

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
1	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-02-291123	All clauses N/A	All clauses	General	Please provide access to the draft standard to review and provide comments: Information Technology - Artificial Intelligence- Management System Without providing draft access, it is difficult to provide comments,	Please provide access to the draft standard to review and provide comments: Information Technology - Artificial Intelligence- Management System Without providing draft access, it is difficult to provide comments,	No action required. Documents were shared for further inputs.	Closed	ChandraSRK	NA	11 June 2024: No Change is required.
2	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-036461	N/A General		General	recommended to add requirements specific to AI management Plan, AI Risk Management Plan(this includes ai risk treatment as well)	recommended to add requirements specific to AI management Plan, AI Risk Management Plan(this includes ai risks treatment as well)	Risk Management is about Risk assessment and treatment. These aspects are already covered in 6.1, 8.2,8.3. In view of this no change is required.	LITD30	ChandraSRK	"6.1 Actions to address risks and opportunities" sub-clause covers only Risk and opportunities associated with AI System. "6.2 AI objectives and planning to achieve them" sub-clause covers to some extent AI system Planning. 8.2 is about AI risk assessment 8.2 is about AI risk treatment ----> "A2.4 Review of the AI policy" talks about review of AI policy at planned intervals to ensure its suitability, adequacy and effectiveness. "A6.2.5 AI system deployment" talks about deployment plan A8.4 Communication of incidents" talks about communication plan However , Development/Maintenance plan for AI system not specifically covered in Annexure A, which is very important control. as well	11 June 2024: These point covered based on the context and controls mentioned at 6 and risk assessment and risk treatment requirements. No Change is required.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
3	Name: ChandraSR K Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024- 03-034885	Introduction N/A	Last Paragraph	General	highly recommended to maintain overall structure of this AI Management System standards to align with of the Basic management standard: (Refer ISO 9001:2015 , ISO/IEC 27001:2022) 4.4 AI management system --> 4.4 AI management system and its processes 5.3 Roles, responsibilities and authorities --> 5.3 Organizational roles, responsibilities and authorities 3. Applicable to other sections too	for ex. 4.4 AI management system and its processes 5.3 Organizational roles, responsibilities and authorities	4.4 is same as 27001, such minor differences are there in between 9001 and 27001 as well. We could take up this at ISO/IEC level.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSR K	Suggest you take up with ISO/IEC., as specifying process related info is important recommended to have 4.4 AI management system and its processes instead of 4.4 AI management system . And retain relevant process related description , refer 4.4.2 clause in ISO 9001:2015	11 June 2024: Agree to take up with ISO/IEC. we can take up instances where it is different from MSS structure. Mr. Chandra and Member Secretary to consolidate such instances.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
4	Name: ChandraSR K Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024- 03-034477	N/A	4	Technical	AI management system maintenance aspects not mentioned in the following statements: The organization's needs and objectives, processes, size and structure as well as the expectations of various interested parties influence the establishment and implementation of the AI management system. Another set of factors that influence the establishment and implementation of the AI management system are the many use cases for AI and the need to strike the appropriate balance between governance mechanisms and innovation. This needs to be corrected as The organization's needs and objectives, processes, size and structure as well as the expectations of various interested parties influence the establishment, implementation and maintenance of the AI management system Another set of factors that influence the establishment, implementation and maintenance of the AI management system are the many use cases for AI and the need to strike the appropriate balance between governance mechanisms and innovation.	The organization's needs and objectives, processes, size and structure as well as the expectations of various interested parties influence the establishment, implementation and maintenance of the AI management system Another set of factors that influence the establishment, implementation and maintenance of the AI management system are the many use cases for AI and the need to strike the appropriate balance between governance mechanisms and innovation.	Comment is on Introduction. Its not a requirement. 7.1 is requirement and that has mentioned the maintenance aspects. In view of this no change is required however if required then we may take up at ISO/IEC level.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSR K	Suggest you take up with ISO/IEC. Consider the following to improve even the readability: The establishment, implementation and maintenance of the AI management system are influenced by various factors: - within the organization, including its needs, objectives, processes, size, and structure, as well as the expectations of different stakeholders. - Numerous use cases for AI - Necessity to maintain a balance between governance mechanisms and innovation	11 June 2024: Suggested change is not affecting the technical requirements. No immediate change is required. Following change may be proposed for next version of 42001: Replace "The organization's needs and objectives, processes, size and structure as well as the expectations of various interested parties influence the establishment and implementation of the AI management system." with "The organization's needs and objectives, processes, size and structure as well as the expectations of various interested parties influence the establishment , implementation,maintaining and continually improving the AI management system."

