AI Assurance Receipts Pack™

Printable Toolkit

12 practical instruments for defensible AI risk acceptance

For CISO • CRO • CAE • Head of AI Governance • GRC Director

The Decision Layer
Navigate complexity. Decide with confidence.

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

How to use this toolkit

One live AI decision. One evidence standard. One explicit risk acceptance. Do not complete the forms as paperwork. Use them to decide what must be proven before risk can be accepted.

- DEFINE - State the decision and the risk being accepted.
- TIER - Determine how much assurance the consequence requires.
- REQUIRE - Specify mandatory evidence before approval.
- COLLECT - Assign producers, owners and verifiers.
- CHALLENGE - Test coverage, currency, credibility, context, completeness and traceability.
- GAP - Make missing evidence visible and decision-relevant.
- ACCEPT - Record who accepts residual uncertainty and under what conditions.
- REVALIDATE - Define expiry and material-change triggers.

The core rule: A document is not automatically evidence. Evidence is only useful when it is sufficient for the decision being made.

1. AI Evidence Requirement Canvas™

Define what the evidence must support before accepting the risk.

AI system / use case	
Decision required	
Risk being accepted	
Decision owner	
Risk owner	
Risk acceptor	
Governance tier	
Decision deadline	
MINIMUM EVIDENCE REQUIREMENT	
Critical condition to demonstrate	
Evidence scope	
Required source / producer	
Required verifier	
Maximum evidence age	
Material change triggers	
Decision-blocking if missing?	Yes / No / Conditional

Requirement statement: Before [decision] may be approved, evidence must demonstrate that [critical condition], covering [scope], produced or verified by [authority], no older than [period], and regenerated following [material change].

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

2. 6C Evidence Quality Scorecard™

Challenge whether evidence is good enough for the decision, not merely present.

6C	1 - Weak	2 - Adequate	3 - Strong	Score
Coverage	Does not address material risk	Partly addresses risk	Directly demonstrates required condition	
Currency	Stale or change-affected	Within age threshold	Current and post-change	
Credibility	Weak / self-asserted source	Competent source	Independent / authoritative source	
Context	Different system / environment	Mostly comparable	Exact system, version and context	
Completeness	Material omissions	Minor known gaps	Assumptions and limits disclosed	
Chain of Evidence	Not traceable	Partly traceable	Fully traceable to source	
Total score				
Average score				
Quality rating	Strong / Adequate / Weak			
Decision implication				

RATIONALE / CHALLENGE NOTES

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

3. Six AI Assurance Receipts™

Define the minimum evidence across the six categories that matter most to a material AI decision.

Receipt	Core question	Minimum evidence	Status
1. Purpose & Authority	Should this AI capability exist and is its authority legitimate?	Purpose; intended/prohibited use; owner; authority limits; decision rights	
2. Data & Inputs	Can we trust the data and inputs sufficiently?	Provenance; permissions; quality; lineage; sensitivity; representativeness	
3. Model & Behaviour	Does the AI perform reliably enough?	Performance; thresholds; failure modes; robustness; limitations; fairness where relevant	
4. Security & Resilience	Can it operate within authority without unacceptable exposure?	Permissions; prompt/agent security; logging; supplier controls; incident response; recovery	
5. Human Oversight	Can humans meaningfully control the consequences?	Intervention; override; escalation; competence; accountability	
6. Monitoring & Reopening	How will we know when today's assurance is no longer enough?	Metrics; thresholds; drift; incidents; changes; expiry; reassessment triggers	
Valid receipts			
Conditional receipts			
Missing receipts			
Overall evidence state			

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

4. Minimum Evidence Matrix™

Scale assurance expectations to the consequence and authority of the AI decision.

Evidence requirement	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
Approved business purpose	M	M	M	M
Intended / prohibited use	M	M	M	M
AI authority boundaries	C	M	M	M
Data provenance & lineage	S	C	M	M
Privacy / lawful-use assessment	C	C	M	M
Model performance validation	C	M	M	M
Edge-case / failure testing	S	C	M	M
Independent security testing	S	C	M	M
Human override testing	C	M	M	M
Supplier assurance	S	C	M	M
Resilience / recovery testing	S	C	C	M
Monitoring & reopening triggers	C	M	M	M
Independent assurance	S	S	C	M

M = Mandatory C = Conditional S = Supporting

ORGANISATION-SPECIFIC CHANGES

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

5. Evidence Accountability Map™

Separate evidence production from ownership, verification, challenge and risk acceptance.

Evidence item	Producer	Owner	Verifier	Challenger	Risk acceptor

INDEPENDENCE CHALLENGE	
Is self-attestation sufficient?	
Does second line need to challenge?	
Does Internal Audit need involvement?	
Is external assurance necessary?	
Can producer and risk acceptor be the same person?	

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

6. AI Evidence Gap Register™

Make missing evidence visible and connect each gap to its decision impact.

Gap	Why it matters	Interim control	Owner	Due	Decision impact
Open gaps					
High / critical gaps					
Decision-blocking gaps					
Suggested state			Proceed / Proceed with Conditions / Pause / Escalate		

A missing document is not automatically a blocker. A missing fact that could change the risk decision often is.

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

7. Evidence Currency Register™

Track the three clocks of evidence: calendar age, system change and context change.

