Complete illustrative engagement

Current canonical record

Record SHA256: 4c1545dd43e6d71669497c01320802c97c1394f12351350171cabdc87da4f72b

After returned procedure confirmation and the later vendor disclosure; institution decisions remain blank.

Schema version: 1.2

Source register

Id: src-intake

Title: Intake and supplied-records list

Version: Intake baseline

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: Sponsor scope acknowledgment is illustrated; no institutional authorization is recorded.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: Two declared uses are in scope: staff drafting from procedure text and an embedded vendor feature under consideration. No customer or account data is supplied.

Limitation: The list is the supplied starting point, not a complete technology census.

Id: src-staff

Title: Staff-use disclosure

Version: Initial disclosure

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No authorization to send confidential material is supplied.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: Staff report using a public assistant to draft procedure explanations. The assistant runs outside the institution. Staff do not declare which procedure version was used or all text entered.

Limitation: Self-report is incomplete and does not establish data exclusion or full usage coverage.

Id: src-procedure-earlier

Title: Earlier controlled procedure

Version: Revision 1

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: A supplied approval record marks this version approved through the institution's procedure-control route. The approver name and calendar date are blank.

Review state: Excerpt compared in this illustration

Content: A second reviewer must approve an exception before staff act. If an instruction conflicts with the controlled procedure, pause and refer the question to the procedure owner.

Limitation: This excerpt alone does not establish that the full procedure is complete, current or acceptable.

Id: src-procedure-later

Title: Later working procedure copy

Version: Revision 2 working copy

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No approval record or supersession notice is supplied.

Review state: Excerpt compared in this illustration

Content: Staff may act on a routine exception and notify the second reviewer afterward. The working copy does not say when an exception stops being routine.

Limitation: The higher revision number does not make this working copy the controlling version.

Id: src-vendor-proposal

Title: Embedded-feature proposal

Version: Proposal baseline

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No feature activation approval is supplied.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: The existing platform may include an AI-assisted summary feature. The proposal describes summaries but does not state whether the feature is on by default, which fields it reads, what is retained, or how the institution disables it.

Limitation: A proposal reference is evidence of a claim, not evidence of actual configuration or accepted controls.

Id: src-vendor-disclosure

Title: Vendor feature disclosure

Version: Initial disclosure

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No institutional acceptance is supplied.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: The disclosure refers to service-event metadata and an administrator setting. It does not describe free-text fields, downstream processing, retention, or the effect of switching the setting off.

Limitation: The disclosure leaves data reach and effective disablement unanswered.

Id: src-change

Title: Changed vendor feature disclosure

Version: Revised disclosure

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No institutional acceptance or activation approval is supplied.

Review state: Read and compared in the follow-up illustration

Content: The revised disclosure says the feature is enabled unless the institution disables it and may read free-text service notes in addition to event metadata. No configuration capture or retention answer accompanies the revision.

Limitation: The supplied change reopens the data-reach and default-setting question; it does not prove the live setting.

Id: src-procedure-confirmation

Title: Returned controlling-version confirmation

Version: Owner response 1

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: Synthetic role confirmation; actual-institution signer and date remain blank

Review state: Inspected and judged sufficient in this illustration for the version question only

Content: The procedure owner confirms Revision 1 controls, withdraws Revision 2 working copy for this workflow and retains the second-review requirement. The returned response includes the controlling approval reference and explicitly addresses the conflicting instruction.

Limitation: Resolves only the controlling-version question in the synthetic sequence. It does not authorize assistant use or establish the permitted-input boundary.

Coverage activities

Id: cov-scope

Activity: Agree the review boundary

What was done: Read the intake baseline and record the two declared uses and supplied materials.

Finding: The engagement is bounded to the supplied records and these two uses.

Limit: No network discovery, system access or institution-wide census was performed.

Id: cov-disclosures

Activity: Reconcile use disclosures

What was done: Compare staff-use disclosure with the embedded-feature proposal and vendor disclosure.

Finding: Staff inputs and vendor data reach remain incompletely declared.

Limit: A disclosure does not establish actual behavior.

Id: cov-versions

Activity: Reconcile procedure versions

What was done: Compare both supplied excerpts and their approval provenance.

Finding: Secondary-review instructions conflict; only the earlier version has supplied approval evidence.

Limit: No full-procedure acceptance or supersession determination is made.

Id: cov-review

Activity: Prepare the reviewer file

What was done: Record observations, open questions, role assignments, recommendation and conditions.

Finding: The board summary explains why feature activation is deferred and staff drafting is limited.

Limit: Preparation does not record a reviewer acceptance or an institutional decision.

Id: cov-change

Activity: Review a supplied change

What was done: Retain the baseline and compare a revised vendor disclosure to the initial disclosure.

Finding: Default activation and free-text data reach reopen the affected question.

Limit: The revised disclosure is not a live configuration inspection.

Six column evidence rows

Id: use-staff

Use: Staff drafting of procedure explanations

Where it runs: A public assistant outside the institution

Data it can touch: Reported procedure text; full inputs are not disclosed. Customer, member, account and confidential material must be excluded.

Owner: Operations procedure owner

Evidence on hand: Staff-use disclosure; earlier controlled procedure; later working copy; supplied approval record for the earlier version; returned controlling-version confirmation

Question still open: Can the permitted-input boundary and generated-answer review be demonstrated?

Source ids

src-staff

src-procedure-earlier

src-procedure-later

src-procedure-confirmation

Reviewer observation: Returned evidence resolves the controlling-version question in this illustration. Staff inputs and safe-use treatment remain open.

Review disposition: Retain the earlier controlled procedure as the review baseline; resolve conflict before using generated instructions operationally.

Id: use-vendor

Use: Embedded AI summary feature in an existing platform

Where it runs: The vendor's service; downstream processing is not declared

Data it can touch: Initial disclosure mentions event metadata; free-text reach, retention and downstream access are unresolved.

Owner: Vendor-management owner with IT review

Evidence on hand: Embedded-feature proposal and incomplete initial vendor disclosure

Question still open: Is the feature enabled by default, what can it read, and does the institution's off setting stop the relevant processing?

Source ids

src-vendor-proposal

src-vendor-disclosure

Reviewer observation: The documents describe a feature but do not establish the live setting or effective off control.

Review disposition: Do not authorize activation on the supplied evidence; request configuration and data-handling evidence.

Conflicting procedure excerpts

Source id: src-procedure-earlier

Excerpt: A second reviewer must approve an exception before staff act. If an instruction conflicts with the controlled procedure, pause and refer the question to the procedure owner.

Approval state: A supplied approval record marks this version approved through the institution's procedure-control route. The approver name and calendar date are blank.

Source id: src-procedure-later

Excerpt: Staff may act on a routine exception and notify the second reviewer afterward. The working copy does not say when an exception stops being routine.

Approval state: No approval record or supersession notice is supplied.

Open questions

Id: q-procedure

Question: Which procedure version controls?

Reason: The supplied excerpts conflict and the later working copy lacks approval and supersession evidence.

Needed evidence: Procedure owner's controlling-version confirmation, approval record and explicit treatment of the conflicting instruction.

Owner role: Operations procedure owner

Status: Resolved in illustration for controlling version only

Resolution source id: src-procedure-confirmation

Resolution reason: The returned owner response identifies the controlling version, approval reference and treatment of the conflicting instruction.

Id: q-staff-data

Question: What text has staff sent, and what may they send?

Reason: The staff disclosure does not enumerate inputs or demonstrate exclusion of confidential material.

Needed evidence: A permitted-input rule, a redacted input example and a review of the disclosed usage boundary.

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner with operations

Status: Open

Id: q-vendor

Question: What can the feature read, and is it effectively off?

Reason: Default behavior, fields, retention, downstream access and effective disablement are not established.

Needed evidence: Feature-specific handling terms, field list, retention answer and authorized configuration evidence.

Owner role: Vendor-management owner with IT

Status: Reopened by supplied change

Id: q-return

Question: What evidence would permit a return to the reviewer?

Reason: The recommendation is conditional; no acceptance or institutional authorization is recorded.

Needed evidence: Completed role actions, reviewed supporting evidence and a separate recorded decision by the authorized institution reviewer.

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner

Status: Open

Actions

Id: action-procedure

Owner role: Operations procedure owner

Action: Confirm the controlling procedure and resolve the secondary-review conflict with an approval or correction record.

Due milestone: Before any generated procedure instruction is used operationally

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Controlling-version confirmation and approved treatment of the conflicting instruction

Status: Resolved in illustration after sufficient returned evidence

Question ids

q-procedure

Closure source ids

src-procedure-confirmation

Closure scope: Version confirmation only; assistant authorization remains separate

Reviewer role: Illustrative procedure-control reviewer

Actual institution acceptance: Left blank

Id: action-staff

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner with operations

Action: Define permitted inputs, collect a redacted example, and review the staff-use disclosure before allowing the limited drafting workflow.

Due milestone: Before the limited staff drafting workflow begins

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Permitted-input rule, redacted input example and documented review

Status: Assigned role; completion not asserted

Question ids

q-staff-data

Id: action-vendor

Owner role: Vendor-management owner

Action: Obtain feature-specific default, field-access, retention, downstream-processing and disablement answers; reconcile the revised disclosure.

Due milestone: Before feature activation is reconsidered

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Written feature disclosure and handling terms with unresolved items identified

Status: Assigned role; completion not asserted

Question ids

q-vendor

Id: action-it

Owner role: IT owner

Action: Inspect the authorized feature setting and document what the off control covers; use approved synthetic test material if a control test is authorized.

Due milestone: Before feature activation is reconsidered

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Authorized setting record and any separately authorized control-test result

Status: Inspection and test are requested; neither is claimed completed

Question ids

q-vendor

Id: action-board

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner

Action: Return the evidence and unresolved items to the authorized reviewer, then record any actual decision separately.

Due milestone: At the next reviewer decision milestone after the evidence actions

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Reviewer observations and a separately completed institution decision record

Status: Reviewer acceptance and institution decision remain blank

Question ids

q-return

Retained baseline

Id: baseline-review

Label: Retained review baseline

Source ids

src-intake

src-staff

src-procedure-earlier

src-procedure-later

src-vendor-proposal

src-vendor-disclosure

Recommendation: Retain the earlier controlled procedure as the baseline. Limit staff drafting to approved generic or redacted procedure material under human review once the input and version conditions are resolved. Keep the embedded feature disabled pending evidence of data reach, defaults and effective disablement.

Decision conditions

The procedure owner confirms the controlling version and resolves the secondary-review conflict.

Risk/compliance and operations review the permitted-input rule and redacted example; confidential material remains outside the public assistant.

Vendor management supplies complete feature-specific handling answers, and IT provides authorized evidence of the relevant setting and control behavior.

The authorized institution reviewer makes and records the actual decision separately; a source reference or completed checkbox is insufficient.

Actual institution decision

Decision: Left blank

Reviewer: Left blank

Owner: Left blank

Calendar date: Left blank

Retention note: Keep the initial source register, excerpts, observations, open questions and recommendation together. The supplied follow-up does not overwrite them.

Change event

Id: change-vendor-disclosure

Trigger: A revised vendor feature disclosure is supplied after the baseline review.

Source id: src-change

Changed claim: The feature is described as enabled unless disabled, with access to free-text service notes as well as event metadata.

Affected question id: q-vendor

Reopened question: What can the feature read, and is it effectively off?

Reviewer observation: The changed default and broader stated data reach require new configuration and handling evidence. The source change does not prove the live feature is active or that a disable control works.

Actions reopened

action-vendor

action-it

Baseline disposition: Retain the baseline. Add this revision and a follow-up observation; do not silently replace the earlier evidence.

Recommendation after change: Continue to defer feature activation and request revised handling answers plus authorized setting evidence. The controlling-version action remains resolved in the illustration; permitted staff inputs and generated-answer review remain open.

