

AI Governance Scoring Methodology

How Revue-ai assesses organisational AI governance maturity

Introduction

Revue-ai's AI governance assessments use a structured methodology to score organisational AI governance maturity across eight dimensions, aligned to four major regulatory and standards frameworks: the EU AI Act, UK DSIT AI Regulation Principles, ISO/IEC 42001, and the NIST AI Risk Management Framework.

Each assessment draws on 50+ specialist AI agents operating within a 12-step analysis pipeline, with every finding evidence-linked and validated through a three-tier quality assurance process. The result is a consulting-grade governance maturity profile — delivered in hours, not weeks.

The 8 Governance Dimensions

1. AI Strategy & Leadership

What it assesses: Whether AI is strategically directed with clear executive ownership, investment priorities, and organisational AI vision.

Key evaluation criteria:

- Board-level AI strategy and roadmap
- Executive sponsorship and accountability
- AI investment governance and prioritisation
- Strategic alignment between AI initiatives and business objectives
- Workforce AI literacy and capability planning

Why it matters: Organisations without strategic AI direction risk fragmented adoption, duplicated investment, and misalignment between AI capabilities and business goals. Regulators increasingly expect demonstrable executive oversight of AI.

2. Risk Management & Assessment

What it assesses: How AI-specific risks are identified, quantified, and managed across the organisation.

Key evaluation criteria:

- AI risk register and risk taxonomy
- Risk appetite statement covering AI-specific risks
- Risk assessment methodology (including high-risk AI classification)
- Incident response and escalation protocols
- Continuous risk monitoring and reassessment processes

Why it matters: AI introduces novel risk categories — from model failure to adversarial attack to reputational harm. Without structured AI risk management, organisations cannot demonstrate due diligence to regulators, insurers, or stakeholders.

3. Regulatory Compliance

What it assesses: Readiness for current and emerging AI regulation across applicable jurisdictions.

Key evaluation criteria:

- EU AI Act risk classification and gap analysis
- UK DSIT AI Regulation Principles adherence assessment
- ISO/IEC 42001 alignment and readiness
- NIST AI RMF mapping and maturity
- Compliance monitoring processes and regulatory horizon scanning

Why it matters: The regulatory landscape for AI is accelerating. The EU AI Act imposes binding obligations with significant penalties. UK and international frameworks set expectations that boards and procurement teams increasingly require evidence of compliance.

4. Data Governance & Privacy

What it assesses: How data used by AI systems is governed, protected, and controlled throughout its lifecycle.

Key evaluation criteria:

- Data classification and sensitivity labelling
- Consent management and lawful basis documentation
- Data lineage and provenance tracking
- Privacy impact assessments (including AI-specific DPIAs)
- Data retention policies and enforcement
- Cross-border data handling and transfer mechanisms

Why it matters: AI systems are only as trustworthy as the data they consume. Poor data governance undermines model reliability, creates privacy risk, and exposes organisations to regulatory action under GDPR and sector-specific data regulations.

5. Ethical AI & Fairness

What it assesses: Whether AI use reflects organisational values, societal expectations, and fairness principles.

Key evaluation criteria:

- Bias detection and mitigation processes
- Fairness metrics definition and monitoring
- Transparency practices and public disclosure
- Explainability standards for AI-driven decisions
- Ethical review processes and governance forums

Why it matters: Bias in AI systems can cause measurable harm to individuals and groups, attract regulatory scrutiny, and erode public trust. Ethical AI practices are increasingly a procurement requirement and a reputational imperative.

6. Accountability & Oversight

What it assesses: Whether clear ownership, escalation, and oversight mechanisms exist for AI systems and their outputs.

Key evaluation criteria:

- RACI matrices for AI decisions and deployments
- Audit trails for AI-driven decisions and actions
- Human-in-the-loop requirements and enforcement
- Accountability frameworks and named responsible individuals
- Governance committee structures and meeting cadence

Why it matters: Without clear accountability, AI failures become organisational failures with no clear path to remediation. Regulators and auditors expect named individuals accountable for AI systems and documented escalation paths.

7. Operational Maturity

What it assesses: How AI systems are operationalised, monitored, maintained, and improved over time.

Key evaluation criteria:

- MLOps practices and deployment pipelines
- Model monitoring and performance tracking
- Drift detection and model retraining processes
- Change management for AI systems
- Documentation standards and knowledge management
- Business continuity planning for AI-dependent processes

Why it matters: Deploying AI is not the hard part — operating it reliably is. Organisations with immature AI operations face model degradation, undetected failures, and an inability to demonstrate ongoing compliance.

8. Third-Party AI Management

What it assesses: How vendor, partner, and supply-chain AI is assessed, governed, and monitored.

