

A specimen of the ISO 25059 quality model kit

Six rows from the live record. The paid kit carries all 25 records, the full evidence list, the change table and the dated plan.

SPECIMEN: NOT THE FULL KIT, NOT YOUR DATA

RECORD DATE	2026-10-20
PUBLISHED EDITION	ISO/IEC 25059:2023, first edition, first edition, 15 pages
SECOND EDITION	ISO/IEC FDIS 25059, edition 2, stage 50.00, registered 23 July 2026
PLANNING DATE	15 February 2027 (planning estimate, not an ISO date)
PUBLICATION	Not recorded by ISO. The planning date is an estimate, not a deadline.
SOURCES	ISO page 88234; the published edition; the public draft of the second edition.
LICENCE	One organisation, internal use and its consultants. Not for resale. The standard text remains ISO's.

What this is. A register of the model elements, the evidence a reviewer asks for, the common gaps and a dated plan. The requirement lines are our words, not ISO's. The FDIS text is not public and is not reproduced; the change lines are read from the public draft and labelled draft. The planning date is an estimate. This is a quality model, not a management system standard, and it is not certifiable. **Not legal advice; does not certify.**

What is inside

- **The register:** 6 rows, each with the clause, the 2023 baseline, the change, what to write, the evidence, the gaps, an owner and a due date.
- **The change table:** the 2023 to second edition comparison, with new, moved and amended elements marked.
- **The gap list:** 18 common failures, each with an action and an owner.
- **The evidence list:** 18 records a reviewer asks for, by characteristic.
- **The dated plan:** 7 milestones from the citation re-base to the quarterly review.
- **The board note:** six lines a governance lead can read out, with the decision, the cost and the limit.
- **The procurement question set:** twelve questions that turn the model into a supplier conversation.

How to use it

Start with the register. Put an owner and a due date on every row that is not already evidenced. Use the change table to see what the second edition moves or adds, the evidence list to collect the records, the gap list to decide what to fix first, and the plan to sequence the work. Re-check the ISO stage at the planning date; the change watch tells you when the record moves.

Quality model register (specimen: six rows)

CLAUSE	CHARACTERISTIC	STATUS	WHAT IT IS	WHAT TO WRITE	DUE
5.2	User controllability	Moved in the second edition	User controllability describes how far a user is able to step into how the system behaves, and to do so in time to matter. The second edition defines a controller as a person or outside agent with authority to act, a control point as the place in the interface where that action lands, and engagement of control as the moment when an authorised party takes charge of a group of control points. It places the characteristic under interaction capability rather than usability.	For each system, name the controller, list the control points and describe the engagement of control. State the time within which intervention must be possible and what the system does while control is being taken. A role without the authority to act is not a controller.	
5.4	Functional correctness	Amended	The characteristic describes how far the system gives the correct results with the needed precision. For AI systems, and especially probabilistic machine learning, correct results are not guaranteed in every circumstance, so both correct and incorrect outcomes have to be measured. The error rate and the conditions the result holds under are part of the requirement. Correctness also trades against other qualities such as performance efficiency and robustness.	Write the task, the measure, the evaluation set, the threshold and the conditions in one requirement. Report the error rate with the same prominence as the success rate. Record the trade-offs you accepted against performance efficiency and robustness.	
5.8	Environmental sustainability	New in the second edition	New in the second edition, under performance efficiency. Environmental sustainability describes a condition in which ecosystems, and the functions they perform, are sustained for people living now and for those who come later. The clause treats the field as emerging, but makes environmental cost a quality property alongside correctness and robustness, and points to the standards for carbon intensity, life cycle assessment and greenhouse gas reporting.	Decide whether the system is in scope. If it is, define the boundary (training, inference or both), choose a measure such as energy or carbon intensity, and state how the result feeds the organisation's reporting. If it is not in scope, record the decision and the reason.	
6.3	Societal and ethical risk mitigation	Amended	The characteristic describes how far the system reduces risk of a societal or ethical kind in its context of use. The definition points to a set of areas that shape the judgement: who answers for the system, fair treatment, explainability, professional duty, the worth of the person, privacy, keeping people in charge of the technology, participation by the community, respect for law, international norms and labour practice. The second edition widens the reference from risk to society to potential societal or ethical risk.	Assess each named area for the system, record a position with evidence, and name an owner. Disaggregate the evidence by the groups affected. Where an area is not applicable, say why. Keep the assessment live, because the use and the population change.	
7.2	Traceability	New in the second edition	Traceability describes how far what the service produces can be connected back to what the user needed, or forward from that need. In practice it means records of the models, datasets, requests and outcomes that let a result be reconstructed and a decision explained. It is the service-side counterpart of product transparency.	Define the identifiers that link a request to a model version and an outcome. Set the retention period against the dispute and audit windows. Test reconstruction on a real request, not a synthetic one. Record who may read the log and how a customer obtains an extract without exposing another customer's data.	
7.4	Customizability	New in the second edition	Customizability describes how far the AI service can be changed at the user's request. It is narrower than service adaptability: it is the user-directed part. The record has to show what can be changed, who approves it and what is re-evaluated afterwards.	Publish a catalogue of what can be customized, with the effect on the evaluation and the approval route. Record each request and its outcome. Re-evaluate after any change that touches the model, the data or the decision logic. State the response time for a request and the reason a request can be refused.	

