PUBLIC RECORDS / WORKED EXAMPLE

FedRAMP Class C: verify the scope

Ten decisions from the public record | Part 3

Prepared by Dossier Editorial | November 4, 2026

EVIDENCE SOURCES	EVIDENCE CHECKED	PUBLISHER INSTITUTIONS
2	2026-11-04	1

SECTIONS	READER QUESTIONS	REVIEW SCOPE
7	3	Public records

EVIDENCE CHECKED	2026-11-04
EDITION	1 | Public-source research
ARTICLE	dossierplus.ai/blog/fedramp-20x-class-c-certification-vendor-check

IMPORTANT USE NOTE

Retrospective public-source walkthrough, first published November 4, 2026. Prepared with AI assistance. This is an educational worked example, not a client investigation, legal opinion, or record of a live Dossier research run. No human legal review is claimed.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-C7C6-7AMM-XPVT · Seal 25219BBF9EA3 · SHA-256 533722B808C99D36 · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

PART 01

The decision in brief

A program milestone does not identify every product that qualifies or authorize every agency use. FedRAMP reports its first full CR26 Class C certification on October 29, 2026. The milestone article does not name that product. A defensible vendor review still needs a product-specific record, its boundary and status, and the agency's own risk decision.

Publication date: November 4, 2026. Historical event dates are identified separately. This PDF and the article use the same structured source selection and findings.

PART 02

Executive summary

FedRAMP's November 2 article reports the first full CR26 Class C certification on October 29. It distinguishes that milestone from 26 companies' limited pilot certifications. These are different statuses; a pilot participant should not be silently promoted to full certification in a vendor dossier. **[S01]**

FedRAMP's class guidance describes progressively stronger assurance and explicitly cautions against a direct class-to-impact-level correspondence. The practical outcome is a scope check, not a blanket approval label. This review establishes the agency's reported milestone and identifies the product-identity gap. **[S02]**

PART 03

The missing product name matters

This case concerns the federal program's milestone, not a named vendor's eligibility. The announcement alone cannot support filling in a company from a remembered press release or a list of pilot participants. Treat product name, supplier legal entity, service boundary, environment, and certification identifier as required matching fields.

The public pages were reviewed as of November 4. No restricted assessment package, agency authorization, or vendor-specific listing was examined. The article makes no claim that Dossier holds a FedRAMP certification or that any customer workload is approved.

PART 04

Milestone chronology

DATE	REPORTED MILESTONE	HOW TO RECORD IT
2025	FedRAMP 20x program work began	Background program history, not a product certificate. [S01]
June 2026	CR26 framework released	Identify the framework version associated with a claim. [S01]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-C7C6-7AMM-XPVT · Seal 25219BBF9EA3 · SHA-256 533722B808C99D36 · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

DATE	REPORTED MILESTONE	HOW TO RECORD IT
October 29, 2026	First full CR26 Class C certification	Agency-reported program milestone; product unnamed here. [S01]
November 2, 2026	Milestone article published	Source publication date, distinct from the reported certification date. [S01]

PART 05

Supported findings and unresolved decisions

Outcome: program milestone supported by the program's own account. This can explain why a procurement checklist needs updating. It cannot supply the absent product record. Keep institutional authority and completeness separate: an authoritative page can still omit the field needed for your question.

Outcome: insufficient reviewed evidence for a specific vendor claim. Request the exact listing or certification record and match its service boundary to what the team intends to buy. A parent company name or a similar product family is not enough.

Outcome: agency-use suitability requires a separate determination. The classes guide explicitly separates its assurance framework from a simple impact-level equivalence. Record the actual agency decision and its scope rather than translating a marketing badge into an authorization. **[S02]**

PART 06

From certification claim to usable evidence

1. DOES THE CLAIM IDENTIFY A SPECIFIC PRODUCT AND CERTIFICATION RECORD?

- If established: Match the legal supplier, product, environment, status, and framework version.
- If unresolved: Keep the claim unverified and request the exact record.

2. DOES THAT RECORD COVER THE SERVICE BOUNDARY BEING PURCHASED?

- If established: Document covered components and any exclusions.
- If unresolved: List the mismatch; do not extend the certificate to an entire corporate group.

3. HAS THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY MADE THE RELEVANT USE DECISION?

- If established: Preserve the decision, conditions, and continuing responsibilities.
- If unresolved: Keep agency use unresolved even if the product certification is established.

PART 07

Build a vendor-assurance dossier

Create separate questions for program criteria, product certification, purchased scope, and agency

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-C7C6-7AMM-XPVT · Seal 25219BBF9EA3 · SHA-256 533722B808C99D36 · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

use. Save the milestone page as context and the class guidance as criteria. A later product record should become its own source, not a replacement for either.

Use an evidence table with a row for each claimed capability or status. Add the identifier, status date, boundary, and renewal or monitoring requirement actually documented by that source. Mark absent fields “not in reviewed record.” Avoid a single “compliant” checkbox that hides all of these distinctions.

Before producing a report, verify that the executive summary names only the product established by the record. If the name is still missing, the report should say that directly. This is a suggested Dossier authoring workflow; no vendor assessment or live platform certification check was executed.

PART 08

Evidence to request next

The next packet should include the product-specific official record, relevant boundary description, current status evidence, and the responsible agency’s decision for the intended workload. Ask for a dated change history if the offered service has changed. Assign the unresolved scope question to the team that owns procurement or security review.

PART 09

Questions readers ask

ARE LIMITED PILOT CERTIFICATIONS THE SAME AS FULL CR26 CLASS C?

No. FedRAMP’s milestone article distinguishes them; record the status actually awarded. **[S01]**

DOES CLASS C AUTOMATICALLY MAP TO A PARTICULAR IMPACT LEVEL?

FedRAMP says its classes do not have a direct correlation to impact levels. Read the class criteria and the agency’s own decision. **[S02]**

WHICH VENDOR RECEIVED THE FIRST FULL CERTIFICATION?

The milestone page reviewed here does not name the product. This article does not infer one from pilot participation. **[S01]**

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-C7C6-7AMM-XPVT · Seal 25219BBF9EA3 · SHA-256 533722B808C99D36 · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

PART 10

Linked source register

Titles with a recorded URL link to that source. Entries without a URL identify retained material but do not open an original file. For any court or business record being used in litigation, obtain a certified copy directly from the clerk or filing authority and preserve the retrieval date.

S01 **From memo to milestone**
Program announcement. Anchor: November 2 article; October 29 milestone and pilot comparison. Program history, not a product-specific certificate. · retrieved 2026-11-04

S02 **FedRAMP certification classes**
Program criteria. Anchor: Class overview and relationship to impact levels. Guidance on assurance classes; does not establish an individual agency authorization. · retrieved 2026-11-04

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-C7C6-7AMM-XPVT · Seal 25219BBF9EA3 · SHA-256 533722B808C99D36 · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC