

From AI exposure to governed action.



COMPLETE FICTIONAL EXAMPLE

AI Exposure Review

From uncertainty to governed action.

FICTIONAL CLIENT	Northbridge Professional Services Ltd
REVIEW PERIOD	September 2026
PREPARED BY	Governance Intelligence Systems
STATUS	Illustrative sample — not issued to a real client

A useful review should reduce uncertainty, not manufacture alarm.

This example shows the management report, evidence distinctions, action plan and supporting registers a client may receive.

This is a fictional composite created for demonstration. It contains no real client data. It is not a legal opinion, certification or assessment of any real organisation.

01 · POSITION AT A GLANCE

What leadership needs to know

Overall position: AMBER - manageable exposure, incomplete evidence

AI is already embedded in everyday work. We found no basis in this fictional sample to conclude that the organisation is in material breach of AI-specific law. The immediate issue is visibility: the organisation cannot yet demonstrate a complete, current picture of AI use, data flows, ownership and supplier controls.

Area	Position	Evidence status	Priority
AI inventory	Partial - licensed tools known; staff-led use not fully captured	Supported + client-reported	High
Client/confidential data	Permitted boundaries are not consistently documented	Reported by client	High
Ownership	Accountability exists informally but is not consolidated	Supported by reviewed evidence	High
Human review	Strong in client-facing outputs; less clear in internal decision support	Supported + unknown	Medium
Supplier assurance	Core suppliers reviewed; embedded AI changes not tracked consistently	Supported by reviewed evidence	Medium
AI literacy	General awareness exists; role-specific evidence is limited	Reported by client	Medium

What should happen first

- **Name one accountable owner** for the AI inventory and change log.
- **Confirm the real toolset** with a short staff declaration and supplier check - not only the licensed-software list.
- **Define permitted information** for common AI workflows, especially meeting summaries, drafting and client material.
- **Close evidence gaps** before buying additional governance tooling.

Decision for leadership

Approve a 30-day evidence-and-control tidy-up. Do not pause sensible AI use; make current use visible, owned and verifiable.

02 · SCOPE AND EVIDENCE

What we reviewed - and what we did not

This sample assumes a proportionate review of ordinary professional-services AI use. The real GIS review would tailor scope to the client, sector, geography, systems and risk profile.

Reviewed evidence	Example status
AI / acceptable-use policy and privacy material	Reviewed
Licensed software list and selected supplier documentation	Reviewed
Sample Teams/Copilot meeting workflow	Observed / demonstrated
Interviews with business, compliance, IT and representative users	Client-reported evidence
Selected website and client-facing AI features	Reviewed
AI-related incidents, complaints or exceptions	None reported in sample

Evidence-status labels used throughout

Label	Meaning
Supported by reviewed evidence	GIS inspected evidence sufficient to support the statement within scope.
Reported by client	A client representative stated it; GIS has not independently verified it.
Inferred	Reasonable conclusion from available evidence, clearly identified as inference.
Unknown	Evidence is missing, contradictory or insufficient.
Outside scope	Not examined; no conclusion should be drawn.

Important distinction

Unknown does not mean non-compliant. It means the organisation cannot yet evidence the answer reliably.

03 · AI EXPOSURE MAP

Where AI enters the organisation

The map connects people, tools, information, suppliers, outputs and decisions. It is intended to reveal overlooked exposure without assuming wrongdoing.

People / workflow	AI or AI-enabled tool	Information touched	Output / decision	Current control
Staff meetings	Microsoft 365 / Copilot-style assistant	Names, commercial discussion, client matters	Transcript, summary, actions	Meeting practice varies
Drafting	Approved generative assistant	Emails, internal notes, selected client text	Draft correspondence / reports	Human review expected
Recruitment	ATS with AI-assisted ranking	CVs, application data	Candidate ranking / shortlist	HR review present; model detail limited
Website	Chat / analytics / embedded services	Visitor and usage data	Responses, analytics, leads	Privacy/cookie controls reviewed periodically
Suppliers	SaaS platforms adding AI features	Varies by supplier	Summaries, recommendations, automation	Contract review exists; AI-change trigger incomplete

Exposure questions worth answering

- Can we identify **every material AI-enabled workflow**, including features added to existing software?
- Do we know **what information enters the tool**, where it goes, how long it is retained and who can access it?
- Is there a **named owner** who can approve, restrict or retire the use?
- Where AI influences an important outcome, is **human review meaningful and evidenced**?
- Can we show that policy, training and actual staff behaviour are reasonably aligned?

