

AI governance starter

A complete illustrative engagement

Clearly synthetic example.

Board summary

Two declared uses are documented. Staff drafting creates a version-control and input-boundary question. The embedded feature creates an unresolved data-reach and activation question. The file assigns evidence work to operations, risk/compliance, vendor management and IT.

A later-looking procedure is not necessarily the controlling procedure, and a vendor proposal does not establish which data the feature can access. Acting before those questions are resolved would leave the review rationale unsupported.

Illustrative 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.

Illustrative decision conditions

1. The procedure owner confirms the controlling version and resolves the secondary-review conflict.
2. Risk/compliance and operations review the permitted-input rule and redacted example; confidential material remains outside the public assistant.
3. Vendor management supplies complete feature-specific handling answers, and IT provides authorized evidence of the relevant setting and control behavior.
4. The authorized institution reviewer makes and records the actual decision separately; a source reference or completed checkbox is insufficient.

Conditional illustrative decision

Allow only the limited staff drafting workflow after its input and controlling-version conditions are evidenced and reviewed. Defer embedded-feature activation until the feature conditions are evidenced and the authorized institution reviewer records a separate decision.

Actual institution decision

Decision: _____

Institution reviewer: _____ Decision date: _____

A review prepares a file. It does not certify compliance, give a legal opinion or connect to a core.

Intake and review coverage

What can the institution support on the supplied evidence before these two AI uses proceed?

The sponsor supplies generic procedure excerpts, a staff-use disclosure, an embedded-feature proposal and incomplete vendor disclosure. No real institution, vendor, person or confidential customer record is used.

Included

Two declared uses, supplied-source reconciliation, approval provenance, reviewer observations, role actions, board summary, conditional recommendation and one supplied-change follow-up.

Outside this review

System access, discovery, confidential source collection, actual feature activation, legal opinion, compliance certification and core integration.

Activity	Work and finding	Limit
Agree the review boundary	Read the intake baseline and record the two declared uses and supplied materials. The engagement is bounded to the supplied records and these two uses.	No network discovery, system access or institution-wide census was performed.
Reconcile use disclosures	Compare staff-use disclosure with the embedded-feature proposal and vendor disclosure. Staff inputs and vendor data reach remain incompletely declared.	A disclosure does not establish actual behavior.
Reconcile procedure versions	Compare both supplied excerpts and their approval provenance. Secondary-review instructions conflict; only the earlier version has supplied approval evidence.	No full-procedure acceptance or supersession determination is made.
Prepare the reviewer file	Record observations, open questions, role assignments, recommendation and conditions. The board summary explains why feature activation is deferred and staff drafting is limited.	Preparation does not record a reviewer acceptance or an institutional decision.
Review a supplied change	Retain the baseline and compare a revised vendor disclosure to the initial disclosure. Default activation and free-text data reach reopen the affected question.	The revised disclosure is not a live configuration inspection.

Prepared for the reviewer

The source register, compared excerpts, reviewer observations, role actions and conditional recommendation are prepared for review.

Still open

The controlling-version confirmation, permitted-input evidence, feature-specific handling answers, live setting evidence and actual reviewer decision remain open.

Declared uses and evidence

The same six columns remain visible. Supporting observations explain the disposition below each use.

Staff drafting of procedure explanations

Evidence column	Entry
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?

Reviewer observation

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

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

Embedded AI summary feature in an existing platform

Evidence column	Entry
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?

Reviewer observation

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

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

Sources, versions and procedure conflict

Supplied source / version	Approval provenance and limit
Intake and supplied-records list / Intake baseline	Sponsor scope acknowledgment is illustrated; no institutional authorization is recorded. The list is the supplied starting point, not a complete technology census.
Staff-use disclosure / Initial disclosure	No authorization to send confidential material is supplied. Self-report is incomplete and does not establish data exclusion or full usage coverage.
Earlier controlled procedure / Revision 1	A supplied approval record marks this version approved through the institution's procedure-control route. The approver name and calendar date are blank. This excerpt alone does not establish that the full procedure is complete, current or acceptable.
Later working procedure copy / Revision 2 working copy	No approval record or supersession notice is supplied. The higher revision number does not make this working copy the controlling version.
Embedded-feature proposal / Proposal baseline	No feature activation approval is supplied. A proposal reference is evidence of a claim, not evidence of actual configuration or accepted controls.
Vendor feature disclosure / Initial disclosure	No institutional acceptance is supplied. The disclosure leaves data reach and effective disablement unanswered.

Earlier controlled procedure - Revision 1

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.

Later working procedure copy - Revision 2 working copy

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.

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

Source references show what was supplied. Inspection, acceptance and action completion require their own recorded evidence.

Open questions and assigned actions

Roles are assigned in the illustration. Due dates are relative milestones. Completion is not asserted.

Open question	Evidence needed / owner
Which procedure version controls?	Procedure owner's controlling-version confirmation, approval record and explicit treatment of the conflicting instruction. Owner: Operations procedure owner. Status: Open.
What text has staff sent, and what may they send?	A permitted-input rule, a redacted input example and a review of the disclosed usage boundary. Owner: Risk/compliance owner with operations. Status: Open.
What can the feature read, and is it effectively off?	Feature-specific handling terms, field list, retention answer and authorized configuration evidence. Owner: Vendor-management owner with IT. Status: Reopened by supplied change.
What evidence would permit a return to the reviewer?	Completed role actions, reviewed supporting evidence and a separate recorded decision by the authorized institution reviewer. Owner: Risk/compliance owner. Status: Open.

Action register

Owner role	Action and evidence	Due milestone
Operations procedure owner	Confirm the controlling procedure and resolve the secondary-review conflict with an approval or correction record. Return: Controlling-version confirmation and approved treatment of the conflicting instruction.	Before any generated procedure instruction is used operationally
Risk/compliance owner with operations	Define permitted inputs, collect a redacted example, and review the staff-use disclosure before allowing the limited drafting workflow. Return: Permitted-input rule, redacted input example and documented review.	Before the limited staff drafting workflow begins
Vendor-management owner	Obtain feature-specific default, field-access, retention, downstream-processing and disablement answers; reconcile the revised disclosure. Return: Written feature disclosure and handling terms with unresolved items identified.	Before feature activation is reconsidered
IT owner	Inspect the authorized feature setting and document what the off control covers; use approved synthetic test material if a control test is authorized. Return: Authorized setting record and any separately authorized control-test result.	Before feature activation is reconsidered
Risk/compliance owner	Return the evidence and unresolved items to the authorized reviewer, then record any actual decision separately. Return: Reviewer observations and a separately completed institution decision record.	At the next reviewer decision milestone after the evidence actions

A supplied change reopens a question

Retained baseline

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

The initial embedded-feature proposal and disclosure did not establish default activation, free-text reach or an effective off control. The recommendation deferred feature activation.

Changed source

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

Changed vendor feature disclosure - Revised disclosure

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.

Question reopened

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

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

Vendor management reconciles the revised feature disclosure. IT supplies authorized setting evidence and any separately authorized control-test result. Both are due before activation is reconsidered. Neither action is claimed complete.

Recommendation after the 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: _____

Institution reviewer: _____ Decision date: _____

Records retained with this file

Executive summary CSV and supporting records JSON retain the source versions, observations, actions, baseline and supplied change. Stable record identifiers appear in the exports; the human review remains about the question and its evidence.

No acceptance is inferred from a supplied source, reference, checkbox or higher revision number.