



FedRAMP® General Document Acceptance Criteria

Version 3.0

08/30/2023



info@fedramp.gov
fedramp.gov

DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

Date	Version	Page(s))	Description	Author
03/12/2015	0.6	All	Draft	Steve Levitas
05/05/2015	0.7	All	Incorporated Monette Respress's comments about acceptability of figures	Steve Levitas
07/30/2015	0.8	5-9	Incorporated Government comment	Val Connell
07/30/2015	1.0	5	Removed Section 3.0 and made ready for public release	John Hamilton
06/06/2017	1.0	Cover	Updated logo	FedRAMP PMO
02/07/2018	2.0	All	Reformatted Document	FedRAMP PMO
08/30/2023	3.0	All	Minor formatting and editing updates	FedRAMP PMO

How to contact us

For questions about FedRAMP, or for questions about this document including how to use it, contact info@FedRAMP.gov.

For more information about FedRAMP, see www.FedRAMP.gov.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Document Review Criteria.....	1

1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to describe the general document acceptance criteria for the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP) to both writers and reviewers. These acceptance criteria apply to all documents FedRAMP reviewers assess that do not have predefined checklists or acceptance criteria.

This document does not include security and/or technical review criteria used by the FedRAMP Joint Authorization Board (JAB) or FedRAMP agency review teams to analyze the security and risk posture of a cloud offering.

Writers and reviewers of documents should read this document.

2. Document Review Criteria

Table 1 contains a list of the criteria, including clarity, completeness, conciseness, and consistency, to be considered during a general document acceptance review as well as the severity level categories. The “Description” column includes the common items associated with the criteria to provide guidance. The reviewer determines the defect and its criterion. Severity levels (Low, Medium, and High) are provided for guidance only. The reviewer determines the severity level of an item based on their judgment.

Table 1 – Document Review Criteria

Criterion	Description	Severity
Clarity	• Correct and consistent format • Correct and continuous section numbering • Logical presentation of material • Current dates and timely content • Non-standard terms, phrases, acronyms, and abbreviations are defined	High • Material is ambiguous, unclear, or incomprehensible
		Medium • Material can be interpreted or understood after parsing

- Proper titles and labels are applied to figures
- No ambiguous statements or content
- Minimal and appropriate use of the passive voice
- No awkward phrases, typographical errors, spelling errors, missing words, or incorrect page and section numbers
- Reasonable sentence and paragraph lengths
- Use of generally accepted rules of grammar, capitalization, punctuation, symbols, and notation
- Appropriate and accurate identification of cross-references
- Figure text is readable and figure graphics are sharp

Low

- Detracts from the understanding of the material
- Typos, misspellings, undefined abbreviations, and similar minor defects

Completeness

- Responsive to all applicable FedRAMP requirements
- Includes all appropriate sections of the FedRAMP template
- Includes all attachments and appendices
- Includes the Table of Contents, List of Tables, and List of Figures, when applicable
- Figures include the required information, correct labels, and keys that identify the meaning of colors and line formats

High

- Unresponsive to a FedRAMP requirement
- Incomplete or poor responses to a FedRAMP requirement that compromises security
- Does not include an appropriate section of the FedRAMP template
- Missing an attachment or appendix essential to the completeness or understanding of the material

Medium

- Incomplete or poor responses to a FedRAMP requirement that does not compromise security
- Missing a nonessential attachment or appendix

		Low Missing the Table of Contents, List of Tables, or List of Figures when applicable
Conciseness	- Content and complexity is relevant to the audience - No unnecessary words or phrases	High Content or complexity is irrelevant to the audience
		Medium Unnecessary words or phrases are used that detract from the reader's understanding of the material
		Low Unnecessary words or phrases that do not detract from the reader's understanding of the material
Consistency	- Terms have the same meaning throughout the document - Items are referred to by the same name or description throughout the document - The level of detail and presentation style are the same throughout the document - The material does not contradict the predecessor document - All material in subsequent documents has a basis in the predecessor document - Figure content agrees with the text	High - Material contradicts the predecessor document - Material has no basis in the predecessor document
		Medium Inconsistencies detract from the reader's understanding of the material
		Low - Presentation style is different - Inconsistencies are understandable