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
5	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034121	Introduction N/A	5	General	"Crucial examples of such management processes are:" missed to cover the following: Requirements for products and services, Design and development of products and services. processes for Requirements for products and services, Design and development of products and services.	processes for Requirements for products and services, Design and development of products and services.	Comment is on Introduction. These are just examples and not an exhaustive list. Moreover these points are covered by life cycle example. In view of this no change is required.	LITD30	ChandraSRK	Please revisit this , then see to add following: - Life cycle processes applicable to development and maintain AI System	11 June 2024: No Change is required.
6	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-031548	Introduction N/A	5	General	recommend to have diagrams for intended user of this standards , to improve level of understanding:	recommend to have diagrams for intended user of this standard , to improve level of understanding: How this standard relates to standards: MSS/AI/Life Cycle	Please provide diagram and accordingly we can take up at ISO/IEC level.	LITD30	ChandraSRK	Refer the sheet: "Diagrams" for draft picture on : AI Standards and How they related. Useful for New readers, quick understanding	11 June 2024: Agree to propose such a diagram for inclusion as an Annex. Members to suggest changes required in the diagram.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
7	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034427	N/A 3.24	1	General	AI system impact assessment definition 1. doesn't include impact on organization or any entities	formal, documented process by which the impacts on one or more of: individuals, groups of individuals, societies or organization are identified, evaluated and addressed by an organization developing, providing or using products or services utilizing artificial intelligence	Agree to the rational, similar comments were provided for 42005 as well however not agreed by SC 42. We may discuss and again take up at ISO/IEC level.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	Discuss and take up with ISO/IEC	11 June 2024: Agree however, to be discussed again in next meeting. Members to look in to 42005. 1 July 2024 : Agree, everyone was requested to check Impact assessment aspect in other MSS. It was decided to specifically check the relation between Organization and under Societies.
8	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034267	/A 4.4		General	extra word document introduced in the standard, which is not required: The organization shall establish, implement, maintain, continually improve and document an AI management system, including the processes needed and their interactions, in accordance with the requirements of this document.	The organization shall establish, implement, maintain and continually improve an AI management system, including the processes needed and their interactions, in accordance with the requirements of this document.	For specificity, 'this document' is required. It is fine and inline with the standards practices. In view of this no change is required.	LITD30	ChandraSRK	I am referring the "document" used after implement. Please re-check again	1 July 2024 : Agree, we can propose to remove 'document'.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
9	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034245	A 5.1		Editorial	5.1 Leadership and commitment following important statement missing specific to AI management system process: promoting the use of the process approach and risk-based thinking;	promoting the use of the process approach and risk-based thinking relevant for AI Management system	This is not mentioned in 27001 as well. Its mentioned in 9001 so in way its covered. Further Note 2 is referring to Responsible approach. In view of this if required we can take it up at ISO/IEC level.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	take up with ISO/IEC	1 July 2024 : No change is required.
10	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034490	A 5.1		Editorial	lists of items can be given numbering as applicable such as a), b) etc instead of -- (refer 5.1 Leadership and commitment, applicable to entire document")	lists of items can be given numbering as applicable such as a), b) etc instead of -- (refer 5.1 Leadership and commitment, applicable to entire document")	It is as per house style so no change is required. Its good to have numbered list so it may be mentioned to ISO/IEC for ensuring this in next revision.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	numbering always helps in traceability and mapping requirement across standards	1 July 2024 : Agree, Change can be proposed if required, change can be proposed for house style as well.