Source for every row: the published ISO/IEC 25059:2023 and the public draft of the second edition, retrieved 2026-10-20. Not legal advice; does not certify.

The change, 2023 to the second edition (specimen: six rows)

CLAUSE	ELEMENT	STATUS	2023 BASELINE	CHANGE IN THE SECOND EDITION
5.2	User controllability	Moved in the second edition	The first edition introduced user controllability as a new sub-characteristic of usability and described intervention in a timely manner.	The parent changes from usability to interaction capability, following the 2023 base model. The control vocabulary is added, so the intervention has a named actor and a defined point. The characteristic is linked to the controllability work in the AI terminology standard and the newer controllability specification.
5.4	Functional correctness	Amended	The first edition amended the definition inherited from the base model to add the note that AI systems do not usually provide correctness in all observed circumstances, and pointed to the evaluation methods for machine learning.	The definition is restated against the 2023 base model. The substance is unchanged: measure correctness and incorrectness carefully, and do not treat a single accuracy figure as the whole story.
5.8	Environmental sustainability	New in the second edition	No equivalent. The first edition had no environmental characteristic.	The characteristic is added beneath performance efficiency in the product model. Environmental risk mitigation is added on the quality-in-use side. The public draft gives a worked example: specify a carbon-intensity requirement, measure it, and use the result in greenhouse gas reporting.
6.3	Societal and ethical risk mitigation	Amended	The first edition described the characteristic as how far a system lowers risk to society, with the same areas in the note.	The wording widens to potential societal or ethical risk, and the characteristic sits under risk mitigation in the aligned quality-in-use model. The areas named in the definition stay.
7.2	Traceability	New in the second edition	No equivalent.	New in the second edition, as a sub-characteristic of the service model. The public commentary links it to the work on AI system logging.
7.4	Customizability	New in the second edition	No equivalent.	New in the second edition, as a sub-characteristic of service adaptability.

Common gaps (specimen: six records)

CLAUSE	COMMON GAP	ACTION	OWNER
5.2	The controller is a role with no authority		
5.2	Control points are not defined		
5.2	The intervention has never been exercised		
5.4	One accuracy figure with no error analysis		
5.4	The evaluation set no longer matches production		
5.4	The result is quoted without its conditions		
5.8	The boundary is undefined		
5.8	Energy is estimated rather than measured		
5.8	The result never reaches a report		
6.3	An ethics statement with no assessment		
6.3	Fairness is asserted but not measured		
6.3	The assessment predates the current use		
7.2	Model versions are not logged		
7.2	Retention is shorter than the dispute window		
7.2	No reconstruction test was ever run		
7.4	Customization has no catalogue		
7.4	A change bypassed the evaluation		
7.4	Refusals are not recorded		

Evidence list (specimen: six records)

