

MANDATE *Suite*

Product Catalogue

42


Five Components.
Thirteen Products.

The MANDATE Suite has five components: two peer governance frameworks — the Enterprise Decision Systems Governance Framework (EDS GF) and the Responsible AI Framework (RAF) — a management system (AIMS), a compliance enhancement (EUAE), and a structural extension (GGF). Each delivers one or more named products. A product is a bounded bundle of instruments addressing one governance problem for one buyer, and every instrument sets obligations with a named owner, defined thresholds, escalation routes and breach classifications. Nothing in the suite is aspirational. Products can be taken singly or as a whole, are licensed as editable templates, and are tailored to an organisation through advisory engagement. MANDATE is the prerequisite for every other EDS GF product: it establishes the Board authority the rest derive from.

5	13	66	26
COMPONENTS	PRODUCTS	NORMATIVE INSTRUMENTS	BOARD KRIS

The Product Map — What Has to Come First

A product is a bounded bundle of instruments solving one governance problem for one buyer.



Eight further products, each a bounded bundle addressing one governance problem for one buyer. Implemented individually or together.

Thirteen products across five frameworks. MANDATE establishes the Board authority from which every other product in its framework derives its mandate.

COMPONENT 01 · 32 INSTRUMENTS


EDS Governance Framework.

Nine products. One constitutional architecture.

The Enterprise Decision Systems Governance Framework governs how the Board delegates machine decision authority to the system. It sets the constitutional ceiling on aggregate autonomous authority, per-system authority limits, the five-level autonomy classification, the eight-stage Board Governance Control Loop, and operational controls that enforce Board intent at the execution boundary. Every instrument in every other EDS GF product derives its governance mandate from the constitutional layer established by MANDATE — Product 1.

Autonomy Levels and Delegation Tiers

Governance intensity is set by the authority a system holds, not by the technology it uses.



MANDATE *Constitutional governance* Primary buyer: Board · CEO · CRO GD-EDS-001 · BR-EDS Series · BRD-EDS-001/002 · ACP-EDS-001 · STR-EDS-001 · POL-EDS-001/002 · RTX-EDS-001	Board authority, risk appetite, accountability structure, and the Governance Doctrine that every downstream product must satisfy. Six constitutional resolutions adopted at Full Board level. Prerequisite for all other EDS GF products.
VANTAGE *Pre-deployment certification* Primary buyer: CAIO · CRO · Internal Audit STD-EDS-004 · FRM-EDS-001 · FRM-EDS-004 · STD-EDS-001 · STD-EDS-003	Pre-deployment readiness scoring, Autonomous Decision Authority Exposure (ADAE) assessment, Governance Maturity Index (GMI) certification process, AI evaluation standard, and agent design behaviour standards. The gate that every system must pass before it reaches production.
ARGUS *Operationalisation* Primary buyer: CAIO · CTO MAN-EDS-001 · FRM-EDS-002 · POL-EDS-004 · FRM-EDS-003 · STD-EDS-008	Full system lifecycle governance: AI Quality Assurance (QA) gate, Human-on-the-Loop (HOTL) certification programme, change and release controls, and supplier and third-party AI governance. The operational backbone that governs every system from deployment to decommissioning.
LEDGER *Agent registry and digital workforce map* Primary buyer: CAIO · HR · Procurement REG-EDS-001 · STD-EDS-007 · POL-EDS-005	The Autonomy Register as the authoritative live record of every production AI system — ADAE scores, autonomy levels, HOTL assignments, Non-Human Identity (NHI) identifiers, and governance status. The data foundation that every other governance mechanism depends on.
SENTINEL *Board monitoring and KRI early warning* Primary buyer: Board · BRC · CRO STD-EDS-002 · STD-EDS-009 · RPT-EDS-001	22 Key Risk Indicators (KRIs) across 13 governance domains, reported quarterly to the Board Risk Committee alongside the four Responsible AI Framework KRIs that AXIOM delivers. Every KRI has a defined threshold, a red, amber, green status, and a mandatory escalation pathway. The visibility mechanism that keeps the Board governing in real time.
CIRCUIT *Incident response and escalation* Primary buyer: CAIO · CRO · Legal POL-EDS-003 · BCP-EDS-001	AI incident management policy covering severity classification, kill-switch activation, escalation pathways, and forensic investigation protocols. The response mechanism for when governance controls are tested by real events.
CHRONICLE *Decision audit trail and regulatory explainability* Primary buyer: General Counsel · Compliance · Regulators STD-EDS-006 · STD-EDS-005 · STR-EDS-002	Write-before-execute logging standard (24-field mandatory schema, 7-year retention, cryptographic integrity), model and prompt versioning, and the regulatory defensibility evidence pack. The audit trail that makes governance legally defensible.

