; the criterion as a whole is rarely not applicable for paid client services.

06. Relevant Professional Experience

Experience claimed on the profile must be relevant to the stated services and described accurately. Reedleys does not require a fixed number of years for every profession; relevance, recency, responsibility, and verifiability are assessed proportionately.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Employment, self-employment, contract, volunteer, supervised, project, or practice history relevant to the services offered.
- Roles, responsibilities, dates, client or employer context, and level of independent responsibility.
- Consistency with CV, portfolio, references, public profiles, licenses, and stated career timeline.
- Whether aggregate years-of-experience claims are calculated honestly and avoid double counting.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ CV or résumé supported by employer, client, contract, payroll, tax, reference, project, or public professional evidence.
- ✓ Employment confirmation, role description, professional reference, project record, or signed engagement evidence.
- ✓ Portfolio items or case summaries that can be linked to the professional's role.
- ✓ Credible explanation of career breaks, overlapping roles, self-employment, or experience obtained in another jurisdiction.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Unsupported claims of years, seniority, clients, project value, or responsibility.
- ✗ Counting education, unrelated work, or overlapping full-time roles as separate cumulative years without disclosure.
- ✗ Using an employer's or team's achievements as personal experience without identifying the individual contribution.
- ✗ Fabricated references, altered contracts, or unverifiable organizations.
- ✗ Experience materially outside the service field presented as directly relevant.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Relevant experience is clearly described, consistent, and supported by credible evidence proportionate to the claims made.

Partially Meets

Some relevant experience is credible, but dates, responsibilities, recency, or supporting evidence are limited.

Does Not Meet

Material experience claims are unsupported, exaggerated, contradictory, fabricated, or unrelated to the stated services.

Not Applicable

Available for genuine entry-level or newly qualified professionals whose services do not require prior experience; the profile must disclose career stage.

07. Education & Training

Any education or training claimed must be accurately named, connected to an identifiable provider, and relevant to the professional profile. Formal academic education is not mandatory unless required for the service or presented as a basis of competence.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Institution or provider, program title, field, level, dates, completion status, and relevance.
- Whether the provider is identifiable and the credential is represented accurately as a degree, diploma, course, workshop, or attendance record.
- Consistency with qualification documents, CV, public profiles, and professional claims.
- Any limitations, incomplete study, non-degree status, or jurisdictional differences requiring disclosure.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Degree, diploma, transcript, completion letter, training certificate, secure digital credential, or official verification link.
- ✓ Provider or institution confirmation, public graduate record, student record, or credential-verification service.
- ✓ Employer or professional-body training record where the provider and learning content are identifiable.
- ✓ Certified translation or explanatory document for education obtained in another language or system.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Edited or incomplete documents that hide the provider, program, result, or completion status.
- ✗ Attendance records described as degrees, licenses, or competency certifications.
- ✗ Unaccredited or informal learning represented as government-recognized education without basis.
- ✗ Self-issued education documents or providers that cannot be reasonably identified.
- ✗ Education belonging to another person or materially inconsistent with the professional's identity.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Claimed education and training are accurately represented, relevant, and successfully verified or credibly supported.

Partially Meets

The learning appears genuine and relevant, but verification, level, completion, or provider information is incomplete.

Does Not Meet

Material education claims are false, misleading, unrelated, unverifiable, or misrepresented in level or status.

Not Applicable

Available when no education or training is claimed and it is not required for the stated service; absence is not automatically negative.