Actual institution decision

Decision: Left blank

Reviewer: Left blank

Owner: Left blank

Calendar date: Left blank

Actual institution decision

Decision: Left blank

Reviewer: Left blank

Owner: Left blank

Calendar date: Left blank

Disclosure: Supporting records for a synthetic illustration; no institutional acceptance or live inspection is asserted.

Illustrative: Yes

Review scope

Uses: 2

Records: Only the declared uses and listed source versions

Exclusions

Institution-wide discovery

Live systems and configurations

Confidential customer records

Legal opinion and compliance certification

Timing: Illustrative sequence, not a measured delivery duration

Tiering method

Source: https://www.csbs.org/node/584231

Source checked: October 11, 2026

Method: Assess consumer impact, human oversight, harm potential and data sensitivity. The highest-rated known factor generally sets the preliminary tier. Unknown factors keep the assignment provisional.

Boundary: Tiers follow the optional CSBS worksheet. Your institution assigns the final tier.

Factor assessments

Use id: use-staff

Consumer impact: Tier 2: drafts may affect operational instructions

Human oversight: Unknown: consistent qualified review not evidenced

Harm potential: Tier 2: a wrong instruction could cause operational harm

Data sensitivity: Unknown: historical inputs not verified

Preliminary tier: Tier 2 provisional; unknown factors may raise the tier

Use id: use-vendor

Consumer impact: Unknown: output use not accepted

Human oversight: Unknown: checkpoints not evidenced

Harm potential: Unknown: operating dependence not established

Data sensitivity: Potential Tier 3: free-text service notes may contain sensitive information

Preliminary tier: Tier 3 provisional pending data and control review

Version: CSBS worksheet preparation: example edition 2026-10-17

Proposed risk tiers

Use id: use-staff

Proposed tier: Tier 2 provisional; unknown factors may raise the tier

Reasons

Drafts may become operational instructions.

Inputs and controlling versions were initially unclear.

Source ids

src-staff

src-procedure-earlier

src-procedure-later

src-procedure-confirmation

Uncertainty: Historical staff inputs and permitted-input enforcement remain unverified.

Possible treatment: Consider a Tier 1 only after permitted generic inputs, controlled versions and human review are evidenced.

Reviewer role: Institution risk reviewer

Reviewer status: Pending institution review

Institution accepted tier: Left blank

Use id: use-vendor

Proposed tier: Tier 3 provisional pending data and control review

Reasons

The revised disclosure expands stated reach to free-text service notes.

Default activation, retention and effective shutdown require evidence.

Service notes may contain sensitive information; actual contents and safeguards remain unknown.

Source ids

src-vendor-disclosure

src-change

Uncertainty: No authorized setting inspection or shutdown test has been returned.

Possible treatment: Keep activation deferred; obtain handling answers and authorized control evidence.

Reviewer role: Institution risk reviewer with IT

Reviewer status: Pending institution review

Institution accepted tier: Left blank

Safe use policy gaps

Id: gap-input-version

Use id: use-staff

Source ids

src-staff

src-procedure-earlier

src-procedure-later

Finding: Neither supplied procedure excerpt states which inputs may enter a public assistant or how generated wording is checked against the controlling version.

Proposed treatment: Permit only approved generic or redacted procedure text. Exclude member, account and confidential material. Record the controlling version and require a second reviewer before operational use.

Action id: action-staff

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner with operations

Status: Open; treatment proposed, not an approved policy

Board condition: Tier 1 staff drafting remains conditional on reviewed input boundaries and generated-answer review.

Evidence assessments

Id: assessment-version

Question id: q-procedure

Source ids

src-procedure-earlier

src-procedure-later

src-procedure-confirmation

Declaration received: Yes

Reference supplied: Yes

Source inspected: Synthetic reviewer compared the returned response with both excerpts

Sufficiency: Sufficient in this illustration for controlling version only

Reviewer role: Illustrative procedure-control reviewer

Review date: Left blank

Institution decision recorded: No

Limitation: No actual-institution approval, use authorization or verified signature

Id: assessment-inputs

Question id: q-staff-data

Source ids

src-staff

Declaration received: Yes

Reference supplied: Yes

Source inspected: Synthetic review of supplied disclosure

Sufficiency: Insufficient: input examples and an accepted safe-use treatment are missing