CHARTER *Executive accountability and remuneration linkage* Primary buyer: CEO · Board · People Committee CHR-EDS-001 · EDU-EDS-001 · BRD-EDS-002	CAIO Charter establishing the role mandate, authority, and independence obligations. Board education brief. Director accountability playbook linking governance performance to remuneration outcomes. The accountability mechanism that makes governance personally consequential.
CONTINUITY *AI business continuity and governance resilience* Primary buyer: COO · CRO · CAIO BCP-EDS-001	AI-specific business continuity plan: governance resilience under system failure, key person dependency management, continuity of oversight arrangements, and the CAIO vacancy protocol. The resilience mechanism that ensures governance survives adverse conditions.

COMPONENT 02 · 13 INSTRUMENTS

Responsible AI Framework.

One product. The ethical boundary on machine authority.

The Responsible AI Framework governs the ethical and rights dimensions of AI deployment. Where the EDS GF governs how much machine authority exists and whether it remains admissible, the RAF governs what that authority may be used for—establishing measurable, binding fairness thresholds; individual rights obligations that cannot be contracted away; and boundaries on prohibited use that no commercial pressure may override. The RAF operates as a constitutional peer to the EDS GF. Neither is subordinate to the other, and both must be satisfied concurrently for every AI system in scope.

AXIOM *Responsible AI governance* Primary buyer: CAIO · CRO · General Counsel · Compliance GD-RAF-001 · BR-RAF-001 · POL-RAF-001/002/003 · STD-RAF-001/002/003/004 · FRM-RAF-001/002 · REG-RAF-001/002	The complete responsible AI governance instrument set: the RAF Governance Doctrine and Board Resolution; three policies covering responsible AI, fairness and bias governance, and AI data governance; four standards covering bias assessment, transparency and explainability, data provenance and quality, and the specification of the four RAF Key Risk Indicators reported to the Board; two frameworks covering responsible use assessment and affected individual rights; and two live operational registers covering responsible use records and RAF nonconformity and corrective and preventive action (CAPA) tracking. AXIOM establishes the ethical boundaries within which all machine authority operates.

> *AXIOM is not a compliance instrument for responsible AI principles. It is the governance architecture that makes those principles operationally enforceable — with measurable thresholds, Board-level accountability, and mandatory escalation pathways when those thresholds are breached.*

COMPONENT 03 · 12 INSTRUMENTS

AI Management System.

One product. The ISO/IEC 42001:2023 certification pathway.

The AI Management System provides the management system envelope that keeps the EDS GF and RAF operationally maintained over time. While the EDS GF and RAF are constitutional governance frameworks — establishing what must be governed and the principles that govern it — AIMS provides the objectives register, competence framework, nonconformity consolidation mechanism, and management review cycle that let the organisation assess, improve, and certify its governance posture. AIMS is the bridge between the MANDATE Suite's constitutional governance and ISO/IEC 42001:2023 certification.

ATLAS *AI management system — ISO/IEC 42001:2023* Primary buyer: CAIO · CRO · Internal Audit · Certification Bodies MAN-AIMS-001 · POL-AIMS-001 · PRO-AIMS-001 · FRM-AIMS-001/002 · REC-AIMS-001/002 · REG-AIMS-001/002/003/004/005	The complete AIMS instrument set: the AIMS Manual (apex instrument mapping the 50 instruments within AIMS scope — 38 dual-claimed EDS GF and RAF instruments and 12 AIMS-native — to ISO/IEC 42001:2023 clauses and Annex A controls); the AIMS Policy (eight governing principles); the Competence and Training Framework (eight role tiers, defined competency requirements and assessment methods); the AI Impact Assessment Framework (8-domain assessment, 5×5 risk matrix); the Top Management Commitment Record; the Management Review Record; the Internal Audit Procedure; and five operational registers covering nonconformity and CAPA consolidation, scope and interested parties, objectives tracking, documented information inventory, and the Statement of Applicability. ATLAS delivers the full ISO/IEC 42001:2023 certification pathway.

> *Without AIMS, the EDS GF and RAF operate as compliance obligations — instruments that must be satisfied but have no mechanism for systematic improvement. With ATLAS, they operate as a continuous improvement system with annual management review, internal audit, and external assurance at GMI Level 5.*

COMPLIANCE ENHANCEMENT · 6 INSTRUMENTS

EU Alignment Enhancement.

One product. EU AI Act deployer compliance.

The EU Alignment Enhancement extends the core MANDATE Suite for organisations within the EU AI Act deployer scope. It does not create a parallel compliance programme. It adds the specific instruments required for EU AI Act deployer obligations — Fundamental Rights Impact Assessment, high-risk system classification and registration, provider technical documentation, Article 50 transparency obligations, and Article 73 serious incident notification — aligned with Regulation (EU) 2026/1744, the Digital Omnibus, in force since 27 July 2026.