08. Qualifications & Certifications

Any qualification or certification displayed as verified must be relevant to the professional's services, issued by an identifiable education, training, certification, or professional body, and represented accurately with its current status and scope.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Qualification or certificate title, issuing organization, issue and expiration dates, certificate or registration number, and current status.
- Relevance to the professional's listed services and whether it reflects attendance, assessment, competence, or authorization.
- Issuer identity, verification method, renewal requirements, restrictions, and public credential record where available.
- Consistency between the credential, profile claims, service scope, and professional title.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Digital or scanned certificate, diploma, credential card, official transcript, or secure digital credential.
- ✓ Official verification link, issuer registry, certification-body confirmation, or direct provider response.
- ✓ Current renewal record, continuing-certification evidence, or status confirmation.
- ✓ Certified translation or credible explanatory evidence for credentials issued in another jurisdiction.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Self-issued certificates, decorative awards, or documents with no identifiable issuer.
- ✗ Edited screenshots, cropped documents, or records that omit material identity or status information.
- ✗ Attendance certificates presented as professional competence certification without clear disclosure.
- ✗ Expired, revoked, suspended, or limited credentials represented as fully current.
- ✗ Credentials that cannot reasonably be connected to the listed professional activity.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Relevant qualifications or certifications are accurately represented and successfully verified or strongly supported.

Partially Meets

The credential appears genuine and relevant, but some status, scope, renewal, or verification evidence is incomplete.

Does Not Meet

A material credential claim is false, misleading, expired without disclosure, unrelated, or unverifiable.

Not Applicable

Available where no qualification or certification is claimed or required; the criterion does not penalize professions based primarily on experience.

09. Licenses & Registrations

Where a professional activity requires or publicly claims a license, registration, permit, protected title, or professional authorization, the credential must be current, held by the applicant, and appropriate to the service and jurisdiction.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Licensing or registration requirement for the stated profession, service, and location.
- Credential holder, number, issuing authority, status, scope, restrictions, issue and expiration dates.
- Whether the professional operates independently, under supervision, through an organization, or within another authorized arrangement.
- Consistency between licensed scope, public title, service claims, location, and employer or practice relationship.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Official regulator or professional-register record, current license, registration certificate, permit, or status letter.
- ✓ Public verification page or confirmation from the issuing authority.
- ✓ Employer or supervising-professional evidence showing a lawful supervised or organizational arrangement.
- ✓ Official guidance demonstrating that no license or registration is required for the stated activity.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Expired, suspended, revoked, restricted, or unrelated credentials presented as active and unrestricted.
- ✗ A license belonging to an employer, colleague, family member, or organization presented as the individual's own.
- ✗ Edited documents, unverifiable numbers, self-issued registrations, or decorative membership badges.
- ✗ Use of a protected title without the required authorization.
- ✗ Offering services outside the geographic, technical, or supervisory scope of the credential.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

All applicable claimed or required licenses and registrations are current, correctly scoped, and verifiably connected to the professional.

Partially Meets

The authorization is substantially valid, but a minor renewal, scope, supervision, or documentation issue needs clarification.

Does Not Meet

A material required or claimed authorization is missing, expired, misleading, unverifiable, or outside the relevant scope.

Not Applicable

Applicable where the stated profession and services do not require and do not claim any license, registration, permit, or protected title.

10. Portfolio & Work Evidence

Where work examples are used to demonstrate expertise, they must genuinely reflect the professional's own contribution, be relevant to the services offered, and respect confidentiality, intellectual property, and client consent.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Portfolio items, case studies, publications, designs, code, photographs, presentations, work products, or project summaries.
- The professional's role, date, context, contribution, and relationship to any team, employer, client, or collaborator.
- Relevance, recency, authenticity, and consistency with stated experience and services.
- Consent, confidentiality, licensing, attribution, and appropriate redaction.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Original work files, published work, repository history, project links, client-approved case studies, or dated portfolio records.
- ✓ Employer or client confirmation, contract or project record, publication byline, credits, or contribution statement.
- ✓ Before-and-after examples, anonymized work, process evidence, or demonstration projects clearly labeled as such.
- ✓ Portfolio hosted on the Reedleys profile, professional website, reputable platform, or controlled repository.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Work copied from another person, stock material presented as original work, or AI-generated material presented as completed client work without disclosure.
- ✗ Team or employer output presented as solely personal work without identifying the individual contribution.
- ✗ Confidential or personal client information published without appropriate permission or redaction.
- ✗ Fabricated project names, results, clients, testimonials, or performance figures.
- ✗ Examples unrelated to the professional's stated services.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Work evidence is authentic, relevant, appropriately attributed, and supports the professional's stated expertise.