Reviewer role: Illustrative risk reviewer

Review date: Left blank

Institution decision recorded: No

Id: assessment-vendor

Question id: q-vendor

Source ids

src-vendor-disclosure

src-change

Declaration received: Yes

Reference supplied: Yes

Source inspected: Synthetic comparison of initial and revised disclosures

Sufficiency: Insufficient: configuration, shutdown, retention and downstream handling remain open

Reviewer role: Illustrative risk reviewer with IT

Review date: Left blank

Institution decision recorded: No

Board traceability

Finding: Version conflict

Question id: q-procedure

Action ids

action-procedure

Assessment id: assessment-version

Board recommendation: Retain Revision 1 as the controlling baseline in this example.

Condition: Closing this action alone does not authorize AI use.

Finding: Safe-use policy gap and unknown historical inputs

Question id: q-staff-data

Action ids

action-staff

Assessment id: assessment-inputs

Board recommendation: Defer operational use of generated instructions pending accepted input and review rules.

Condition: Institution records its own decision after evidence review.

Finding: Expanded vendor data reach and unresolved shutdown

Question id: q-vendor

Action ids

action-vendor

action-it

Assessment id: assessment-vendor

Board recommendation: Keep embedded-feature activation deferred.

Condition: Revised handling terms and authorized control evidence must return to review.

Follow up history

Stage: Initial baseline

Records

Schema version: 1.0

Source register

Id: src-intake

Title: Intake and supplied-records list

Version: Intake baseline

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: Sponsor scope acknowledgment is illustrated; no institutional authorization is recorded.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: Two declared uses are in scope: staff drafting from procedure text and an embedded vendor feature under consideration. No customer or account data is supplied.

Limitation: The list is the supplied starting point, not a complete technology census.

Id: src-staff

Title: Staff-use disclosure

Version: Initial disclosure

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No authorization to send confidential material is supplied.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: Staff report using a public assistant to draft procedure explanations. The assistant runs outside the institution. Staff do not declare which procedure version was used or all text entered.

Limitation: Self-report is incomplete and does not establish data exclusion or full usage coverage.

Id: src-procedure-earlier

Title: Earlier controlled procedure

Version: Revision 1

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: A supplied approval record marks this version approved through the institution's procedure-control route. The approver name and calendar date are blank.

Review state: Excerpt compared in this illustration

Content: A second reviewer must approve an exception before staff act. If an instruction conflicts with the controlled procedure, pause and refer the question to the procedure owner.

Limitation: This excerpt alone does not establish that the full procedure is complete, current or acceptable.

Id: src-procedure-later

Title: Later working procedure copy

Version: Revision 2 working copy

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No approval record or supersession notice is supplied.

Review state: Excerpt compared in this illustration

Content: Staff may act on a routine exception and notify the second reviewer afterward. The working copy does not say when an exception stops being routine.

Limitation: The higher revision number does not make this working copy the controlling version.

Id: src-vendor-proposal

Title: Embedded-feature proposal

Version: Proposal baseline

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No feature activation approval is supplied.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: The existing platform may include an AI-assisted summary feature. The proposal describes summaries but does not state whether the feature is on by default, which fields it reads, what is retained, or how the institution disables it.

Limitation: A proposal reference is evidence of a claim, not evidence of actual configuration or accepted controls.

Id: src-vendor-disclosure

Title: Vendor feature disclosure

Version: Initial disclosure

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No institutional acceptance is supplied.

Review state: Read in this illustration

Content: The disclosure refers to service-event metadata and an administrator setting. It does not describe free-text fields, downstream processing, retention, or the effect of switching the setting off.

Limitation: The disclosure leaves data reach and effective disablement unanswered.

Id: src-change

Title: Changed vendor feature disclosure

Version: Revised disclosure

Calendar date: Left blank

Approval status: No institutional acceptance or activation approval is supplied.

Review state: Read and compared in the follow-up illustration

Content: The revised disclosure says the feature is enabled unless the institution disables it and may read free-text service notes in addition to event metadata. No configuration capture or retention answer accompanies the revision.

