

ISO/IEC 42001 — AI Management System

ISO/IEC 42001

ISO/IEC 42001 is the first management-system standard for AI. This pack tracks the control objectives most relevant to model inventory, evidence, and accountability — the parts Beacon was built to support.

AUTHORITY	International Organization for Standardization
PUBLICATION	ISO/IEC 42001:2023
VERSION	1.0.0 · License: Apache-2.0
URL	https://www.iso.org/standard/81230.html

About this pack

This is the ISO/IEC 42001 pack from the AIGovOps Beacon audit framework. Walk it with your auditor, your CISO, and the engineer who actually ships the system. It is short on purpose.

Items marked **auto** are computed by Beacon from signed receipts and the model inventory — you do not have to hand-evidence them, the platform does. Items without that badge require a human attestation: a person reads the prompt, checks the evidence is real, and ticks a box. Beacon records the attestation as a signed receipt with `event_type attestation`.

The severity label tells you how much weight an item carries in the production-readiness gate. Critical items can fail a release on their own. Lower-severity items contribute to a weighted score.

This pack is released under the Apache License 2.0. The underlying source publication retains its own copyright; consult it for normative language.

Checklist — Functions

CTX

Context of the organization

Clause 4 — context, interested parties, scope.

CTX-4.1

MEDIUM

Has the organization determined external and internal issues relevant to its AI management system?

Evidence `context_analysis_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

CTX-4.2

MEDIUM

Have interested parties relevant to the AIMS been identified?

Evidence `stakeholder_register_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

CTX-4.3

HIGH

Is the scope of the AIMS documented and current?

Evidence `aims_scope_doc` Gate `aims_scope_present`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

LEAD

Leadership

Clause 5 — leadership and commitment, policy, roles.

LEAD-5.1

CRITICAL

Does top management demonstrate leadership and commitment to the AIMS through a documented policy?

Evidence `ai_policy_signed_uri` Gate `governance_policy_present`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

LEAD-5.2

HIGH

Are AI roles, responsibilities, and authorities assigned and communicated?

Evidence `raci_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

PLAN

Planning

Clause 6 — risks, opportunities, objectives, AI system impact assessment.

PLAN-6.1

HIGH

Are risks and opportunities for the AIMS identified and addressed?

Evidence `risk_register_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

PLAN-6.2

CRITICAL

Is an AI system impact assessment performed for each system?

Evidence `aisia_uri` Gate `aisia_present`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

PLAN-6.3

MEDIUM

Are AI objectives documented, measurable, and reviewed?

Evidence `objectives_doc`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

SUP

Support

Clause 7 — resources, competence, awareness, documented information.

SUP-7.1

MEDIUM

Is competence required for AI roles defined and recorded?

Evidence `competence_matrix_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

SUP-7.2

MEDIUM

Is documented information controlled (versioned, access- managed, retention-managed)?

Evidence `doc_control_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP

Operation

Clause 8 and Annex A — operational planning and control.

OP-A.2.2

MEDIUM

Are AI policies aligned with organizational objectives?

Evidence `policy_alignment_review`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.3.2

HIGH

Are processes for reporting concerns about AI systems established (whistleblowing, incident reporting)?

Evidence `concerns_channel_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.4.2

HIGH

AUTO

Are AI system resources (data, tooling, compute, human) documented?

Evidence `resources_inventory_uri` Gate `inventory_complete`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.5.2

CRITICAL

Is an AI system impact assessment process defined and used?

Evidence `aisia_process_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.6.1

MEDIUM

Are objectives for responsible development of AI systems established?

Evidence `responsible_dev_charter`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.6.2

HIGH

Are AI system requirements and specifications documented for each system in scope?

Evidence model_card_uri Gate model_card_present

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.7.2

HIGH

Are data-quality requirements for AI systems documented?

Evidence data_quality_spec

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.7.3

HIGH

Is data provenance recorded?

Evidence data_lineage_uri

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.8.2

HIGH

Is information to interested parties about AI systems provided (instructions, intended use, limitations)?

Evidence instructions_uri

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.9.2

MEDIUM

Are processes for responsible use of AI systems established (acceptable-use policy)?

Evidence aup_uri

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.9.3

CRITICAL

Are objectives for human oversight of AI systems documented?

Evidence oversight_design_uri Gate human_oversight_defined

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

OP-A.10.2

HIGH

Are third-party AI system relationships managed (vendor review, contractual controls)?

Evidence vendor_review_uri

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

EVAL

Performance evaluation

Clause 9 — monitoring, internal audit, management review.

EVAL-9.1

HIGH

AUTO

Are monitoring, measurement, analysis, and evaluation of the AIMS performed at planned intervals?

Evidence monitoring_dashboard_uri Gate monitoring_active

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

EVAL-9.2

HIGH

Are internal audits of the AIMS conducted at planned intervals?

Evidence internal_audit_log

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

EVAL-9.3

MEDIUM

Are management reviews of the AIMS conducted and recorded?

Evidence `mgmt_review_minutes`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

IMP

Improvement

Clause 10 — nonconformity, corrective action, continual improvement.

IMP-10.1

HIGH

Are nonconformities recorded with corrective actions and effectiveness reviews?

Evidence `capa_log_uri`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

IMP-10.2

LOW

Is continual improvement of the AIMS demonstrated?

Evidence `improvement_log`

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Scoring

Scoring:

- PASS threshold defaults to 0.85 for self-assessment; certification bodies will apply their own.
- This pack does not certify. It produces evidence that a certifier can use, signed and timestamped via Beacon receipts.