04 · PRIORITY FINDINGS

Findings that deserve attention

ID	Finding	Why it matters	Evidence	Action
F01	AI inventory is incomplete	Leadership cannot reliably govern tools or features it does not know are in use.	Supported + reported	Complete inventory and assign owner.
F02	Information-handling rules are too general for common AI workflows	Staff may make different judgements about client/confidential material.	Supported	Create short permitted-use guidance by workflow.
F03	Supplier AI feature changes are not a consistent review trigger	Exposure can change without a new procurement event.	Supported	Add AI-change question to supplier review/change process.
F04	Meeting transcription practice is inconsistent	Recording, transparency, retention and access decisions may vary by meeting.	Reported	Define meeting-transcription standard and exceptions.
F05	Evidence of role-specific AI literacy is limited	Awareness may exist but be difficult to demonstrate for higher-impact uses.	Reported + unknown	Target training to actual use cases; retain evidence.

Regulatory context - concise and current

UK organisations remain subject to existing data-protection and sector rules when AI is used. The ICO has been updating automated-decision-making guidance following the Data (Use and Access) Act 2025. In the EU, the AI Act is now broadly applicable from 2 August 2026, with earlier AI-literacy/GPAI provisions and later dates for specified high-risk systems. Applicability must be assessed to the client's facts; this report does not assume that every EU AI Act obligation applies.

GIS rule

A practical exposure is not automatically a legal breach. Where legal interpretation is material, the report should identify the question and the evidence required rather than overstate the conclusion.

05 · CONTROLS WORKING WELL

What should be preserved

A credible review should identify controls that work, not only deficiencies. In this fictional example:

Control	Why it is useful	Recommendation
Human review of client-facing AI-assisted work	Reduces risk of unverified output reaching clients	Maintain; document minimum review standard.
Central software procurement	Creates a natural point for supplier assurance	Extend trigger to material AI-feature changes.
Privacy and confidentiality framework	Provides an existing governance base	Map AI workflows into it rather than creating duplicate policy.
Incident / complaint route	Existing escalation can absorb AI issues	Add AI examples and routing guidance.
Leadership willingness to restrict unsuitable use	Supports proportionate control	Keep decisions evidence-led; avoid blanket bans where unnecessary.

What not to build yet

- A new governance platform solely to hold a small AI register.
- A large committee if one accountable owner and existing governance forum can do the job.
- A second set of policies duplicating privacy, information security or procurement controls.
- Complex scoring that cannot be traced back to literal evidence.

Design principle

Integrate before extending. Use existing governance mechanisms wherever they can carry the AI control reliably.

06 · UNKNOWNNS AND CONTRADICTIONS

What we cannot yet say with confidence

Question	Current position	Why unresolved	Resolution
Are public AI tools used with client material?	Unknown	Policy expectation and staff practice have not been fully reconciled.	Anonymous declaration + targeted follow-up.
Do all AI-enabled suppliers notify material model/processing changes?	Unknown	Contract terms vary.	Prioritise top suppliers; record notification terms.
Is every meeting participant consistently informed when transcription is active?	Client reports 'usually'	Practice differs by organiser/tool.	Standard notice + meeting setting check.
Does AI ranking materially influence recruitment decisions?	Inferred	ATS functionality known; decision behaviour not evidenced.	Observe one workflow and document human decision point.

Example contradiction handling

Policy says: public generative AI is not approved.

Two interviewees report occasional use for rewriting non-client text. GIS would record both facts, not silently convert them into a 'shadow AI breach'. The next step is to establish actual use, information categories and whether the policy remains proportionate.

What would change our recommendations: evidence of sensitive data entering unapproved services; solely automated significant decisions; a material supplier-processing change; a regulator/client requirement; an incident; or a substantial change in applicable law or guidance.

