

TOOLKIT 1 - AI Readiness Assessment™

# Sample Output Pack

Executive Report | Maturity Dashboard | 90-Day Roadmap

Illustrative fictional data only. Assessment workbook and scoring engine not included.

## Document Control

---

Controlled document metadata for client-facing Toolkit 1 materials.

<b>Document ID</b>	TK1-SAMPLE-v1
<b>Toolkit</b>	Toolkit 1 – AI Readiness Assessment™
<b>Document Title</b>	Sample Output Pack
<b>Version</b>	v1
<b>Status</b>	Final
<b>Classification</b>	Client-facing
<b>Review Date</b>	07-05-2027

## About this sample

This document shows the executive-ready output format produced by Toolkit 1 - AI Readiness Assessment™. All organisation names, scores, findings, and data are fictional and illustrative only.

It is intentionally complete in format and structure. What it does not include is the assessment workbook, question set, scoring engine, or maturity guidance - those are in the licensed toolkit.

Use this sample to confirm that the output format fits your internal governance needs. If it does, the licensed toolkit provides the structured assessment system that produces these outputs consistently and defensibly.

## 1. Sample Executive Report

FICTIONAL DATA - ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY

### Organisation

Organisation	Northbridge Digital Services Ltd (fictional)
Assessment date	15 May 2026
Scope	Corporate functions + Product (GenAI features in roadmap)
Primary AI use cases	Internal knowledge assistant; document summarisation; automated triage/routing
AI deployment model	Embedded SaaS AI (Microsoft Copilot, third-party APIs); no internal model builds currently
Assessor	Internal - Head of Information Security & Risk

### Overall assessment result

#### Overall AI Readiness: **MODERATE**

Composite score: 2.6 / 5.0 - Maturity band: Developing

*Defined ownership and repeatable practices exist in key areas. Governance is not yet fully embedded across the AI lifecycle. Targeted investment is required before scaling higher-risk use cases.*

## Top risks identified

Severity	Risk area	Finding
HIGH	Supplier AI risk	No structured assurance process for GenAI API providers. Contract terms do not address data processing, model drift, or incident notification.
HIGH	Incomplete AI system inventory	No confirmed register of all AI tools in use. Shadow AI usage likely in commercial and product functions.
MEDIUM	Inconsistent evidence of risk treatment	Risk register entries exist but approval records and treatment evidence are incomplete for 60% of AI-related entries.
MEDIUM	Data lineage gaps	Unclear lineage for prompts, embeddings, and fine-tuning datasets used in the knowledge assistant.
MEDIUM	Lifecycle monitoring absent	No regular cadence for reviewing AI system performance, drift, or output quality post-deployment.
LOW	HITL controls not documented	Human-in-the-loop controls exist informally for triage routing but are not documented or tested.

## Indicative strengths and gaps

Indicative strengths	Indicative gaps
✓ Established ISO 27001-aligned ISMS provides a governance foundation	▶ No formal AI system inventory or lifecycle register
✓ Defined information security risk methodology with active ownership	▶ Supplier AI assurance process undefined - gap in third-party risk
✓ Initial AI usage policy in place (Acceptable Use)	▶ AI risk ownership below CISO level is unclear
✓ Management awareness of AI governance expectations is high	▶ No structured pre-deployment review gate for new AI use cases
	▶ Monitoring and performance review cadence absent

## 2. Sample Maturity Dashboard

FICTIONAL DATA - ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY

The dashboard below shows how the organisation scores across the seven AI governance domains assessed. Each domain is scored 1-5 against defined maturity descriptors. The composite score determines the overall readiness band.

Domain	Score	Maturity band	Assessor notes
AI Governance & Accountability	3.2 / 5	Developing	Ownership defined at CISO level; governance charter drafted but not yet ratified.
AI Risk Management	2.4 / 5	Initial	Risk entries exist; treatment evidence and escalation paths incomplete.
Data Governance & Quality	2.8 / 5	Developing	Data classification policy covers AI inputs partially; lineage gaps for GenAI.
AI Lifecycle Management	2.1 / 5	Initial	No formal deployment gates or post-deployment review process in place.
Transparency & Explainability	2.6 / 5	Developing	Explainability requirements noted in policy but not operationalised.
Supplier & Third-Party AI	1.8 / 5	Ad Hoc	No structured AI supplier assurance; reliance on general vendor contracts.
Human Oversight & Controls	3.1 / 5	Developing	HITL controls exist informally; not documented, tested, or monitored.
<b>Composite score</b>	<b>2.6 / 5</b>	<b>MODERATE - Developing</b>	Governance foundations in place. Lifecycle management and supplier assurance require priority investment.

### Maturity scale reference

Maturity level	Description
<b>1 - Ad Hoc</b>	No defined process. Activity is reactive, undocumented, and owner-dependent.
<b>2 - 5</b>	<i>Full maturity descriptors for levels 2-5 (Initial, Developing, Managed, Optimising) are included in the licensed toolkit.</i>

SAMPLE OUTPUTS - SANITISED - NOT FOR REDISTRIBUTION

### 3. Sample Priority Action List

FICTIONAL DATA - ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY

The priority action list is generated from the assessment results. Actions are ranked by priority, assigned to owner roles, and windowed across the first 90 days. The full toolkit includes maturity-aligned actions for each domain and level.