Partially Meets

Some credible work evidence is available, but contribution, recency, context, or verification is limited.

Does Not Meet

Material portfolio content is copied, fabricated, misleading, improperly attributed, or unrelated to the stated services.

Not Applicable

Available where a portfolio is not customary, practical, lawful, or compatible with client confidentiality; other experience evidence is then considered.

11. Client Feedback & Reputation

The professional's reputation must be assessed using a balanced view of available feedback. Reviews, testimonials, and endorsements must not be fabricated, manipulated, or presented without appropriate context or consent.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Public and Reedleys reviews, direct feedback, testimonial patterns, recency, volume, consistency, and recurring themes.
- Responses to positive and negative feedback, evidence of issue resolution, and professional communication.
- Authenticity, disclosure of incentives or relationships, testimonial consent, and review-solicitation practices.
- Relevant public professional records or substantiated concerns, interpreted proportionately and in context.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Verified Reedleys reviews, public platform reviews, client references, feedback forms, and consented testimonials.
- ✓ Redacted client correspondence showing feedback and resolution.
- ✓ Review-invitation policy, testimonial consent, or platform verification.
- ✓ Context explaining unusual events, impersonation, review bombing, or documented corrective action.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Purchased, fabricated, self-posted, or undisclosed incentivized reviews.
- ✗ Review gating, coercion, retaliation, or selective suppression of legitimate negative feedback.
- ✗ Publishing private client information in response to criticism.
- ✗ Using feedback earned by another professional, employer, or team as personal feedback without clarification.
- ✗ Concealing material recurring concerns from the submitted evidence.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Available feedback is broadly consistent, review practices appear genuine, and material concerns are handled responsibly.

Partially Meets

Feedback is limited or mixed, but the professional demonstrates credible practices and some evidence of responsible response.

Does Not Meet

Material recurring concerns, deceptive review practices, fabricated feedback, or serious unexplained inconsistencies are identified.

Not Applicable

Available where insufficient feedback exists for a fair assessment; lack of reviews is not automatically negative, particularly for new professionals.

12. Professional Conduct

The professional must demonstrate respectful, honest, non-deceptive conduct and appropriate boundaries in client communication, marketing, service delivery, confidentiality, and representation of competence.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Professional communication, marketing claims, conflicts of interest, confidentiality, consent, recordkeeping, and client boundaries.
- Codes of conduct, ethical guidelines, employer rules, or professional obligations relevant to the service.
- Any substantiated conduct concerns and the professional's response, remediation, and current practice.
- Whether the professional distinguishes opinion, advice, education, and regulated professional services appropriately.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Published code of conduct, client-care policy, confidentiality statement, consent process, conflict policy, or professional terms.
- ✓ Redacted communication examples, employer or professional-body conduct records, training, or supervision evidence.
- ✓ Professional membership or licensing code acknowledged by the applicant.
- ✓ Documented corrective action, reflective practice, or updated procedures following a substantiated issue.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Deceptive claims, impersonation, discrimination, harassment, threats, retaliation, or deliberate misuse of client information.
- ✗ Presenting personal opinion as regulated advice or implying authority not held.
- ✗ Fabricated codes, memberships, supervision, or conduct records.
- ✗ Material undisclosed conflicts of interest that could affect client decisions.
- ✗ Repeated substantiated conduct concerns without credible remediation.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Evidence supports honest, respectful, responsible conduct and appropriate professional boundaries.

Partially Meets

Conduct appears generally appropriate, but formal guidance, consistency, or evidence of boundaries and conflict management is limited.

Does Not Meet

Material deceptive, abusive, discriminatory, unethical, retaliatory, or confidentiality-related concerns are identified.