07 · 30-DAY ACTION PLAN

Small actions, clear owners, visible completion

When	Action	Owner	Dependency	Completion evidence
Days 1-5	Appoint AI inventory owner and agree reporting route	COO / Compliance	Leadership decision	Named owner + written remit
Days 1-10	Run short staff AI-use declaration; reconcile with licensed tools	AI owner + IT	Staff participation	Dated inventory with source/status
Days 5-15	Issue one-page permitted-information guidance for common AI workflows	Compliance / DPO	Inventory v1	Published guidance + acknowledgement
Days 10-20	Review top five AI-enabled suppliers for data, change and notification terms	Procurement + IT	Supplier docs	Supplier evidence log
Days 15-25	Standardise AI meeting transcription notice, retention and exception process	Operations	Tool settings / privacy input	Approved standard + settings evidence
Days 20-30	Deliver role-specific AI literacy refresh for material users	Compliance / L&D	Confirmed workflows	Attendance + material + assessment/acknowledgement
Day 30	Leadership review: close, extend or escalate each finding	Accountable executive	Evidence above	Decision record

Free internal-fix pack GIS should leave behind

- AI inventory starter template.
- One-page staff AI-use declaration.
- Supplier AI-change question set.
- Meeting transcription checklist and sample notice.
- Finding closure / evidence checklist.
- Simple decision record for approve / restrict / monitor / stop.

08 · OPPORTUNITIES AND FOLLOW-UP ROUTES

Fix what matters; do not turn every finding into consultancy

Outcome	When it fits	What happens next
Client resolves internally	Action is clear and capability exists in-house	GIS supplies practical guidance/template where possible; client closes with evidence.
GIS support	Client wants implementation help or independent assurance	Bounded scope, explicit deliverable and completion test.
Specialist third party	Legal, cyber, employment or other specialist advice is required	GIS identifies the question and evidence pack; specialist owns advice.
Monitor only	No action justified now, but change could matter later	Add to agreed watch list; update client only when relevant.
No action	Control is adequate / exposure immaterial	Record rationale and leave it alone.

Potential GIS follow-up services

- Governance and control remediation - policies, ownership, registers and decision controls.
- Supplier / AI tool review - evidence, terms, processing, safeguards and change triggers.
- AI Governance Watch - relevant UK/EU/sector, supplier and product changes translated into client-specific action.
- Periodic refresh - reassess after material change or an agreed interval.
- Incident / change review - rapid assessment when something changes unexpectedly.
- Role-specific awareness and controlled-adoption support.

Client choice

Is there any other area of AI use, governance or risk that you would like us to help you understand, monitor or improve?

09 · MONITORING, NEXT STEPS AND LIMITATIONS

What would you like GIS to keep watching?

Watch area	Select	How GIS should respond
UK AI / data-protection developments	☐	Only when relevant to this client's actual use.
EU AI Act developments	☐	State applicability status; do not assume EU scope.
Sector regulator / professional guidance	☐	Translate change into evidence/action question.
Named suppliers and AI-enabled products	☐	Flag material feature, data or terms changes.
Client/confidentiality exposure	☐	Connect updates to known workflows.
Recruitment / people decisions	☐	Watch higher-impact decision support.
Agentic AI / autonomous workflows	☐	Reassess if introduced or materially expanded.
Other client-nominated area	☐	Define scope and notification threshold.

How a useful update should read

Relevant change - not generic news

A change has been announced affecting a tool or regulatory area identified during your AI Exposure Review. Based on the position we reviewed with you, it may be worth checking [specific control/workflow]. We hope this is useful. If you would like help assessing whether the change affects your current position, GIS can assist.

Limitations

This fictional sample is a service-design artefact. A real review would state the agreed scope, evidence cut-off, jurisdictions, systems and exclusions. GIS assesses evidence and governance position; it should not present itself as certifying legal compliance. Findings can change when new evidence, system changes, supplier terms, incidents or legislation emerge.

Suggested review close: leadership confirms the action plan, selects any watch areas, nominates internal owners, and decides whether any finding needs GIS or specialist support.

SUPPORTING REGISTER · A

Evidence and finding register

The management report stays short because the underlying evidence is traceable here. One row should be capable of being challenged without rewriting the narrative.