11	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034081	A 5.2		General	recommend to maintain document structure as per the standard section: Compatibility with other management system standards, but 5.2 AI Policy not maintaining structure	5.2 AI policy 5.2.1 Establishing the AI policy 5.2.2 Communicating the AI policy	This is related to the general comment (Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034885). such minor differences are there in between 9001 and 27001 as well. We could take up this at ISO/IEC level.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	take up with ISO/IEC	1 July 2024 :Agree to take up with ISO/IEC. we can take up instances where it is different from MSS structure. Mr. Chandra and Member Secretary to consolidate such instances.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
12	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-039949	N/A 6.1		Editorial	6.1.3 AI risk treatment < Taking the risk assessment results into account, the organization shall define an AI risk treatment process to:> following observation on above statement 1. Risk treatment need not to be separate process, it is activity in Risk management process 2. Define is not standard word to use in MSS	The organization shall establish, implement and maintain AI risk treatment activities that support	Yes it is agreed that risk treatment is an activity inside risk management. However this structure and usage of term 'define' are in line with 27001. In view of this no change is required.	Discuss	ChandraSRK	establish is the standard word used in MSS, but not define. We need to take ISO 9001 as base.	1 July 2024 :Both terms (establish and define) have been used as appropriate. However we can take up with ISO/IEC where it is different from MSS structure. Mr. Chandra and Member Secretary to consolidate such instances.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
13	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-037822	/A 6.1.1		Technical	<p>6.1.2 AI risk assessment < The organization shall define and establish an AI risk assessment process that:> following observation on above statement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Assessment need not to be separate process, it is activity in Risk management process 2. Define is not standard word to use in MSS 3. implement, maintain missing in the following requirement: The organization shall define and establish an AI risk assessment process that: 	The organization shall establish, implement and maintain AI risk criteria activities that support	Proposed Change mentioned is for 6.1.1. however comment is referring to 6.1.2. Regarding addition of 'Implement' we may take up at ISO/IEC level	Discuss	ChandraSRK	Column C: to be corrected as 6.1.2 instead of 6.1.1	1 July 2024 :Both terms (establish and define) have been used as appropriate. However we can take up with ISO/IEC where it is different from MSS structure. Mr. Chandra and Member Secretary to consolidate such instances.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
14	Name: Sundar Narayanan	A 6.1.1		Technical	The organization shall determine the risks and opportunities shall be based on: 1. domain, industry environment, application environment, 2. intended use (scope, nature, context and purpose), 3. regulations or standards, organizational policy, industry guidelines	The organization shall determine the risks and opportunities according to: — the domain and application context of an AI system; — the intended use; - regulations, standards, industry guideline relating to the use case	regulations, standards, industry guideline relating to the use case' is covered by 'the external and internal context described in 4.1'. In view of this no change is required.		Sundar Narayanan		1 July 2024: No change is required.
15	Name: Sundar Narayanan	N/A 6.1.2		Technical	AI risk assessment does not explain the need for appropriately identifying risk appetite and risk tolerance. The risk appetite and risk tolerance could help in determining the level of risk.	b) ensures repeated AI risk assessments can produce consistent, valid and comparable results;	Proposed change is same as the existing content of the standard. Further, risk appetite and risk tolerance has to be defined by the organization as per their risk criteria. Please refer 6.1.1. In view of this no change is required.		Sundar Narayanan		1 July 2024: As of now no change is required. Mr. Sundat Narayana to examine in relation with ISO/IEC 23894 and ISO 31000. He may submit revised comment and proposed change,if required.
16	Name: Sundar Narayanan	N/A 6.1.2		Technical	AI risk assessment shall consider the level of risk based on four key factors namely, relevance, severity, likelihood, and detectability	The organization shall define and establish an AI risk assessment process that: e) 3) evaluate AI risks by comparing them based on relevance, severity, likelihood, and detectability	ISO/IEC 23894 is mentioned here and ISO/IEC 23894 is based on ISO 31000. In view of this no change is required.		Sundar Narayanan		1 July 2024: Mr. Sundar Narayana to examine in relation with ISO/IEC 23894 and ISO 31000. He may submit revied comment and proposed change for inclusion of 'detectability' aspect in additional guidance

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
17	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-032442	N/A 6.1.2		Technical	6.1.2 AI risk assessment Need correction in following statement b) is designed such that repeated AI risk assessments can produce consistent, valid and comparable results;	b) ensures repeated AI risk assessments can produce consistent, valid and comparable results;	Rational for proposed change is not mentioned so no change is required.	Discuss	ChandraSRK	Rationale: Designed is not a standard word used in MSS	1 July 2024 :Agree to take up with ISO/IEC. we can take up instances where it is different from MSS structure. Mr. Chandra and Member Secretary to consolidate such instances.
