THE CHICAGO PRINCIPLES

for Independent AI Assurance

Issued by AIQA Global

Artificial intelligence is now embedded in decisions that affect capital allocation, healthcare, employment, public safety, and the administration of justice. The pace of deployment exceeds the pace at which prescriptive regulation can credibly be written. In the interval, markets need a way to distinguish responsibly governed AI from the rest. **Independent assurance is that mechanism. Independent assurance complements regulation; it does not replace lawful oversight.**

The following principles describe what independent AI assurance is, and what it must be to be trusted by the boards, insurers, investors, regulators, and procurement officers who increasingly depend on it. They are stated as a foundation, not a final word.

1. Independent

Assurance is provided by a party with no financial, operational, or governance interest in the AI system being assessed.

Independence is the foundation on which every other principle rests. An assurance provider that builds, owns, sells, or operates the system it evaluates is not providing assurance — it is providing self-attestation under a different name. Independence must be structural, disclosed, and verifiable.

2. Measurable

Assessments are based on defined, evidence-supported factors rather than narrative claims.

Responsible AI cannot be assured by adjective. The factors that determine an assessment must be specified in advance, applied consistently across organizations, and grounded in verifiable evidence. Where judgment is required, the basis for that judgment must be recorded and reviewable.

3. Auditable

Methodology, evidence, and conclusions are documented in a form capable of independent review.

An assurance framework that cannot itself be examined offers limited assurance. Methodology must be transparent in its logic, even where specific scoring weights or proprietary algorithms remain confidential. Evidence and conclusions must be retained in a form that supports independent review, regulatory inquiry, and after-the-fact reconstruction.

4. Comparable

Results are expressed in standardized form that permits meaningful comparison across organizations and over time.

Assurance that produces only bespoke narratives cannot inform underwriting, procurement, or capital allocation. Standardized expression — whether through scoring, certification tiers, or standardized disclosures — is what allows assurance to function as market infrastructure rather than as private consultation.

5. Continuously Updated

The framework evolves as AI capabilities, deployment contexts, and risks evolve.

AI is not a static technology, and assurance frameworks built for one generation of capability will not serve the next. Continuous updating must be governed by published cadence, methodology revision history, and independent technical input. Stability of result must be balanced against fidelity to the technology being assessed.

6. Accountable

Assurance providers stand behind their methodology, governance, and representations.

Independent assurance must itself be subject to governance. Methodology changes should be documented, conflicts disclosed, and appeals or review mechanisms available where materially consequential determinations are challenged. Assurance providers should be accountable for the integrity of their process, even where they do not guarantee outcomes — assurance attests to governance quality, not to the absence of all future failure.

These principles apply to any provider of independent AI assurance, including AIQA. Independent assurance will become essential market infrastructure for responsible artificial intelligence. These principles are offered as a foundation for that work.