

IGS-C Compatibility & Conformance Claims Policy v1.3

Document type: Legal / policy guidance

Edition: 1.3 – Nov 2025

Status: Draft for consultation

Audience: Vendors, integrators, marketing teams, accredited assessors, legal and compliance teams

1. Purpose

This policy defines **how organisations and solutions may describe their relationship to IGS-C standards**, including GCR-M and regional profiles such as OSPCRM.

It aims to:

- Protect users, regulators and buyers from misleading claims;
- Allow fair and accurate descriptive use of IGS-C terminology;
- Clarify when the use of phrases such as "implements", "compatible", "conformant" or "certified" is appropriate.

2. Definitions

For the purposes of this policy:

- "**Implements GCR-M**" – the product or process uses GCR-M concepts internally (e.g. for modelling risk or structuring reports) but has not been formally evaluated by IGS-C.
- "**Compatible with GCR-M**" / "**GCR-M compatible**" – the product or process demonstrably aligns with GCR-M concepts and interfaces, and this has been verified by an independent Tiered assessor.

- "**Conformant with GCR-M**" – the organisation or solution has undergone a structured assessment against GCR-M/OSPCRM criteria with satisfactory outcome.
- "**Certified**" – the organisation or solution has achieved **Level 3** certification under the IGS-C Conformance & Certification Criteria and is listed as such in the public registry.

These terms are not mere marketing language; they imply different levels of evidence.

3. Permitted descriptive uses

3.1 Referring to GCR-M and OSPCRM

Any party may **descriptively** refer to IGS-C standards, for example:

- "Our internal risk methodology is inspired by GCR-M."
- "We map our ISO 27001 controls to OSPCRM for African operations."
- "This report uses the context/pathway/structural control structure of GCR-M."

These statements are acceptable as long as they are **true and not misleading**, and do not imply formal endorsement or certification.

3.2 Claiming "implements GCR-M"

An organisation or solution may state that it **implements GCR-M** if:

- It can provide internal documentation showing how GCR-M concepts are used;
- It does not claim formal evaluation or approval by IGS-C;
- It is willing to share such documentation under NDA with regulators or prospective clients if requested.

4. Controlled claims: "compatible", "conformant", "certified"

4.1 "Compatible with GCR-M" / "GCR-M compatible"

These claims are **controlled**. They may only be used when:

- A Tiered assessor (T2 or above) has performed a limited compatibility review;
- A short written statement exists, describing:
 - the aspects of GCR-M/OSPCRM that were evaluated;
 - any limitations or excluded areas;
- The assessor and scope are recorded in the IGS-C registry.

Compatibility is **not** equivalent to full conformance or certification.

4.2 "Conformant with GCR-M" / "Conformant with OSPCRM"

These claims require a broader assessment:

- The organisation or solution has undergone a structured assessment against relevant GCR-M/OSPCRM criteria;
- Gaps have been identified and either remediated or clearly documented as accepted risks;
- A formal report exists and can be made available to regulators or clients under appropriate confidentiality;
- The result and scope are recorded in the IGS-C registry.

Conformance may map to **Level 2 (Independently assessed)** or **Level 3 (Certified)** depending on the depth of the review.

4.3 "Certified by IGS-C" / "IGS-C Level 3 certified"

These claims are reserved for:

- Organisations and solutions that have achieved **Level 3** certification;
- Assessments carried out by accredited organisations and Tiered assessors;
- Entities explicitly listed as "Certified" in the public registry.

Any use of the word "certified" in connection with IGS-C, GCR-M or OSPCRM **must** correspond to a specific registry entry.

5. Examples

5.1 Acceptable claims

- "Deep Advisor implements the GCR-M risk language to generate contextual remediation plans."
- "Deep InfoSec has been assessed as a T0 organisation under IGS-C criteria."
- "Our African operations are OSPCRM-conformant (Level 2), as independently assessed by a T2 assessor."
- "This training uses GCR-M structure but is not an official IGS-C accreditation course."

5.2 Unacceptable or misleading claims

- "IGS-C certified" when no Level 3 certification exists in the registry;
- "Official IGS-C architecture" stated by a vendor for proprietary reference architectures without formal review;
- "Compliant with all IGS-C requirements" without specifying scope or profile;
- Using IGS-C logos to imply endorsement of a non-assessed product.

In cases of doubt, organisations should err on the side of **more precise wording** and consult the secretariat.

6. Enforcement and revocation

6.1 Monitoring

IGS-C may:

- Periodically review public claims by vendors and organisations;
- Act on reports from regulators, clients or competitors about potential misuse.

6.2 Responses to misuse

Possible responses include:

- Private clarification request;
- Public clarification where necessary to avoid user confusion;
- Suspension or revocation of accreditation or certification;
- Legal action in cases of repeated, intentional misuse of names or marks.

6.3 Cooperation with regulators

Where misleading claims may impact regulated sectors (e.g. financial services, healthcare, critical infrastructure), IGS-C may inform relevant authorities so they can take appropriate supervisory action.

End of document.