18	Name: Sundar Narayanan	/A 6.1.3		Technical	The section on AI risk treatment focuses more on controls. It ignores other treatment methods including transfer of risks. Also, it does not exhibit that disclosure of potential risk to customers and other stakeholders could also be a possible treatment (This approach is widely used in healthcare drug approval process).	Taking the risk assessment results into account, the organization shall define an AI risk treatment process to: h. Apply appropriate efforts towards transfer of the risk i. Disclose potential limitations and known adversities / risks caused by the AI performance to its customers	It has also mentioned about formulation of AI risk treatment plan. There is further guidance in Annex-B and 23894. 23894 specifically mentions 'sharing the risk'. In view of this no change is required. Please see if any further additional guidance need to be included for taking up at ISO/IEC level.	Others	Sundar Narayanan		1 July 2024 : Check if additional guidance is required.
19	Name: Sundar Narayanan	6.1.4		Technical	AI system impact assessment is not defined. It shall consider the requirements including the privacy implications, harms, bias, accountability, robustness, security, safety, systemic societal impact assessment to assess the implications to the society	AI System impact assessment shall cover assessment of risks associated with privacy, harms, bias, accountability, robustness, safety, security and systemic societal impact assessment.	AI system impact assessment is defined at 3.24. for further guidance , refer 42005. In view of this no change is required.	Others	Sundar Narayanan		1 July 2024 : No change is required.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
20	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034164	N/A 8		Technical	8 Operation recommend to maintain document structure as per the standard section: Compatibility with other management system standards sub section in introduction says high level structure is maintained, but 8 Operation subsections fails to maintain high-level structure with ISO 9001: for ex design and development of AI systems section missing	8.2 Requirements for products and services 8.3 design and development of AI systems 8.4 Control of externally provided processes, products and services 8.5 Production and service provision	This is related to the general comment (Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034885). such minor differences are there in between 9001 and 27001 as well. We could take up this at ISO/IEC level.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	Please discuss with ISO/IEC to have uniformity across all MSS,	1 July 2024 :Agree to take up with ISO/IEC. we can take up instances where it is different from MSS structure. Mr. Chandra and Member Secretary to consolidate such instances.
21	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-038668	N/A 9.2.2		Technical	9.2.2 Internal audit programme < ensure that the results of audits are reported to relevant managers.> to be re-phrased as <ensure that the results of audits are reported to relevant authority in organization.>	ensure that the results of audits are reported to relevant authority in organization.	27001 and 9001 has used term 'relevant management'. We may take up at ISO/IEC level	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	I have checked again ISO 9001, ISO 27001. "Manager" is not a standard word used in MSS, so check with ISO/IEC.	1 July 2024 :Agree to take up with ISO/IEC. we can take up instances where it is different from MSS structure. Mr. Chandra and Member Secretary to consolidate such instances.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
22	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-036614	N/A A.5		General	A.5 Assessing impacts of AI systems Objective: To assess AI system impacts to individuals or groups of individuals, or both, and societies affected by the AI system throughout its life cycle Can be re-phrased as To assess AI system impacts to one or more of: individuals, groups of individuals, organization or societies throughout AI System life cycle	To assess AI system impacts to one or more of: individuals, groups of individuals, societies or organization throughout AI System life cycle	Similar to Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034427	Discuss	ChandraSRK	Additionally, some sentence also changed here	1 July 2024 : Agree, everyone was requested to check Impact assessment aspect in other MSS. It was decided to specifically check the relation between Organization and under Societies.
23	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-031196	N/A A.6.2		General	A.6.2 AI system life cycle title is similar to A.6.AI system life cycle so A.6.2 AI system life cycle can be changed to A.6.2 AI system life cycle stages	A.6.2 AI system life cycle stages	We may take up at ISO/IEC level	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	Discuss and take up with ISO/IEC	1 July 2024 : Agree, suggest to ISO/IEC.
24	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-032424	N/A A6.2		General	A.6.2 AI system life cycle need to cover additional entry for effective integration of AI sub system with overall system	effective integration of AI sub system with overall system	There is no concept of AI sub-system. This document is also about AI system. We may discuss and accordingly take up at ISO/IEC level	Discuss	ChandraSRK	Ideally speaking we don't have any thing like 100% AI system. Any AI based system contains AI component + non AI component. Interface between these is important, hence proposing for AI subsystem terminology and its integration	1 July 2024 : to discuss in next meeting on 8th July 2024(2PM) 8th July 2024 : 42001 is focused on AI Systems.No change is required.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
25	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034666	N/A A.6.2		General	A.6.2 AI system life cycle need to cover additional entry for quality management of AI sub system with overall system	quality management of AI sub system with overall system	There is no concept of AI sub-system. This document is also about AI system. We may discuss and accordingly take up at ISO/IEC level	Discuss	ChandraSRK	Rationale: We need to plan for AI system Quality Management as well. If not where this is being addressed	8th July 2024 : Quality is part of AIMS. In line with comment[Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-032424] no change is required.
