

PUBLIC METHODOLOGY

AI Governance Ratings Methodology

A public description of the AIGR assessment architecture, evidence standard, rating lifecycle, governance controls and interpretive boundaries.

METHODOLOGY VERSION

AIGR Public Methodology v1.0

Effective August 2026 · Public methodology. Controlled weights, thresholds and calibration logic are not disclosed.

Evidence-backed governance opinions within a defined scope and date.

01 · METHODOLOGY PURPOSE

Defensibility is created by disciplined governance of the rating.

AIGR treats the rating as a controlled governance opinion. The public methodology explains the decision architecture while reserving proprietary scoring parameters, thresholds and calibration logic.

SCOPE Define the subject Entity, system, lifecycle, jurisdiction and evidence period are fixed before assessment.	EVIDENCE Anchor conclusions Material conclusions require current, attributable and sufficient evidence.	JUDGMENT Control interpretation Exceptions, findings and material decisions are recorded through a repeatable process.	ISSUANCE Separate authority Final rating approval is distinct from routine assessment and remediation activity.	MONITOR Keep it current Material changes, incidents and new evidence can trigger reassessment or rating action.
--	--	---	--	--

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE BOUNDARY

The methodology describes the governance architecture, evidence principles, rating scale, review model and rating actions. Internal control weights, conversion thresholds, calibration procedures and other protected analytical parameters remain controlled.

02 · ANALYTICAL ARCHITECTURE

Two layers support one governance opinion.

Separating the diagnostic measure from the published designation allows detailed internal analysis without presenting the designation as a percentage, probability or credit score.

ANALYTICAL LAYER

Governance Score

0-100 analytical measure used for diagnostics, remediation prioritization and trend analysis.

RATING LAYER

AIGR-100 → AIGR-40

Categorical governance designation for executive interpretation and reporting, plus AIGR-NR where an opinion cannot be supported.

INTERPRETATION PRINCIPLES

PRINCIPLE	PUBLIC INTERPRETATION
Distinct outputs	A strong analytical score does not automatically establish a high-confidence rating.
Evidence-sensitive	Evidence strength and unresolved material conditions affect confidence and rating judgment.
Critical gates	Severe control failures may constrain the outcome regardless of strength elsewhere.
Controlled mapping	Score-to-designation conversion logic is governed internally and is not a public formula.

03 · RATING ARCHITECTURE

Eight domains create a balanced enterprise governance view.

Sector and jurisdiction overlays can change control emphasis and evidence expectations without changing the core architecture.

01 Governance & oversight

Accountability, decision rights, policy, governance bodies and executive visibility.

02 Organizational readiness

Operating model, skills, training, ownership and management capability.

03 Risk management

Classification, impact analysis, risk treatment, exceptions and remediation.

04 Responsible AI practices

Intended use, transparency, fairness, human oversight and recourse.

05 Enterprise architecture

System design, integration, data flows, dependencies and technical control points.

06 Cybersecurity governance

Identity, access, model/data security, monitoring and third-party security.

07 Regulatory alignment

Mapping to applicable obligations, sector requirements and jurisdictional context.

08 Operational governance

Monitoring, change control, incident response, records and evidence continuity.

04 · RATING LIFECYCLE

The rating is a governed decision process, not a one-time questionnaire.

The lifecycle preserves scope discipline, evidence lineage, recorded challenge and ongoing review from intake through monitoring.

01 Intake Define entity, AI system, use case, sector, jurisdiction and assessment boundary.

02 Classify Establish risk context, evidence expectations, materiality and assessment pathway.

03 Assess Evaluate controls, evidence, findings and material deficiencies within scope.

04 Review Challenge evidence quality, interpretation, exceptions, conflicts and unresolved issues.

05 Rate Determine designation, rationale, conditions and decision record through authorized approval.

06 Monitor Track validity, incidents, changes, remediation and triggers for further rating action.

DECISION RECORD

Scope, evidence references, material findings, reviewer challenge, approval decisions, report version and subsequent rating actions are retained as part of the rating file.