Not Applicable

Not normally available; expectations are applied proportionately to the service and professional context.

13. Complaint & Resolution Practices

Clients must have a reasonable way to raise a concern, service problem, or dispute, and the professional must use a proportionate process to acknowledge, review, respond to, and close the matter.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Complaint or concern channels, response expectations, documentation, escalation, remedies, and closure.
- Whether the professional handles complaints directly, through an employer, platform, insurer, regulator, or professional body.
- Consistency between stated policy and actual examples.
- Use of complaint outcomes to improve future practice.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Published complaint or resolution policy, client agreement, platform process, employer procedure, or professional-body route.
- ✓ Redacted correspondence or case records demonstrating acknowledgement, review, response, remedy, and closure.
- ✓ Escalation, refund, re-performance, mediation, insurance, or referral records where appropriate.
- ✓ Root-cause notes, reflective practice, training, or process changes resulting from a complaint.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ No reasonable route for clients to raise a concern.
- ✗ Automatic dismissal, blocking, retaliation, threats, or public disclosure of private client information.
- ✗ Fabricated cases, altered correspondence, or selective evidence that omits known material issues.
- ✗ Policies that impose undisclosed or unreasonable barriers to complaints.
- ✗ Repeated unresolved complaints without credible review or corrective action.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

A clear, proportionate resolution route exists and available evidence shows concerns can be handled fairly and constructively.

Partially Meets

A basic process exists, but documentation, escalation, response expectations, or improvement evidence is limited.

Does Not Meet

No credible process exists, or concerns are handled in a materially unfair, inaccessible, deceptive, or retaliatory way.

Not Applicable

Available only where all client complaints are formally handled by an identified employer or platform and the professional can show that route.

14. Continuing Professional Development

Where relevant to maintaining competence, the professional should demonstrate recent learning, skills updating, supervision, reflective practice, or other development appropriate to the services offered. Mandatory CPD requirements must be met where they apply.

☑ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Recent courses, workshops, conferences, reading, supervised practice, mentoring, peer review, or structured self-development.
- Relevance to current services, identified development needs, changes in technology, standards, regulation, or client expectations.
- CPD hours, cycles, renewal requirements, reflective records, and application of learning where applicable.
- Consistency between CPD claims, certificates, professional-body records, and current practice.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ CPD certificates, transcripts, professional-body records, learning logs, supervision records, or attendance verification.
- ✓ Reflective notes, updated portfolio, new procedures, or examples showing how learning changed practice.
- ✓ Employer training, product or systems training, mentoring, peer review, or supervised development.
- ✓ Self-directed learning records where the activity, date, source, relevance, and outcome are clearly documented.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ Undated lists of topics with no evidence of completion or relevance.
- ✗ Duplicate, fabricated, edited, or self-issued certificates presented as independent training.
- ✗ Unrelated learning counted solely to inflate CPD volume.
- ✗ Mandatory renewal or CPD requirements left unmet while the related credential is presented as current.
- ✗ Attendance alone represented as mastery without appropriate context.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

Recent, relevant development is credibly evidenced and, where applicable, satisfies mandatory CPD or renewal expectations.

Partially Meets

Some relevant development is shown, but evidence, recency, planning, reflection, or application is limited.

Does Not Meet

Mandatory development is unmet, material CPD claims are false or unverifiable, or no reasonable effort to maintain current competence is demonstrated where clearly expected.

Not Applicable

Available where CPD is not customary or reasonably relevant to the stated service; voluntary learning may still strengthen the overall assessment.

15. Quality, Consistency & Professional Maturity

The professional must demonstrate, proportionately to career stage and service risk, a consistent approach to quality, reliable delivery, appropriate self-review, and improvement. This criterion considers the overall maturity of the professional practice rather than prestige or seniority alone.