26	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-032200	N/A A.6.2.2		General	A.6.2.2 contains word material which is not standard word in management system standards> The organization shall specify and document requirements for new AI systems or material enhancements to existing systems.	The organization shall specify and document requirements for new AI systems or enhancements to existing systems.	Agree, 'material' word may not be required. We may take up at ISO/IEC level.	ISO/IEC	ChandraSRK	Discuss and take up with ISO/IEC	8th July 2024 :Agree to take up at ISO/IEC. To be taken up along with other comments related to MSS structure.
27	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-039446	N/A Table A.1		Editorial	Table A.1 — Control objectives and controls need to cover additional entry for Design and development Plan, Quality Plan , Risk Management, data management, ai communication plan for AI based system	following control objectives to be added wrt AI System: - Design and development Plan - Quality Plan - Risk Management Plan - data management plan - Communication plan	These are covered under A.6 , A.7 and A.8. In view of this no change is required.	Discuss	ChandraSRK	to be discussed	8th July 2024 : It is related to already discussed comment [Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-034121]so no change is required.
28	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-048775	N/A B.2.2		General	B.2.2 AI policy Implementation guidance, need to cover which role responsible for AI Policy, such as role approved by management should be responsible for the development, review and evaluation of the AI policy, or the components within. However similar info available in B.2.4 Review of the AI policy	A role approved by management should be responsible for the development, review and evaluation of the AI policy, or the components within.	B.2.4 is also covering the aspect of development of AI policy so there is no need to mention this both at B.2.2 and B.2.4.In view of this no change is required.	Discuss	ChandraSRK	Implementation guidance to cover about roles, responsible, actvitiy. It is covered in B2.4, however it is suggested to cover in section B2.2	8th July 2024 : B.3.2 is about roles and responsibilities , B2.2 and B2.4 along with B 3.2. are covering the concerns so no change is required.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
29	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-046586	N/A 4.3	B.	General	B.4.3 Data resources Data privacy, data approval authority, version or some identifying tag that from previous versions to be added under list: Documentation on data should include, but is not limited to, the following topics:	Data privacy, data approval authority, version or some identifying tag that from previous versions	This list is not exhaustive. These aspects are covered under data quality. In view of this no change is required.	Discuss	ChandraSRK		8th July 2024 :This list is not exhaustive. The concept of identifying tag is covered by 'the date that the data were last updated or modified'; other aspects are related to data quality. No change is required.
30	Name: Sundar Narayanan	N/A 5.3	B.	General	AI impact assessment documentation shall include the risk criteria (including the relevance, severity, likelihood and detectability)	AI impact assessment documentation shall include the risk criteria (including the relevance, severity, likelihood and detectability)	Other information is referring to risk management. In view of this no change is required.		Sundar Narayanan		8th July 2024 :No Change is required.
31	Name: Sundar Narayanan	N/A 5.4	B.	General	B.5.4 Assessing AI system impact on individuals or groups of individuals needs to take into account the impact of AI system on individuals, groups, nation state and humanity as a whole. The nation state implications are not clearly articulated. For instance, Facebook impact on elections is a community and nation state issue.	When assessing the impacts on individuals or groups of individuals, or both, the organization should consider the impact of AI systems on nation-state and humanity as a whole.	May be discussed and accordingly can be taken up at ISO/IEC level.		Sundar Narayanan		8th July 2024 : To take up as decided related to other comment [Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-036614]
32	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-045855	N/A 5.4	B.	General	B.5.4 Assessing AI system impact on individuals or groups of individuals Implementation guidance When assessing the impacts on individuals or groups of individuals, or both, and societies , the organization should consider its governance principles, AI policies and objectives.	When assessing the impacts on individuals or groups of individuals, or both, the organization should consider its governance principles, AI policies and objectives.	What is the rational for removal of 'societies'. In absence of rational no change is required.	Discuss	ChandraSRK	This is about B.5.4 Assessing AI system impact on individuals or groups of individuals. So 'societies' not required	8th July 2024 : A.5 mentions 'societies' however A.5.4 has no specific mention of 'societies' so agree to take up, It is also related to other comment [Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-036614.]