05 · AIGR RATING SCALE

Seven categorical designations, plus Not Rated.

The designation summarizes the governance opinion within the stated assessment perimeter. It is not a percentage, probability, credit rating or safety guarantee.

DESIGNATION	MEANING	INTERPRETIVE SIGNAL
AIGR-100	Exemplary governance	Leading maturity
AIGR-90	Advanced governance	High confidence
AIGR-80	Established governance	Established
AIGR-70	Developing governance	Improvement required
AIGR-60	Emerging governance	Material remediation
AIGR-50	Limited governance	High concern
AIGR-40	Critical governance concern	Urgent review
AIGR-NR	Not rated	Insufficient scope, evidence or conditions

HOW TO READ THE SCALE

AIGR-100 through AIGR-40 are proprietary categorical designations. The separate analytical score may support diagnostics, but the published designation is the operative rating outcome. AIGR-NR indicates that the conditions required to form a defensible opinion were not met.

06 · SCOPE DEFINITION

A rating is only meaningful when the rated perimeter is explicit.

Five parameters are fixed before assessment. They appear in the rating record and constrain how the result may be used.

PARAMETER	WHAT IS FIXED	WHY IT MATTERS
ENTITY	Legal entity and accountable business unit	Establishes ownership of controls and remediation.
SYSTEM	Named AI system, version and intended use	Prevents a rating from being transferred to unrelated systems.
LIFECYCLE	Development, deployment or operating stage	Determines the evidence expected at the assessed stage.
JURISDICTION	Territorial and sector regulatory context	Defines which obligations and overlays are relevant.
PERIOD	Evidence window and as-at date	Makes clear that the opinion is point-in-time and evidence-bound.

SCOPE-CHANGE PRINCIPLE

Material changes to the rated entity, system, intended use, lifecycle, jurisdiction or evidence period can invalidate assumptions in the prior opinion and may require reassessment, suspension, withdrawal or a new rating record.

07 · EVIDENCE STANDARD

Evidence must show more than policy intent.

AIGR evaluates whether artifacts are fit to support the conclusion being reached. The evidentiary burden increases with materiality and risk.

01

Relevance

The artifact addresses the control requirement directly.

02

Currency

The artifact reflects the system and period under assessment.

03

Traceability

Owner, date, source and lineage are attributable within the client environment.

04

Sufficiency

The artifact demonstrates operating practice rather than design intent alone.

EVIDENCE DISPOSITION

STATE	INTERPRETATION
Verified	Current, attributable and sufficient support is available for the conclusion.
Qualified / partial	Relevant support exists but limitations reduce evidentiary confidence.
Self-attested	Management assertion is recorded without sufficient independently reviewable support.
Absent / blocker	Required evidence is missing, rejected or a material gate prevents reliance on the control.

08 · INDEPENDENCE & CONFLICTS

Assessment, remediation support and rating issuance are separated.

The methodology is designed to prevent commercial or advisory activity from determining the published rating outcome.

FUNCTION	PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY	DECISION BOUNDARY
Assessment	Collect and test evidence; record findings and control conclusions.	Does not independently approve the final designation.
Remediation support	Help the organization close defined governance gaps.	Separated from rating approval and disclosed where applicable.
Rating issuance	Challenge the assessment record and approve, modify or decline the designation.	Performed by an authorized rating decision function.

CONFLICTS MANAGEMENT

Potential conflicts are identified and recorded at intake. Where separation of function or other controls cannot manage a conflict to the required standard, the engagement can be declined or the outcome designated Not Rated. Commercial terms are not contingent on the rating result.

09 · RATING ACTIONS

An issued rating is a live opinion subject to defined actions.

Each action is recorded against the rating file with its effective date, rationale and supporting evidence.

Affirmation

Periodic review confirms that the current designation remains supported.

Upgrade / downgrade

Material improvement or deterioration changes the designation.

Conditional

A material gate or unresolved condition constrains the rating outcome.

Suspension

The opinion is paused while an incident, material change or evidence-integrity issue is investigated.