Limitation: The supplied change reopens the data-reach and default-setting question; it does not prove the live setting.

Coverage activities

Id: cov-scope

Activity: Agree the review boundary

What was done: Read the intake baseline and record the two declared uses and supplied materials.

Finding: The engagement is bounded to the supplied records and these two uses.

Limit: No network discovery, system access or institution-wide census was performed.

Id: cov-disclosures

Activity: Reconcile use disclosures

What was done: Compare staff-use disclosure with the embedded-feature proposal and vendor disclosure.

Finding: Staff inputs and vendor data reach remain incompletely declared.

Limit: A disclosure does not establish actual behavior.

Id: cov-versions

Activity: Reconcile procedure versions

What was done: Compare both supplied excerpts and their approval provenance.

Finding: Secondary-review instructions conflict; only the earlier version has supplied approval evidence.

Limit: No full-procedure acceptance or supersession determination is made.

Id: cov-review

Activity: Prepare the reviewer file

What was done: Record observations, open questions, role assignments, recommendation and conditions.

Finding: The board summary explains why feature activation is deferred and staff drafting is limited.

Limit: Preparation does not record a reviewer acceptance or an institutional decision.

Id: cov-change

Activity: Review a supplied change

What was done: Retain the baseline and compare a revised vendor disclosure to the initial disclosure.

Finding: Default activation and free-text data reach reopen the affected question.

Limit: The revised disclosure is not a live configuration inspection.

Six column evidence rows

Id: use-staff

Use: Staff drafting of procedure explanations

Where it runs: A public assistant outside the institution

Data it can touch: Reported procedure text; full inputs are not disclosed. Customer, member, account and confidential material must be excluded.

Owner: Operations procedure owner

Evidence on hand: Staff-use disclosure; earlier controlled procedure; later working copy; supplied approval record for the earlier version

Question still open: Which version controls, and can the permitted input boundary be demonstrated?

Source ids

src-staff

src-procedure-earlier

src-procedure-later

Reviewer observation: The excerpts conflict on secondary review. No supersession evidence supports treating the later working copy as controlling. Input disclosure remains incomplete.

Review disposition: Retain the earlier controlled procedure as the review baseline; resolve conflict before using generated instructions operationally.

Id: use-vendor

Use: Embedded AI summary feature in an existing platform

Where it runs: The vendor's service; downstream processing is not declared

Data it can touch: Initial disclosure mentions event metadata; free-text reach, retention and downstream access are unresolved.

Owner: Vendor-management owner with IT review

Evidence on hand: Embedded-feature proposal and incomplete initial vendor disclosure

Question still open: Is the feature enabled by default, what can it read, and does the institution's off setting stop the relevant processing?

Source ids

src-vendor-proposal

src-vendor-disclosure

Reviewer observation: The documents describe a feature but do not establish the live setting or effective off control.

Review disposition: Do not authorize activation on the supplied evidence; request configuration and data-handling evidence.

Conflicting procedure excerpts

Source id: src-procedure-earlier

Excerpt: A second reviewer must approve an exception before staff act. If an instruction conflicts with the controlled procedure, pause and refer the question to the procedure owner.

Approval state: A supplied approval record marks this version approved through the institution's procedure-control route. The approver name and calendar date are blank.

Source id: src-procedure-later

Excerpt: Staff may act on a routine exception and notify the second reviewer afterward. The working copy does not say when an exception stops being routine.

Approval state: No approval record or supersession notice is supplied.

Open questions

Id: q-procedure

Question: Which procedure version controls?

Reason: The supplied excerpts conflict and the later working copy lacks approval and supersession evidence.

Needed evidence: Procedure owner's controlling-version confirmation, approval record and explicit treatment of the conflicting instruction.

Owner role: Operations procedure owner

Status: Open

Id: q-staff-data

Question: What text has staff sent, and what may they send?

Reason: The staff disclosure does not enumerate inputs or demonstrate exclusion of confidential material.

Needed evidence: A permitted-input rule, a redacted input example and a review of the disclosed usage boundary.

