

Clause 8.4 requires an assessment of the impact of AI systems on individuals, groups and society — the requirement with no equivalent in ISO 27001. ISO/IEC 42005 gives detailed guidance on conducting one; ISO/IEC 23894 covers AI risk management.

SECTION	WHAT IT CAPTURES	WORKED ANSWER FOR AI-003
1. System identification	Which system, which version, which inventory ID	AI-003 résumé screening assistant, vendor SaaS, assessed at v4.2 against the 2026 hiring cycle
2. Purpose and necessity	What decision it informs, and why AI rather than a person	Ranks applicants against published role criteria at a volume the two-person recruiting team cannot process manually. Ranking only — it does not reject
3. Affected individuals and groups	Who is affected, including those who never interact with the system	External applicants, disproportionately early-career and career-changers. Also affects internal applicants applying for transfer
4. Potential benefits	Stated plainly, so the assessment is balanced	Faster time-to-first-response for applicants, consistent application of stated criteria, and an audit trail that manual screening did not produce
5. Potential harms	Reasonably foreseeable harm, not only intended use	Systematic disadvantage to applicants with non-linear career histories, non-Australian qualifications, or employment gaps. Reinforcement of historical hiring patterns present in training data
6. Fairness and bias analysis	How bias was tested, on what data, with what result	Quarterly disparity testing across gender and age bands on ranked-vs-hired outcomes. Q2 2026 flagged a gap for candidates with 12-month-plus employment gaps; criteria weighting was amended and re-tested
7. Transparency to affected people	What applicants are told, and when	The careers page states AI assists shortlisting and that a human reviews every decision. Disclosed before application, not after
8. Human oversight	Where a person can intervene and whether they meaningfully can	Recruiter reviews every rejection with the ranking rationale visible. No automated rejection is permitted. Recruiters are measured on decisions, not on throughput, so the review is real rather than nominal
9. Contestability	How an affected person challenges an outcome	Applicants may request a human review by email; the request route is published on the careers page. Requests and outcomes are logged
10. Data provenance and quality	Where training and inference data came from, and its limits	Vendor-trained model; training data not disclosed to us. Documented as a limitation and raised with the vendor. Inference data is our own application forms only
11. Residual risk and acceptance	What remains after treatment, and who accepted it	Medium residual: vendor training data remains opaque. Accepted in writing by the Head of People, with the review interval shortened to six months as the compensating control
12. Review trigger and date	What forces a re-assessment before the scheduled date	Next review 2026-11-30. Immediate re-assessment on vendor model change, role-criteria change, or any disparity finding above threshold

Free to use and adapt. This template is published in full by [Aegentra Academy](https://aegentra.com.au/academy), an official PECB authorised training partner in Australia. Get the rest of the set and the course it accompanies at aegentra.com.au/academy/iso-42001-lead-implementer.