33	Name: Sundar Narayanan	N/A 6.1	B.	General	Responsible AI expectation shall extend to design, development, deployment and decommissioning of AI systems.	To ensure that the organization identifies and documents objectives and implements processes for the responsible design, development, deployment and decommissioning of AI systems.	Life cycle stages have been mentioned as one of the aspects of consideration. Life cycle stages cover these aspects. In view of this no change is required.		Sundar Narayanan		8th July 2024 : This control is already covering this aspect so no change is required.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
34	Name: Sundar Narayanan	N/A B. 6.2		General	Lifecycle of AI system does not cover the post market monitoring or maintenance of the AI system	The organization should specify and document requirements for new AI systems or material enhancements to existing systems including based on post-market monitoring and maintenance of AI system.	Requirements are not only based on the 'post-market monitoring'. The propose change conveys meaning that requirements are to be based on 'post-market monitoring'. Further, Operation and Monitoring is one the stages of life cycle as per 5338. In view of this no change is required.		Sundar Narayanan		8th July 2024: No change is required
35	Name: Sundar Narayanan	N/A B. 6.2.3		General	"The organization should document the AI system design and development based on organizational objectives, documented requirements and specification criteria." The guidance does not cover the need for documenting the limitations and known vulnerabilities, bias testing scores, privacy impact assessment, user manual, interpretability guidance, and notifications/ alerts to help user understand failure modes.	The guidance shall cover the need for documenting the limitations and known vulnerabilities, bias testing scores, privacy impact assessment, user manual, interpretability guidance, and notifications/ alerts to help user understand failure modes.	This list is not exhaustive. These aspects are covered under 'evaluation and refinement of models'. In view of this no change is required.		Sundar Narayanan		8th July 2024: No change is required
36	Name: ChandraSRK Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-047959	N/A A		General	following new control can be added: Human Resources for AI Management System to establish, implement, maintain AI QMS, Audit	following new control can be added: Human Resources for AI Management System to establish, implement, maintain AI QMS, Audit	What is the rational for addition of new control. What is AI QMS and how it would be different from AIMS. In absence of rational no change is required.	Discuss	ChandraSRK	Please QMS as MS . Need clarification on How Quality of AI system is achieved resources need to establish, maintain, implement AI MS as well as For auditing	8th July 2024: To examine other MSS to find out whether there are specific control for each requirement. Agree to take up along with comments related to MSS structure subject to examination of other MSS.

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
37	Name: Chandrasr K Organisation: N/A Comment ID #: LITD_2024-03-048285	N/A B	A,	General	<p>B.6.2.3 Documentation of AI system design and development Control The organization should document the AI system design and development based on organizational objectives, documented requirements and specification criteria.</p> <p>B.6.2.3 Documentation of AI system design and development Control The organization should document the AI system design and development based on organizational objectives, documented requirements and architecture.</p> <p>even these to be split into to two separate controls for each life cycle stage separate control is required to ensure stage specific measures for ex. AI system requirements and specification to be splitted into AI system requirements, AI system Architecture</p> <p>Needs following clarification(s) 1. AI Policy for specific system may be different from organization AI policy. Note: This is not specified in AI MSS 2.Stakeholders of AIMS vs AI system need to bring in more clarity 3. How about indirectly effected user 4. AI includes HW also, not only SW 5. whether this standards applicable to : educational institutes, researches also stakeholders metrics</p>	AI system requirements AI system Architecture	May be discussed and accordingly if required, it can be taken up at ISO/IEC level.	Discuss	Chandrasr K	to be discussed	8th July 2024: No change is required

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
38	Name: Madhav Chablani Organisation: CSA - India	All clauses N/A	All clauses	General	ISO 42001:2023, is tabled as comprehensive governance model for AI, relies heavily on entities that may not fully grasp the nuances and complexities of the digital realm. Typically these entities are either in code development or management neither of which understand the complexities of the other. In an era where AI algorithms are constantly pushing boundaries, the question arises: Can a set of non-automated control standards truly keep pace with the dynamic and ever-evolving nature of artificial intelligence?	Align or include , need of automated controls / standards , or interdependencies / Relationships , to truly keep pace with the dynamic and ever-evolving nature of artificial intelligence.	What is the meaning of 'automated controls/standards'? There is no specific proposed change along with content. In view of this no change is required.		Madhav Chablani		8th July 2024: No change is required
