Organisational maturity evaluation grid

6 pillars × 6 levels verifiable criteria with evidence aligned with AEXIA™ Framework V3.1

Organisation		**Scope assessed**	
Assessment date		**Framework version**	AEXIA™ V3.1
Assessor		**Second assessor (recommended)**	

How to use the grid

1. A criterion is met only if evidenced. Cite the evidence (document, date, version): AEXIA recognises no level by mere declaration.
2. A level is reached if all its criteria are met AND all those of lower levels. A partially met criterion counts as not met. N0 is the default level.
3. The published AEXIA-O level is that of the weakest pillar (weakest link). The six-pillar profile is for internal steering.
4. Have each pillar rated by two independent people if the assessment is communicated externally; record disagreements.

Level	Name	Characteristic signal (v3.3)
N0	Non-existent	No explainability practice. Total black box.
N1	Initial	Ad hoc, reactive, undocumented practices.
N2	Defined	Written policy, selected methods, assigned roles.
N3	Managed	Monitored indicators, regular internal audit, advanced AI Act compliance.
N4	Advanced	DCME deployed, ECS measured, RAD calculated. Automation.
N5	Excellence	International reference, contribution to ISO standards.

Pillar F Foundations : Mathematical and theoretical foundations (SHAP, LIME, DCME)

ID	Criterion	Met?	Evidence (document, date, version)
N1 · Initial			
F1.1	At least one XAI method (SHAP or LIME) used on a real case, even if undocumented	☐Yes ☐No	
N2 · Defined			
F2.1	XAI method selected and documented	☐Yes ☐No	
F2.2	XAI glossary validated by the DGC	☐Yes ☐No	
N3 · Managed			
F3.1	XAI methods benchmarked	☐Yes ☐No	
F3.2	Method / model selection matrix in place	☐Yes ☐No	
F3.3	Role-based training (CDO, data scientist, data steward, DPO, business) delivered	☐Yes ☐No	
N4 · Advanced			
F4.1	DCME deployed: causal graph published and justified, graph sensitivity analysis	☐Yes ☐No	
F4.2	Explanation quality standards formalised (fidelity, robustness, readability, reproducibility, defensibility)	☐Yes ☐No	
N5 · Excellence			
F5.1	Active contribution to XAI mathematical standards (ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 42)	☐Yes ☐No	

Assigned level	☐N0 ☐N1 ☐N2 ☐N3 ☐N4 ☐N5	**First unmet criterion**	
Rationale		**Assessor disagreement**	☐No ☐Yes:

Reminder: N0 is assigned when the N1 criterion is not met.

Pillar A Architecture : Technical and organisational explainability infrastructure

ID	Criterion	Met?	Evidence (document, date, version)
N1 · Initial			
A1.1	XAI tools installed, without integration	☐Yes ☐No	
A1.2	Rudimentary registry (spreadsheet or equivalent)	☐Yes ☐No	
N2 · Defined			
A2.1	XAI pipeline integrated into MLOps	☐Yes ☐No	
A2.2	XAI data catalogue documented	☐Yes ☐No	
N3 · Managed			
A3.1	XAI data catalogue operational	☐Yes ☐No	
A3.2	Explanation registry active	☐Yes ☐No	
A3.3	Explanation access API	☐Yes ☐No	
N4 · Advanced			

A4.1	Automated multi-scale architecture	☐Yes ☐No	
A4.2	Automatic AEXIA gate before production	☐Yes ☐No	
N5 · Excellence			
A5.1	XAI architecture published as a sector or academic reference	☐Yes ☐No	

Assigned level	☐N0 ☐N1 ☐N2 ☐N3 ☐N4 ☐N5	**First unmet criterion**	
Rationale		**Assessor disagreement**	☐No ☐Yes:

Pillar G Governance : Roles, responsibilities, policies and control

ID	Criterion	Met?	Evidence (document, date, version)
N1 · Initial			
G1.1	XAI role informally assigned, without mandate	☐Yes ☐No	
N2 · Defined			
G2.1	XAI charter written and signed	☐Yes ☐No	
G2.2	XAI RACI validated	☐Yes ☐No	
G2.3	DGC (governance committee) created	☐Yes ☐No	
N3 · Managed			
G3.1	DGC meets at least quarterly (minutes)	☐Yes ☐No	
G3.2	XAI policies applied and monitored	☐Yes ☐No	
N4 · Advanced			
G4.1	Gates decided by the prescribed bodies (systemic governance)	☐Yes ☐No	
G4.2	RAD-lite and gap age calculated and steered	☐Yes ☐No	
N5 · Excellence			
G5.1	International XAI governance reference; contribution to ISO/IEC standards	☐Yes ☐No	