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner with operations

Status: Open

Id: q-vendor

Question: What can the feature read, and is it effectively off?

Reason: Default behavior, fields, retention, downstream access and effective disablement are not established.

Needed evidence: Feature-specific handling terms, field list, retention answer and authorized configuration evidence.

Owner role: Vendor-management owner with IT

Status: Reopened by supplied change

Id: q-return

Question: What evidence would permit a return to the reviewer?

Reason: The recommendation is conditional; no acceptance or institutional authorization is recorded.

Needed evidence: Completed role actions, reviewed supporting evidence and a separate recorded decision by the authorized institution reviewer.

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner

Status: Open

Actions

Id: action-procedure

Owner role: Operations procedure owner

Action: Confirm the controlling procedure and resolve the secondary-review conflict with an approval or correction record.

Due milestone: Before any generated procedure instruction is used operationally

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Controlling-version confirmation and approved treatment of the conflicting instruction

Status: Assigned role; completion not asserted

Question ids

q-procedure

Id: action-staff

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner with operations

Action: Define permitted inputs, collect a redacted example, and review the staff-use disclosure before allowing the limited drafting workflow.

Due milestone: Before the limited staff drafting workflow begins

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Permitted-input rule, redacted input example and documented review

Status: Assigned role; completion not asserted

Question ids

q-staff-data

Id: action-vendor

Owner role: Vendor-management owner

Action: Obtain feature-specific default, field-access, retention, downstream-processing and disablement answers; reconcile the revised disclosure.

Due milestone: Before feature activation is reconsidered

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Written feature disclosure and handling terms with unresolved items identified

Status: Assigned role; completion not asserted

Question ids

q-vendor

Id: action-it

Owner role: IT owner

Action: Inspect the authorized feature setting and document what the off control covers; use approved synthetic test material if a control test is authorized.

Due milestone: Before feature activation is reconsidered

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Authorized setting record and any separately authorized control-test result

Status: Inspection and test are requested; neither is claimed completed

Question ids

q-vendor

Id: action-board

Owner role: Risk/compliance owner

Action: Return the evidence and unresolved items to the authorized reviewer, then record any actual decision separately.

Due milestone: At the next reviewer decision milestone after the evidence actions

Calendar due date: Left blank

Evidence to return: Reviewer observations and a separately completed institution decision record

Status: Reviewer acceptance and institution decision remain blank

Question ids

q-return

Retained baseline

Id: baseline-review

Label: Retained review baseline

Source ids

src-intake

src-staff

src-procedure-earlier

src-procedure-later

src-vendor-proposal

src-vendor-disclosure

Recommendation: Retain the earlier controlled procedure as the baseline. Limit staff drafting to approved generic or redacted procedure material under human review once the input and version conditions are resolved. Keep the embedded feature disabled pending evidence of data reach, defaults and effective disablement.

Decision conditions

The procedure owner confirms the controlling version and resolves the secondary-review conflict.

Risk/compliance and operations review the permitted-input rule and redacted example; confidential material remains outside the public assistant.

Vendor management supplies complete feature-specific handling answers, and IT provides authorized evidence of the relevant setting and control behavior.

The authorized institution reviewer makes and records the actual decision separately; a source reference or completed checkbox is insufficient.

Actual institution decision

Decision: Left blank

Reviewer: Left blank

Owner: Left blank

Calendar date: Left blank

Retention note: Keep the initial source register, excerpts, observations, open questions and recommendation together. The supplied follow-up does not overwrite them.

Change event

Id: change-vendor-disclosure

Trigger: A revised vendor feature disclosure is supplied after the baseline review.

Source id: src-change

Changed claim: The feature is described as enabled unless disabled, with access to free-text service notes as well as event metadata.

Affected question id: q-vendor

Reopened question: What can the feature read, and is it effectively off?

Reviewer observation: The changed default and broader stated data reach require new configuration and handling evidence. The source change does not prove the live feature is active or that a disable control works.

Actions reopened

action-vendor

action-it

Baseline disposition: Retain the baseline. Add this revision and a follow-up observation; do not silently replace the earlier evidence.