CLAUSE	CATEGORY	RECORD A REVIEWER ASKS FOR	OWNER
5.2	Control design	A diagram of the control points, the controller for each and the state the system enters when control is taken	
5.2	Role and authority	The role description and delegation that give the controller the authority to act	
5.2	Exercise record	A dated record of an intervention being exercised, with what worked and what did not	
5.4	Correctness measure	The task definition, the measure and the threshold, with the error rate stated alongside the success rate	
5.4	Evaluation record	The dataset, its provenance and the conditions under which the result was obtained	
5.4	Trade-off record	The accepted trade-offs against performance efficiency and robustness, with the reason	
5.8	Boundary	The measurement boundary, naming training, inference or both, and the infrastructure covered	
5.8	Measure	The energy or carbon measure, the method and the reporting period	
5.8	Reporting link	Where the result is used in the organisation's environmental or greenhouse gas reporting	
6.3	Ethical assessment	A position on each named area, with the evidence and the date	
6.3	Fairness evidence	Disaggregated results by affected group, with the method and the threshold	
6.3	Accountability	The named owner for the societal and ethical position and the review date	
7.2	Identifier scheme	The identifiers that link request, model version, data version and outcome	
7.2	Retention	The retention period and the reason it matches the dispute and audit windows	
7.2	Reconstruction test	A dated reconstruction of a real outcome from the logs alone	
7.4	Catalogue	The customization options, the effect of each and the approval required	
7.4	Request record	Each request, the decision and the date, including refusals and the reason given	
7.4	Re-evaluation	The evaluation repeated after a change that affects the model, the data or the decision, with the result compared to the baseline	

Board note

LINE	WHAT TO SAY	YOUR NUMBER OR DATE
The decision	Approve a re-baseline of the AI quality requirement set before the second edition publishes, with a named owner and a date.	
Why now	The published edition cites a base model that has been replaced. Whatever the second edition says, the citation is out of date today.	
What changes	The second edition aligns to the newer product and quality-in-use models, adds an AI service quality model and adds environmental sustainability.	
What it costs	One named owner, four checkpoints and the evidence already held by the quality or test function. The work is an edit with a review, not a new programme.	
What the board gets	A requirement set that names the edition, a measure per characteristic, an owner per row, and the evidence a customer or assessor asks for.	
What it does not get	A certificate. The model is voluntary and there is no certification or transition scheme. No legal or regulatory status is created.	

Procurement question set

#	QUESTION TO THE SUPPLIER	EVIDENCE EXPECTED	ANSWER
1	Which edition of the AI quality model does your answer rely on, and when was it last checked?		
2	Which of the twelve characteristics apply to this system, and which are excluded with a reason?		
3	For each characteristic in scope, what is the measure, the evaluation method and the threshold?		
4	What is the functional correctness target, and how is the error side measured and reported?		
5	Which robustness cases were tested: unseen, biased, adversarial, invalid, interference and environment?		
6	What does the transparency record contain, and how often is it updated?		
7	Who can intervene in the system, at which control point, and within what time?		
8	What is the societal and ethical risk position, and is the fairness evidence disaggregated by group?		
9	Is environmental sustainability in scope, and if so what is the boundary, the measure and the reporting link?		
10	If the system is a service, how are traceability, service adaptability and customizability evidenced?		
11	Who owns the requirement set, when is it reviewed, and what triggers an earlier review?		
12	Will you give access to the logs, datasets and metrics behind these answers, and for how long?		

Dated plan

DATE	MILESTONE	WHAT IT MEANS	RECORD TO KEEP	DONE
2026-11-30	Re-base the citations	Find every document that cites the 2011 product quality model or the 2023 edition. Record the 2023 product and quality-in-use models, and replace the vocabulary that moved, including interaction capability in place of usability and flexibility in place of portability.	The citation register and the changed requirement set.	
2026-12-31	Decide applicability for the twelve characteristics	For each AI system, mark each of the twelve characteristics include or exclude, with a reason. Record the decision, not only the included set.	The applicability table per system, with reasons.	
2027-01-31	Write the measure, method and threshold	For each included characteristic, write the task, the measure, the evaluation method, the threshold and the conditions. Name the evidence and the owner.	The quality requirement sheet with every row filled.	
2027-02-15	Planning checkpoint	The planning date is an estimate, not an ISO date. Check the ISO stage record for 50.20, 60.00 and 60.60, record the stage, and adjust the plan. Do not treat the date as a deadline.	A dated note of the stage and the next action.	
At publication	Read the published edition and update the record	When ISO records stage 60.60, read the published edition, confirm every change against the published text rather than the draft, update the citations and brief the teams.	The updated register, the reference list and the briefing record.	
90 days after publication	Re-baseline and re-check	Run the free check again with the published edition, re-baseline the requirement set, and close the gaps the published text creates. Keep the previous baseline for the change history.	The new baseline and the coverage reading.	
Quarterly	Review the evidence	Re-read the evidence per characteristic, confirm the model and data versions, and record any change that affects a measure or a threshold.	The review note and the updated evidence list.	

After publication. Replace the estimate with the date ISO records at stage 60.60, read the published edition, confirm every change against the published text rather than the draft, and update the clause references in the register. The register is a working document, not a certificate.