✓ WHAT REEDLEYS REVIEWS

- Consistency across identity, service scope, experience, credentials, portfolio, client feedback, terms, and conduct evidence.
- Planning, preparation, quality checks, completion criteria, recordkeeping, follow-up, and management of errors or limitations.
- Use of feedback, supervision, reflection, peer review, or performance information to improve practice.
- Whether claims are proportionate to career stage, evidence, authorization, and demonstrated capability.

✓ ACCEPTED EVIDENCE

- ✓ Quality checklists, client onboarding and completion records, templates, supervision notes, peer review, or professional-practice procedures.
- ✓ Repeat-client evidence, consistent project records, service metrics, feedback analysis, and examples of corrective action.
- ✓ Reflective practice, improvement plan, updated services, revised terms, or learning applied following an identified issue.
- ✓ External audit, professional review, certification, employer appraisal, or quality recognition as supporting—not sole—evidence.

✗ NOT ACCEPTED

- ✗ General claims of being an “expert,” “best,” or “world-class” without proportionate evidence.
- ✗ Isolated high-profile work used to conceal inconsistent broader practice.
- ✗ Fabricated metrics, clients, outcomes, reviews, awards, or quality records.
- ✗ Repeated material errors or service failures without acknowledgement and corrective action.
- ✗ Treating age, fame, follower count, or senior job title as a substitute for quality and consistent evidence.

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

Meets

The overall evidence demonstrates consistent, reliable, self-aware, and improving professional practice appropriate to the career stage and service risk.

Partially Meets

The practice is credible but quality controls, consistency, documentation, reflection, or maturity are still developing.

Does Not Meet

Material inconsistency, unsupported claims, recurring quality concerns, or lack of corrective learning undermines the professional profile.

Not Applicable

Not normally available; expectations are scaled fairly for new, supervised, part-time, or lower-risk professional practice.

Ratings reflect a point in time



Current status

A rating reflects the evidence available at assessment. The public record shows profile type, standard, rating, certificate number, date, and current status. Replaced or inactive records clearly identify the current one.



Reassessment

Reedleys may offer or require reassessment at period end, on a material change, on new evidence, or on request. A reassessment may raise, hold, or lower a rating, payment never guarantees improvement.



Material changes

Applicants keep profiles current and report material changes to identity, ownership, services, licensing, or standing. Failure to disclose may lead to review, status limitation, or certificate replacement.

Standard updates: Reedleys may update the standards as technology, verification methods, and expectations evolve. Each published version identifies its number and effective date, applicants are normally assessed under the version in effect when the assessment begins.

Key terms

Applicant

The organization or individual professional submitting information for Reedleys Recognition.

Applicable criterion

A criterion that reasonably relates to the applicant's profile type, activities, claims, jurisdiction, or operating model.

Assessment

The review of submitted and available evidence against the applicable Reedleys Recognition Standard.

Accepted evidence

Evidence that may be considered because its source, relevance, identity, date, scope, and credibility are sufficient. Acceptance does not automatically mean the criterion is met.

Credential

A qualification, certification, license, registration, permit, membership, authorization, or similar evidence issued by an identifiable body.

Material

Important enough that it could reasonably affect the assessment, rating, customer understanding, or confidence in the profile.

Organization

A business, company, corporation, partnership, firm, agency, non-profit, or sole proprietorship using a business or other accepted entity profile.

Professional

An individual person offering services or presenting professional experience, qualifications, or credentials through a personal profile.

Recognized status

The status showing that Reedleys completed an assessment under the applicable standard and published a rating result.

Rating

The Reedleys AAA-D result that summarizes the assessment outcome under the applicable standard.

Verification

A process used to confirm a specific fact, such as identity, domain control, issuer record, or certificate. Verifying one fact does not verify every profile claim.

Verifiable

Capable of reasonable confirmation through an official source, issuer, secure provider, controlled system, technical method, or consistent credible evidence.

END OF MASTER STANDARD

Discover. Verify. Connect.

This master standard is the authoritative source for the Reedleys Recognition Standards page, applicant guidance, assessor instructions, and this handbook. Version 1.0, effective July 28, 2026.