Recommendation after change: Continue to defer feature activation and request the revised handling answers plus authorized setting evidence. The staff version-control question stays open on its existing evidence.

Actual institution decision

Decision: Left blank

Reviewer: Left blank

Owner: Left blank

Calendar date: Left blank

Actual institution decision

Decision: Left blank

Reviewer: Left blank

Owner: Left blank

Calendar date: Left blank

Disclosure: Supporting records for a synthetic illustration; no institutional acceptance or live inspection is asserted.

Note: Retained unchanged. Initial questions and actions remain visible as history.

Stage: Returned evidence

Source id: src-procedure-confirmation

Question id: q-procedure

Action id: action-procedure

Result: Version question resolved in the illustration; assistant use remains unapproved.

Stage: Later vendor change

Event

Id: change-vendor-disclosure

Trigger: A revised vendor feature disclosure is supplied after the baseline review.

Source id: src-change

Changed claim: The feature is described as enabled unless disabled, with access to free-text service notes as well as event metadata.

Affected question id: q-vendor

Reopened question: What can the feature read, and is it effectively off?

Reviewer observation: The changed default and broader stated data reach require new configuration and handling evidence. The source change does not prove the live feature is active or that a disable control works.

Actions reopened

action-vendor

action-it

Baseline disposition: Retain the baseline. Add this revision and a follow-up observation; do not silently replace the earlier evidence.

Recommendation after change: Continue to defer feature activation and request revised handling answers plus authorized setting evidence. The controlling-version action remains resolved in the illustration; permitted staff inputs and generated-answer review remain open.

Actual institution decision

Decision: Left blank

Reviewer: Left blank

Owner: Left blank

Calendar date: Left blank

Result: Vendor question and two related actions return to review. Prior record is retained; no approval carries forward.

Delivery checklist

Declared coverage and exclusions

AI use inventory

Source/version register

Evidence assessment and gaps

Proposed risk tiers with reasons

Safe-use policy gap and treatment

Owned actions and milestones

Examiner-request mapping

Board briefing with evidence links

Blank actual-institution decision

Retained baseline and changed-source review

Examiner mapping

Request: Inventory

Where answer lives: Declared-use summary and review boundary

Limit: Declared uses only

Request: Policies

Where answer lives: Source register and safe-use policy gap

Limit: Treatment proposed; institution accepts

Request: Governance

Where answer lives: Owned actions and the separate institution decision

Limit: Actual acceptance blank

Request: Risk assessment

Where answer lives: Tiering method and proposed tier reasons

Limit: Proposed CSBS-aligned tiers

Request: Vendor documents

Where answer lives: Source register and evidence assessments

Limit: Disclosure is not configuration inspection

Request: Monitoring

Where answer lives: Retained baseline and supplied-change history

Limit: Supplied updates, not automatic monitoring

Request: Risk tier worksheet

Where answer lives: Proposed risk tiers and reviewer status

Limit: Institution reviewer still required

Export boundary: Preparation and illustrative reviewer observations are separate from actual institution acceptance. Blank decision fields remain blank.

Example edition: 2026-10-17

As of state: After returned procedure confirmation and the later vendor disclosure; institution decisions remain blank.

Method review

Status: Proposed illustration; qualified reviewer signoff not recorded

Reviewer: Left blank

Date: Left blank

Selection note: Use the existing supporting record four-factor method consistently. No new institutional or regulator acceptance is asserted.

Board brief

Recommendation: Keep embedded-feature activation deferred. Consider staff drafting only after input limits and human review are accepted.

Rationale: The procedure version conflict is resolved in this illustration. Vendor handling, data reach and shutdown evidence remain incomplete.

Conditions

Retain Revision 1 as the controlling procedure baseline.

Return an accepted input rule and evidence of generated-answer review before operational use.

Obtain feature-specific handling terms and authorized shutdown evidence before reconsidering activation.

Tiers

Staff procedure drafting: Tier 2 provisional; unknown factors may raise the tier

Embedded vendor feature: Tier 3 provisional pending data and control review

Institution decision: Left blank

Institution reviewer: Left blank

Decision date: Left blank