Withdrawal

The scope no longer applies, evidence access ends, or continued use of the rating is no longer supportable.

Not Rated

Scope, evidence, independence or assessment conditions do not support an opinion.

10 · CHALLENGE & APPEAL

A rated organization can challenge the record through a controlled process.

Appeal governance protects factual accuracy and consistent application of the methodology without turning the process into negotiation over the framework itself.

GROUND

Factual or methodological

Factual error, material evidence not considered, misapplication of the framework or material scope misstatement.

NOT GROUND

Commercial disagreement

Disagreement with the framework or dissatisfaction with the business consequences of the designation.

PROCESS

Independent review

Written submission, review by decision-makers not responsible for the original outcome, and a recorded determination.

APPEAL EFFECT

The existing designation normally remains in effect during the challenge unless it is suspended for cause. The determination is recorded whether or not the designation changes.

RECORD INTEGRITY

The original assessment, appeal submission, reviewer analysis, decision and effective rating action remain part of the retained rating history to support later review and reconstruction.

11 · METHODOLOGY GOVERNANCE

The framework itself is controlled, versioned and reviewable.

Reproducibility depends on knowing which methodology version, evidence set and decision rules were in force at the time of the rating.

CONTROL	PUBLIC METHODOLOGY REQUIREMENT
Versioning	Every issued rating identifies the applicable methodology version and effective date.
Change control	Material changes to criteria, gates or scale are documented prospectively rather than silently applied to prior ratings.
Calibration	Decision consistency is evaluated across assessments and reviewers to identify interpretation drift.
Confidentiality	Client evidence is tenant-segregated; public outputs do not reproduce confidential evidence unless expressly authorized.
Benchmarks	Cohorts are constructed subject to consent, confidentiality and sufficient comparability.
Records	Assessment evidence, findings, review challenge, approvals and rating actions are retained for governance and appeal.

12 · FRAMEWORK MAPPING & SECTOR OVERLAYS

A common governance architecture can support multiple sector and regulatory contexts.

Framework mappings provide traceability and preparation support; they do not convert an AIGR rating into certification or legal compliance.

LAYER	TREATMENT
Core architecture	Common governance domains, evidence rules, scoring discipline and retained decision records.
Sector overlay	Control emphasis and evidence expectations reflect the material risks of the sector and use case.
Jurisdiction overlay	Applicable legal and regulatory context informs the evidence expected within scope.
Framework mapping	Controls can be cross-referenced to external standards and obligations for readiness and traceability.
Critical gates	Severe weaknesses in safety, privacy, security, accountability or evidence integrity may constrain the outcome.

INTERPRETIVE BOUNDARY

AIGR framework mapping is an analytical crosswalk. It does not replace a statutory conformity assessment, accredited certification, legal analysis, independent audit or regulator-specific procedure where such processes are required.

13 · RATING USE & LIMITATIONS

Stating what the rating does not represent is part of the methodology.

A defensible governance opinion must remain inside the scope and evidentiary limits of the assessment.

BOUNDARY	INTERPRETATION
A rating is	An opinion on governance maturity and evidentiary confidence within a defined perimeter.
A rating is	A point-in-time decision-support signal subject to monitoring and rating actions.
A rating is not	A certification, accreditation, legal opinion, audit opinion or regulatory approval.
A rating is not	A percentage, probability, credit rating, financial recommendation or safety guarantee.
A rating is not	Transferable to other entities, systems, versions, jurisdictions or periods without assessment.

FULL METHODOLOGY PUBLICATION

Public methodology v1.0

This document provides the public governance architecture used to interpret AIGR ratings. Proprietary formulas, control weights, thresholds, calibration logic and confidential client evidence remain controlled.

Research reference

Methodology structure informed by the AIGX Research public methodology. For research context and related publications, visit aigxresearch.com/methodology/.

Disclaimer

AIGR assessments and ratings are governance evaluations and do not constitute certification, legal advice, regulatory approval, investment advice or a guarantee of AI-system compliance, safety or performance.