Key evaluation criteria:

- Vendor AI due diligence processes
- Contractual AI provisions and obligations
- Third-party risk assessments for AI components
- Supply chain AI visibility and inventory

- SLA compliance monitoring for AI services

Why it matters: Most organisations use third-party AI — often without full visibility into how it operates. The EU AI Act extends obligations across the AI value chain. Organisations must demonstrate governance over AI they deploy, regardless of who built it.

Framework Alignment

Each governance dimension maps to specific requirements across the four frameworks assessed:

Dimension	EU AI Act	UK DSIT Principles	ISO/IEC 42001	NIST AI RMF
AI Strategy & Leadership	Art. 9 (Risk Management System), Art. 17 (Quality Management)	Principle: Appropriate Transparency	Clause 5 (Leadership), Clause 6 (Planning)	Govern 1.0, Govern 2.0
Risk Management & Assessment	Art. 9 (Risk Management), Art. 15 (Accuracy, Robustness, Cybersecurity)	Principle: Safety, Security and Robustness	Clause 6.1 (Risk Assessment), Annex B	Map 1.0–5.0, Govern 3.0
Regulatory Compliance	Art. 6 (Classification), Art. 43 (Conformity Assessment)	Principle: Contestability and Redress	Clause 4 (Context), Clause 9 (Evaluation)	Govern 1.0, Govern 6.0
Data Governance & Privacy	Art. 10 (Data Governance), Art. 12 (Record-keeping)	Principle: Fairness	Clause 7.5 (Documented Information), Annex A	Map 2.0, Measure 2.0
Ethical AI & Fairness	Art. 10(2)(f) (Bias Examination), Art. 13 (Transparency)	Principle: Fairness; Principle: Appropriate Transparency	Annex A (AI Controls), Clause 10 (Improvement)	Map 2.0, Measure 2.0–3.0
Accountability & Oversight	Art. 14 (Human Oversight), Art. 26 (Obligations of Deployers)	Principle: Accountability and Governance	Clause 5.3 (Roles and Responsibilities)	Govern 2.0, Govern 5.0
Operational Maturity	Art. 9(9) (Post-market Monitoring), Art. 72 (Post-market Monitoring)	Principle: Safety, Security and Robustness	Clause 8 (Operation), Clause 10 (Improvement)	Manage 1.0–4.0
Third-Party AI Management	Art. 25 (Obligations along the AI Value Chain)	Principle: Accountability and Governance	Annex A (Supplier Controls)	Govern 4.0, Govern 6.0

Scoring Methodology

Dimension Scoring

- Each dimension is scored **0–100** based on weighted evaluation criteria
- Criteria are weighted by regulatory significance and organisational impact
- Every score is linked to specific evidence extracted from source data

Composite Score

- A **composite governance maturity score (0–100)** is calculated across all eight dimensions
- Dimension weights reflect regulatory priority and risk exposure

Maturity Levels

Level	Score Range	Description
Critical	0–20	Minimal or no governance structures in place. Significant regulatory and operational risk.
Developing	21–40	Early-stage governance. Some processes exist but are inconsistent or undocumented.
Established	41–60	Governance structures in place with documented processes. Gaps remain in coverage or enforcement.
Advanced	61–80	Mature governance with consistent enforcement, monitoring, and continuous improvement.
Leading	81–100	Best-in-class governance. Proactive, embedded across the organisation, and externally validated.

Gap Analysis

- Gap analysis highlights the distance between current state and target maturity for each dimension
- Gaps are mapped to specific framework requirements
- A **prioritised remediation roadmap** ranks gaps by regulatory risk, organisational impact, and implementation effort

Quality Assurance

Every Revue-ai governance assessment passes through a three-tier validation process:

- **Automated validation** — Structural checks, completeness verification, scoring consistency, and evidence linking
- **Cross-referencing** — Findings validated across multiple data points and framework requirements
- **Consistency verification** — Scores, narratives, and recommendations checked for internal coherence

Reports must meet an **80/100 consulting-grade quality threshold** before delivery. A full evidence trail links every finding, score, and recommendation to source data.

Output

AI Governance Readiness Assessment (15–20 pages)

- Executive summary with composite maturity score
- Dimension-by-dimension scoring with evidence
- Framework alignment analysis
- Key findings and critical gaps
- Prioritised remediation roadmap
- Board-ready format

AI Risk Intelligence Report (25–30 pages)

- Everything in the Readiness Assessment, plus:
- Deep-dive risk analysis per dimension
- Detailed framework compliance mapping
- Scenario-based risk modelling
- Extended remediation roadmap with effort estimates
- Benchmarking against industry maturity norms

Both reports are delivered in board-ready format, designed to support executive decision-making, regulatory submissions, and audit evidence.

Revue-ai Ltd | revue-ai.com | Available on Microsoft Azure Marketplace