#	Priority	Action	Owner	Window	Notes
1	HIGH	Establish AI system inventory	Risk / InfoSec	Weeks 1-4	Immediate sprint. Block on supplier assurance and lifecycle visibility.
2	HIGH	Define AI supplier assurance process	Procurement / CISO	Weeks 2-6	Map critical AI suppliers; add AI-specific clauses to vendor review template.
3	HIGH	Implement pre-deployment AI review gate	Product / Risk	Weeks 3-8	Lightweight gate for new AI use cases. Connects to AISIA framework.
4	MEDIUM	Complete AI risk register treatment evidence	Risk	Weeks 4-8	Close evidence gaps on existing entries. Assign treatment owners.
5	MEDIUM	Document HITL controls for triage routing	Operations / Product	Weeks 5-10	Formalise existing informal controls. Add to operating procedures.
6	MEDIUM	Define AI lifecycle monitoring cadence	InfoSec / Product	Weeks 6-12	Quarterly review schedule for active AI systems. Link to ISMS review cycle.
7	LOW	Ratify AI governance charter	CISO / Board	Weeks 8-12	Build on drafted charter. Board ratification adds defensibility.

SAMPLE OUTPUTS - SANITISED - NOT FOR REDISTRIBUTION

## 4. Sample 90-Day Roadmap

FICTIONAL DATA - ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY

The roadmap sequences the priority actions into three phases. Phase 1 establishes foundations and closes the highest-severity gaps. Phase 2 strengthens controls and operationalises governance. Phase 3 embeds the cadence and produces the first assurance output.

Action	Detail
<b>Phase 1: Establish Foundations (Days 1-30)</b>	
AI system inventory	Create and baseline a register of all active and planned AI tools, APIs, and models across the organisation.
Ownership assignment	Confirm named accountability for each AI system. Map to existing risk and governance roles.
Supplier AI risk review	Identify top 5 AI suppliers by risk exposure. Initiate gap review against AI-specific assurance criteria.
Pre-deployment gate draft	Define a lightweight checkpoint process for new AI deployments. Align with existing change/risk process.
<b>By day 30:</b> A documented AI system inventory with confirmed ownership. Supplier risk gaps identified. Governance gate process drafted.	
<b>Phase 2: Strengthen Controls (Days 31-60)</b>	
Risk register completion	Close evidence gaps on existing AI risk entries. Confirm treatment owners and timelines.
HITL documentation	Formalise human-in-the-loop controls for automated triage routing. Add to operating procedures.
Lifecycle monitoring design	Define review cadence for active AI systems (performance, drift, output quality). Assign reviewers.
Policy update	Update AI Acceptable Use Policy to reflect inventory, supplier requirements, and lifecycle expectations.
<b>By day 60:</b> AI risk register updated with complete evidence and treatment. HITL controls documented and tested. Monitoring schedule defined.	
<b>Phase 3: Embed and Assure (Days 61-90)</b>	
Governance charter ratification	Present AI governance charter to board or leadership committee for ratification.
First lifecycle review	Complete a structured review of the highest-risk active AI system using the new monitoring format.
Supplier assurance letters	Issue or receive AI-specific assurance confirmations from critical AI suppliers.

<b>Baseline report</b>	Produce the first quarterly AI governance report using the toolkit executive output format.
<b>By day 90:</b> Board-ratified AI governance charter. First formal lifecycle review completed. Quarterly assurance reporting cadence established.	

## 5. What’s in the licensed toolkit

This sample shows the output structure. The licensed toolkit provides the assessment system that produces these outputs - consistently, defensibly, and reusable.

What you get	What it does
<b>Assessment workbook</b>	Structured question set across 7 governance domains. Produces scores, maturity bands, and narrative outputs automatically.
<b>Scoring guidance &amp; descriptors</b>	Full maturity descriptors for each domain and level. Supports consistent, defensible scoring across assessors.
<b>Executive report template</b>	Editable Word template for the output format shown in this sample. Designed for board, audit, and regulator audiences.
<b>Maturity roadmap logic</b>	Maturity-aligned improvement actions for each level and domain. Sequenced for real-world implementation.
<b>Evidence spine</b>	Pre-built evidence structure designed to align with ISO/IEC 42001 intent and integrate with an ISO/IEC 27001 ISMS.
<b>Editable templates</b>	Priority action list, 90-day roadmap, and quarterly review templates - all reusable across cycles.
<b>Repeatable cadence design</b>	Use the same rubric and templates for quarterly or annual refresh without rebuilding from scratch.

### Why £349 is low-risk

A comparable internal readiness review typically requires multiple stakeholder sessions, consolidation, and reporting. This toolkit compresses that effort into days while improving consistency and defensibility. Outputs can be shared with leadership, internal audit, customers, regulators, and advisers for assurance purposes.

**One purchase. Reusable each cycle. No consultancy required.**

SAMPLE OUTPUTS - SANITISED - NOT FOR REDISTRIBUTION

*Decision-support only. This toolkit supports governance decision-making and audit preparation. It is not certification, legal advice, or external assurance.*