Evidence	Produced	Valid until	System / model	System change?	Context change?	Current?

Expiry rule: Evidence remains valid for [period], provided no material change occurs to the model, data, prompts, tools, permissions, use case, user population, jurisdiction, supplier or operating environment. Any material change requires reassessment regardless of calendar expiry.

REASSESSMENT ACTIONS

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

8. Conditional Evidence Acceptance Record™

Use when an evidence gap is bounded, temporary and explicitly accepted by an authorised person.

AI system / decision	
Evidence gap	
Why evidence is missing	
Uncertainty created	
Potential consequence	
Compensating control	
Why the control is sufficient temporarily	
Condition owner	
Required evidence due date	
Authority accepting the gap	
Decision state	Proceed with Conditions / Pause / Escalate
Automatic escalation if overdue?	

The evidence gap is accepted temporarily by [authority] until [date], subject to [conditions]. If the required evidence is not produced, or the compensating control fails, the decision must be paused or escalated.

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

9. Evidence-to-Risk Decision Sheet™

Convert assurance work into an explicit statement of what is known, unknown and still being accepted.

WHAT WE KNOW

WHAT WE DO NOT KNOW

EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORTS THE DECISION

EVIDENCE STILL MISSING

RESIDUAL RISK

Recommended state	
Risk owner	
Risk acceptor	
Conditions	
Reassessment date	

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

10. AI Risk Acceptance Record™

Record the residual risk, evidence relied upon, authority, conditions and expiry.

AI system	
Decision	
Governance tier	
Residual risk accepted	
Evidence relied upon	
Material evidence gaps	
Conditions	
Risk owner	
Risk acceptor	
Acceptance date	
Valid until	
Reopening triggers	
Decision state	Proceed / Proceed with Conditions / Pause / Escalate

Risk acceptance statement: Based on the evidence available as of [date], the residual risk associated with [AI system] is accepted by [authority], subject to [conditions] and automatic reconsideration upon [triggers].

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

11. 30-Minute Evidence Challenge™

Run a disciplined challenge before the formal decision meeting.

Minutes	Challenge	Output	Complete?
5	What decision and risk are we supporting?	One-sentence decision and risk statement	
5	What evidence is mandatory?	Minimum evidence list	
5	What is missing?	Decision-relevant gaps	
5	What assumptions sit inside the evidence?	Critical assumptions and limitations	
5	What evidence is stale or scope-mismatched?	Evidence to refresh or reject	
5	Proceed, condition, pause or escalate?	Recommended decision state	

TEN CHALLENGE QUESTIONS

- What decision does this evidence support?
- What risk are we accepting?
- What evidence is mandatory?
- What is missing?
- What has changed since testing?
- What evidence came from the supplier?
- What has been independently verified?
- What assumptions could invalidate the conclusion?
- What evidence would we wish we had after an incident?
- What would cause us to reopen the decision?

Recommended state	
Challenge lead	
Date	

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

12. AI Assurance Decision Pack™

Assemble one concise pack that a decision-maker can actually use.

Section	Decision-ready content
1. Decision statement	
2. Governance tier	
3. Six Assurance Receipts summary	
4. Evidence Quality Score	
5. Evidence Gap summary	
6. Evidence Accountability	
7. Evidence Currency	
8. Residual Risk summary	
9. Conditions	
10. Risk Acceptance	
11. Decision expiry	
12. Reopening triggers	
Recommended state	
Decision owner	
Risk acceptor	
Decision date	
Valid until	
Pack owner	

Target: 5-10 pages for a material AI decision. The assurance pack should help someone decide, not prove how much work the team performed.

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE

Master AI Assurance Checklist™

Section	Check	Done	Notes
DECISION	Decision defined	☐	
DECISION	Risk identified	☐	
DECISION	Risk acceptor known	☐	
EVIDENCE	Six receipts considered	☐	
EVIDENCE	Mandatory evidence identified	☐	
EVIDENCE	Sources documented	☐	
EVIDENCE	Scope confirmed	☐	
QUALITY	Coverage adequate	☐	
QUALITY	Evidence current	☐	
QUALITY	Source credible	☐	
QUALITY	System-specific	☐	
QUALITY	Traceable	☐	
ACCOUNTABILITY	Producer known	☐	
ACCOUNTABILITY	Owner known	☐	
ACCOUNTABILITY	Verifier known	☐	
ACCOUNTABILITY	Challenger known	☐	
GAPS	Missing evidence recorded	☐	
GAPS	Decision impact assessed	☐	
GAPS	Conditions assigned	☐	
ACCEPTANCE	Residual risk explicit	☐	
ACCEPTANCE	Authority confirmed	☐	
ACCEPTANCE	Decision documented	☐	
REVALIDATION	Expiry set	☐	
REVALIDATION	Material changes defined	☐	
REVALIDATION	Reopening triggers set	☐	

Final question: If this AI decision were challenged six months from now, could you show exactly what evidence justified the risk acceptance and what would make that acceptance invalid?

Maman Ibrahim – ICF Accredited Coach – Fellow ISRM – Fellow IoCR – MIET – ChCSP – CISSP – CISA – CRISC – CDPSE

GINKGO RESILIENCE LTD - 3RD FLOOR, 86-90 PAUL STREET - LONDON -ENGLAND - EC2A 4NE