ACCORD *EU AI Act deployer compliance* Primary buyer: CAIO · CRO · General Counsel · DPO FRM-EUAE-001 · STD-EUAE-001/002/003 · PRO-EUAE-001 · STR-EUAE-001	The complete EU AI Act deployer instrument set: the Fundamental Rights Impact Assessment Framework (FRIA); the EU High-Risk Classification and Registration Standard; the Provider Technical Documentation Standard; the EU AI Transparency Obligations Standard, which carries the Article 50 duties already in force; the EU Serious Incident Notification Procedure (Article 73 compliance); and the EU Regulatory Engagement Strategy. ACCORD is designed to absorb into core MANDATE instruments when Australian AI obligations crystallise — the architecture anticipates regulatory evolution without requiring a framework rebuild.

> *ACCORD is aligned with Regulation (EU) 2026/1744, the Digital Omnibus, in force since 27 July 2026. The Article 50 transparency obligations have applied since 2 August 2026 and were not deferred. The high-risk obligations in Chapter III were deferred, and apply from 2 December 2027 and 2 August 2028 according to system category. Organisations without current EU AI Act obligations may implement ACCORD as a regulatory readiness instrument.*

STRUCTURAL EXTENSION · 3 INSTRUMENTS

Group AI Governance Framework.

One product. Governance across entity boundaries.

The Group AI Governance Framework extends the MANDATE Suite for holding company and group structures. Individual entity compliance is not group governance. A holding company whose subsidiaries each satisfy their individual Autonomy Budget and GMI requirements may still be exposed at the group level — because cross-entity AI systems operate across legal-entity boundaries simultaneously, and no individual entity's governance instruments can see or govern that aggregate exposure. NEXUS governs what no individual entity instrument can reach.

NEXUS *Group AI governance* Primary buyer: Group CAIO · Group CRO · Group Board GD-GGF-001 · FRM-GGF-001 · STD-GGF-001	The complete Group AI Governance Framework instrument set: the Group Governance Doctrine (constitutional instrument for group-level AI governance); the Group Autonomy Allocation Framework (Group Portfolio ADAE calculation, Group Autonomy Budget ceiling, subsidiary sub-budget allocation, mandatory cross-entity ADAE loading of one band, being +25 ADAE points — non-waivable); and the Cross-Entity System Classification Standard (C1–C4 criteria for identifying systems that operate across legal-entity boundaries, and the concurrent subsidiary Board sanction required where an affected entity cannot lawfully act in the holding company's interests). NEXUS establishes the Group Chief AI Officer as a mandatory constitutional role and a precondition for deploying any cross-entity system, and adds five Group KRIs to the Group Board Monitoring Dashboard — a report distinct from the entity-level dashboard, which NEXUS does not amend.

> *The cross-entity ADAE loading — one band above the calculated score, being +25 ADAE points, mandatory and non-waivable — reflects the amplified governance exposure that arises when machine decision-making crosses legal-entity boundaries simultaneously. A system in the Moderate band becomes High. High becomes Critical. Critical becomes Systemic. A system already Systemic stays Systemic, that band being terminal, and the points are still added to its score.*

The Governance Conversation

Starts Here.

42 Consulting.AI designed, built, and published the MANDATE Suite. It is the product of a single governing conviction: that AI governance at the depth regulated enterprises require cannot be delivered by a compliance framework. It requires a constitutional architecture — adopted by the Board, enforced by the infrastructure, and continuously tested against current conditions.

"Governance is not the opposite of intelligence. It is what makes intelligence trustworthy."

If your organisation is approaching the governance threshold—where autonomous AI systems make or materially influence decisions that affect customers, financial outcomes, or regulatory standing—the MANDATE Suite provides the architecture to cross it correctly.

Contact

Dr M Maruf Hossain, PhD, GAICD

Chief AI Strategist · Architect, MANDATE *Suite*

42 Consulting.AI

enquire@42consulting.ai

www.42consulting.ai

Academic Foundation

Governance-First AI · Board Authority. Architectural Precision. Governed AI at Enterprise Scale.

https://doi.org/10.1007/979-8-8688-3118-8

The MANDATE is constitutional. 15 architectural blueprints make it enforceable.

Apress · 2026

The MANDATE Suite rests on an open-access research record of sixteen papers setting out the theoretical basis for each governance mechanism, published for independent scrutiny and citation.

The full research record is available for independent review at zenodo.org/communities/mandate/records

MANDATE Suite · EDS Governance Framework · Responsible AI Framework · AI Management System · EU Alignment Enhancement · Group AI Governance Framework

© 2026 42 Consulting.AI · All rights reserved · PUBLIC