AEXIA™ SELF-ASSESSMENT SHEET

Maturity summary

Organisation and system portfolio aligned with AEXIA™ Framework V3.1

Organisation		**Period covered**	
Date		**Assessor**	
Framework version	AEXIA™ V3.1	**AEXIA-O grid completed?**	☐ Yes ☐ No

This sheet summarises the results of the AEXIA-O evaluation grid and the AEXIA Cards. It contains no level declared without evidence.

1 The AEXIA™ triptych

A. Published AEXIA-O level (weakest link)	N___ Determining pillar: _____

B. AEXIA-O profile	N0	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	Target
F · Foundations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
A · Architecture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
G · Governance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
C · Compliance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
O · Operations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___
M · Measurement and improvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	N___

C. AEXIA-S distribution	S0	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	Total
All systems											
of which high risk											

The three values are read together: A is published, B steers investment, C steers operational trade-offs. Never communicate an average alone.

2 Alerts from the AEXIA-O × AEXIA-S matrix

Situation	Reading (v3.3)	Count	Systems (codes)
S6-S7 systems in an N0-N1 organisation	Prohibited: the organisation lacks the controls		
S8-S9 systems in an N0-N1 organisation	Major alert: production without governance		
High-risk S8-S9 systems, N2 organisation	High risk: not authorised		
S6+ systems without a documented gate	Missing evidentiary gate		
Systems without an up-to-date AEXIA Card	Insufficient traceability		
Downgrades over the period	Mechanism 3		

3 Key indicators

Indicator	Definition	Value	Target (policy)	Comment
XAI coverage	% of high-risk systems with a validated explanation (ECS, fidelity, Data Owner sign-off)	__ %	≥ 80 % (indicative)	
AEXIA Card coverage	% of inventoried systems with an up-to-date card	__ %		
Explanation time	Average time from request to delivery	__ h	< 24 h (indicative)	
Median ECS	At ε = 0.1 σ, with N, normalisation, confidence interval and controls	__ [__ ; __]	Policy threshold	
Median fidelity	Deletion or insertion measure	__		
XAI incidents	Incidents linked to a missing or unstable explanation	__	< 2 per month (indicative)	
RAD-lite	Calculated below; no normative reading before calibration	__	—	
Gap age	Months since the oldest unresolved gap was opened; average duration	__ / __	—	

3 bis RAD-lite calculation

System	β (1-4)	S_att	S_eff	β × gap	β × S_att
Totals				Σ = ____	Σ = ____
RAD-lite = Σ β × max(0, S_att − S_eff) / Σ β × S_att			____ / ____ = _____		
Share of the largest contributor			_____ % System: _____		

Gap = number of evidentiary gates not passed between S_eff and S_att. β follows regulatory criticality (1–4). S levels are ordinal: read the gap as a number of missing gates.

4 Improvement plan

Pillar or system	Priority action	Owner	Deadline	Target criterion

Next applicable AI Act date	☐2 Dec 2027 (Annex III) ☐2 Aug 2028 (Annex I)	**Semi-annual review of the regulatory section**	____ / ____

Assessor signature		**Date**	

Targets marked "indicative" are organisation policy benchmarks, not prescribed by AEXIA. V3.1 attaches no normative reading to RAD until calibration on real systems is done. AEXIA™ Framework V3.1 · Author: Mohamadou SIDIBE AI BIAIS INITIATIVE CC BY 4.0 V3.1 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23583886