Assigned level	☐N0 ☐N1 ☐N2 ☐N3 ☐N4 ☐N5	**First unmet criterion**	
Rationale		**Assessor disagreement**	☐No ☐Yes:

Pillar C Compliance · Regulation, ethics and audit

ID	Criterion	Met?	Evidence (document, date, version)
N1 · Initial			
C1.1	Partial awareness of the AI Act and GDPR (art. 22)	☐Yes ☐No	
N2 · Defined			
C2.1	AI risk register established	☐Yes ☐No	
C2.2	AI Act classification of each inventoried system	☐Yes ☐No	
C2.3	GDPR / AI Act mapping completed	☐Yes ☐No	
N3 · Managed			
C3.1	Annual compliance audit	☐Yes ☐No	
C3.2	AI Act compliance evidenced by documents for high-risk systems	☐Yes ☐No	
N4 · Advanced			
C4.1	Automated compliance (controls built into the pipeline)	☐Yes ☐No	
C4.2	Continuous regulatory watch (at least semi-annual review)	☐Yes ☐No	
N5 · Excellence			
C5.1	Participation in European standardisation work (CEN/CENELEC, ETSI)	☐Yes ☐No	

Assigned level	☐N0 ☐N1 ☐N2 ☐N3 ☐N4 ☐N5	**First unmet criterion**	
Rationale		**Assessor disagreement**	☐No ☐Yes:

Pillar O Operations · Operational excellence and project management

ID	Criterion	Met?	Evidence (document, date, version)
N1 · Initial			
O1.1	Explanations provided on request, without formal procedure	☐Yes ☐No	
N2 · Defined			
O2.1	XAI sprints (Agile) in place	☐Yes ☐No	
O2.2	XAI runbook written	☐Yes ☐No	
N3 · Managed			
O3.1	Explanation service levels defined and monitored	☐Yes ☐No	
O3.2	Operational XAI indicators monitored	☐Yes ☐No	
N4 · Advanced			
O4.1	Full ITIL management of XAI (incidents, service levels, knowledge base)	☐Yes ☐No	
O4.2	Lean Six Sigma applied to explanation production	☐Yes ☐No	

N5 · Excellence			
O5.1	Recognised XAI centre of excellence	☐Yes ☐No	

Assigned level	☐N0 ☐N1 ☐N2 ☐N3 ☐N4 ☐N5	**First unmet criterion**	
Rationale		**Assessor disagreement**	☐No ☐Yes:

Pillar M Measurement and improvement · Evaluation, measurement and continuous improvement

ID	Criterion	Met?	Evidence (document, date, version)
N1 · Initial			
M1.1	Informal self-assessment	☐Yes ☐No	
N2 · Defined			
M2.1	AEXIA™ score established at least annually, with evidence	☐Yes ☐No	
N3 · Managed			
M3.1	Quarterly XAI dashboard	☐Yes ☐No	
M3.2	Indicators monitored and communicated	☐Yes ☐No	
N4 · Advanced			
M4.1	ECS measured per the publication rules (ε, N, normalisation, fidelity, controls, confidence interval)	☐Yes ☐No	
M4.2	Gap prediction and automated improvement plans	☐Yes ☐No	
N5 · Excellence			
M5.1	Sector benchmark published	☐Yes ☐No	
M5.2	Academic publication of results	☐Yes ☐No	

Assigned level	☐N0 ☐N1 ☐N2 ☐N3 ☐N4 ☐N5	**First unmet criterion**	
Rationale		**Assessor disagreement**	☐No ☐Yes:

Summary: the AEXIA™ triptych

Pillar (AEXIA-O profile)	N0	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	Assigned level
F · Foundations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
A · Architecture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
G · Governance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
C · Compliance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
O · Operations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
M · Measurement and improvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___

Published AEXIA-O level (weakest link)	N___ Determining pillar: _____
AEXIA-S distribution	See the self-assessment sheet, section 2

Internal weighted score (optional, never published alone)

Pillar	Weight w	Level n (0–5)	Contribution w × n
F · Foundations	20 %		
A · Architecture	15 %		
G · Governance	20 %		
C · Compliance	20 %		
O · Operations	15 %		
M · Measurement and improvement	10 %		
Weighted score = Σ w × n	100 %		

This score is an internal steering aid: it does not replace the published level. Example: a Compliance pillar at N0 with the other five at N4 gives 3.2 (displayed "Managed") although legal exposure is direct; the weakest link shows N0.

Improvement plan

Pillar to strengthen	Priority action (target criterion)	Owner	Deadline

Assessor signature		**Date**	
Second assessor signature		**Date**	

AEXIA™ Framework V3.1 Author: Mohamadou SIDIBE AI BIAIS INITIATIVE CC BY 4.0 licence V3.1 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23583886