39	Name: Madhav Chablani Organisation: CSA - India	B 4.6 and C2.2		General	Standard's static nature and rigid non-automated framework may hinder innovation rather than fostering it. AI, by its very nature, thrives on adaptability and learning from data, making it challenging to regulate with a fixed set of rules, designed to be controlled by a "governance committee" that doesn't understand it.	It's essential to include governance committee's competence KPI and competencies charter also , and reviewed continuously . As part of resource identification, the organization should document information about the human resources and their competences utilized for Governance Committee entities also , for the organization enabled with AI systems or components.	Standards are not for hindering innovation. May be discussed.		Madhav Chablani		8th July 2024: No change is required

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
40	Name: Madhav Chablani Organisation: CSA - India	All clauses N/A	All clauses	General	There is inability to bridge the governance gap between traditional industries and the AI-driven future. The standard appears to be a product of conventional thinking, lacking the agility required to regulate an industry that constantly pushes technological boundaries. The Standard relies heavily on people driven governance model that has not been very automated or technically forward thinking .	Align model governance , that has to be automated or technically forward thinking .	Please provide specific changes or proposal for development of new standard along with draft.		Madhav Chablani		8th July 2024: No change is required
41	Name: Madhav Chablani Organisation: CSA - India	All clauses N/A	All clauses	General	While the intention behind ISO 42001: 2023 is to ensure responsible and ethical AI development, there are concerns that the nature of the standard may lead to unintended consequences.	Stricter regulations might stifle innovation, creating a conservative environment that hampers the very progress it aims to guide.	Standards are not for hindering innovation. Please provide specific changes or proposal for development of new standard along with draft. There is no specific proposed change so in view of this no change is required.		Madhav Chablani		8th July 2024: No change is required
42	Name: Madhav Chablani Organisation: CSA - India	All clauses N/A	All clauses	General	AI regulation should mirror the adaptive nature of the technology itself.	It's proposed continuous, data-driven assessments and real-time updates to standards, rather than a static set of rules that may quickly become obsolete in the fast-paced world of AI development.	This is standard not a regulation. Please provide specific changes or proposal for development of new standard along with draft. There is no specific proposed change so in view of this no change is required.		Madhav Chablani		8th July 2024: No change is required

Annex-14

S No.	Basic Details	Clause/Subclause No.& Attachment	Paragraph No./Figure No./Table No	Type of Comment	Comments/Suggestions along with Justification for the Proposed Change	Proposed Change/Modified Wordings	Member Secretary Observations	Status	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Decisions of LITD 30/WG 1 meeting
43	Name: Madhav Chablani Organisation: CSA - India	All clauses N/A	All clauses	General	ISO/IEC 42001:2023's attempt to control AI through a governance model raises pertinent questions about its effectiveness and adaptability.	While the pursuit of ethical AI is crucial, rather, a more dynamic and digitally native approach is needed to keep pace with the relentless advancements in artificial intelligence. The controversy surrounding ISO 42001:2023 underscores the broader debate about striking the right balance between regulation and innovation in the ever-evolving landscape of AI.	This is standard not a regulation. Please provide specific changes or proposal for development of new standard along with draft. There is no specific proposed change so in view of this no change is required.		Madhav Chablani		8th July 2024: No change is required
44	Name: Madhav Chablani Organisation: CSA - India	D.2	All clauses	General	Though these are referenced -ISO 9241-210 , ISO/IEC 25024 , ISO/IEC 19944-1 & ISO/IEC 5259 series , but not brought in normative reference	It's important to include these standards in normative reference and along with others standards , as in exclusivity , this standard may not be sufficient .	Please refer 27001 and other related management system standards. Other series of standards are not referred as normative references. In view of this no change is required.		Madhav Chablani		8th July 2024: No change is required
	Additional inputs from other Members										
1	Name: Mr Madhav Chablani Organization: Cloud Security Alliance - NCR (India)				Agree , to adopt ISO/IEC 42001:2023 as it is as Indian standard. Changes,if any agreed by LITD 30 may be taken up at ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 42 for appropriate revision/amendment.						
2	Name: Mr. Raghavendra S Bhat organization: Intel India Technology Private Limited				I agree with your disposition of the comments. No further inputs from me.						