ID	Statement / finding	Evidence source	Status	Confidence	Owner	Closure test
F01	AI inventory incomplete	Software list + interviews	Supported + reported	High	AI owner	Inventory reconciled; unknown tools dispositioned
F02	Workflow guidance too general	Policy + sample workflows	Supported	High	Compliance	Guidance issued and mapped to top workflows
F03	Supplier AI-change trigger inconsistent	Supplier review process	Supported	Medium	Procurement	Trigger added; top suppliers checked
F04	Meeting transcription varies	Interviews / demonstration	Reported	Medium	Operations	Standard + settings evidence
F05	Role-specific literacy evidence limited	Training records	Reported + unknown	Medium	L&D	Material users trained; evidence retained

Evidence provenance fields for the real template

- Evidence ID, title/description, source/owner, date obtained, review date, reviewer, relevant finding IDs.
- Evidence type: document / system observation / interview / supplier statement / client statement / public source.
- Integrity/location reference sufficient to retrieve the evidence without embedding sensitive content in the report.
- Status: current / superseded / incomplete / contradictory / not provided.

SUPPORTING REGISTER · B

Action and decision register

Action ID	Related finding	Decision	Owner	Due	Dependency	Evidence of completion	Status
A01	F01	Complete and own AI inventory	AI owner	Day 10	Staff declaration	Approved inventory + source/status	Open
A02	F02	Issue workflow-specific information guidance	Compliance	Day 15	Inventory v1	Guidance + acknowledgement	Open
A03	F03	Add supplier AI-change trigger	Procurement	Day 20	Top supplier list	Updated process + supplier log	Open
A04	F04	Standardise transcription practice	Operations	Day 25	Tool settings	Standard + sample evidence	Open
A05	F05	Target literacy refresh	L&D	Day 30	Confirmed user groups	Training evidence	Open

Decision vocabulary

Decision	Meaning
Approve	Use may continue under stated conditions.
Restrict	Use permitted only within defined boundaries.
Verify	Evidence gap must be closed before a stronger conclusion.
Remediate	A control needs proportionate improvement.
Monitor	No immediate change; watch a defined trigger.
Stop	Use should cease pending resolution of a material issue.

SUPPORTING REGISTER · C

Internal-fix starter templates

1. Staff AI-use declaration

In the last 90 days, which AI or AI-enabled tools have you used for work? For each: purpose; information entered; whether client/personal/confidential data was involved; whether the tool is organisation-approved; and whether its output influenced a material decision.

2. Supplier AI-change questions

- Has AI/ML functionality been added or materially changed since our last review?
- Does the feature process, retain or transmit our data differently?
- Are subprocessors, model providers, hosting locations or retention terms different?
- Is our information used for model training or product improvement, and under what controls?
- What notification, opt-out, logging, human-oversight and deletion controls are available?

3. Finding closure check

- Action completed and owner confirms it.
- Evidence is attached/retrievable.
- Residual exposure is stated.
- Any policy/process/system dependency is updated.
- Leadership decision is recorded where material.
- Next review trigger/date is defined if monitoring remains necessary.

Courtesy principle

Where the client can reasonably fix an issue internally, GIS should leave them with practical documentation or guidance wherever possible. The client should leave the review better equipped even if they buy nothing else.

Regulatory watch baseline - sample

This is a watch baseline, not a substitute for matter-specific legal advice. Each client update should distinguish confirmed law, regulator guidance, proposals and future commencement dates.

Area	Current sample baseline (1 Oct 2026)	Client relevance test
UK data protection / ADM	Data (Use and Access) Act 2025 changed the framework; ICO ADM/profiling guidance has been under update.	Does the client use profiling or significant automated decisions involving personal data?
EU AI Act	Broadly applicable from 2 Aug 2026; AI literacy applied from Feb 2025; GPAI governance from Aug 2025; specified high-risk dates extend into 2027/2028.	Is the client/provider/use/output within territorial and material scope?
AI transparency	EU Article 50 transparency duties apply from 2 Aug 2026 for relevant systems/content, subject to specific transitional rules.	Does the client deploy chatbots, synthetic/deepfake content or other covered systems?
Sector rules	Existing professional/sector obligations may apply to AI without an AI-specific rule.	Which regulator, professional duties and client contracts govern the workflow?
Supplier/product change	AI capabilities and terms can change between formal procurements.	Which named products are material to the client's exposure map?

Source baseline used for this fictional draft

- European Commission, 'Navigating the AI Act' and AI Act regulatory framework pages, updated August 2026.
- European Commission, Article 50 transparency obligations and enforcement material, 2026.
- Information Commissioner's Office, automated decision-making/profiling guidance consultation and AI/biometrics strategy update, 2026.
- GIS internal website/competitor research: GIS-WEB-002 v0.1, 24 June 2026.

End of fictional sample.