

Executive Readiness Summary

AI Governance — board-level overview

Prepared exclusively for

Northgate Financial Services (SAMPLE — synthetic engagement, not a client)

Reviewer-reviewed assessment

Report version 1.0	Completed 12 August 2026	Record ESH-20260812-SE0001
--------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------

3 AI systems assessed · 8 priority governance actions · 5 provider-dependent

*Confidential — prepared exclusively for the named organisation.
Eshalu AI Governance Readiness Methodology · Not legal advice or certification.*

Executive dashboard

At-a-glance portfolio position. Indicators are qualitative readiness signals — not a compliance score.

3 AI systems assessed	1 Specialist attention	0 Incomplete information	8 Governance gaps	6 Evidence files	5 Provider-dependent
--------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	-------------------------

What the indicators refer to

Specialist attention - Customer Support Copilot: EU transparency-duty candidate. Specialist review recommended; this is a screening signal, not a legal classification.

Actions by suggested timing (advisory - reviewer reviewed)

2 Immediate / pre-go-live	3 Within 30 days	2 60–90 days	1 Timing to agree
------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------	----------------------

Overall assessment position

Assessment status: Reviewer review complete

Reviewer review is complete. Material governance gaps remain and should be remediated before a stronger readiness position can be stated.

This summary covers 3 AI systems operated by Northgate Financial Services (SAMPLE - synthetic engagement, not a client). It reflects the information and evidence supplied at the assessment date and the reviewer-confirmed findings. The overall position is action required because material governance gaps remain.

AI-system portfolio overview

AI system	Readiness signal	Maturity	Primary responsibility	Open actions
Customer Support Copilot Answers customer billing questions from help articles and drafts adjustments for human approval	EU transparency-duty candidate - specialist review recommended	Initial	Deployer (you)	3
Fraud Triage Assistant Ranks suspected fraud alerts for analyst review	not evaluated	Developing	Shared	2
Model Access Gateway Internal gateway routing staff prompts to a third-party model	not evaluated	Initial	Shared	2

Top governance priorities

Before go-live · Customer Support Copilot — Validation

Validation requires action for Customer Support Copilot
Responsibility: Deployer (you) · provider-dependent

Before go-live · Customer Support Copilot — Human oversight

Human oversight requires action for Customer Support Copilot
Responsibility: Deployer (you)

Within 30 days · Customer Support Copilot — Data protection

Data protection requires action for Customer Support Copilot
Responsibility: Deployer (you) · provider-dependent

Within 30 days · Fraud Triage Assistant — Traceability

Traceability requires action for Fraud Triage Assistant

Responsibility: Shared · provider-dependent

Within 30 days · Model Access Gateway — Validation

Validation requires action for Model Access Gateway

Responsibility: Shared · provider-dependent

Responsibility and provider-dependency summary

Where governance responsibility sits across the portfolio's open actions. This makes provider-dependent work visible so it is not mistaken for organisation-only effort.

Responsibility band	Actions	What it means
Organisation / deployer	4	Owned and evidenced by your organisation.
Provider-dependent	5	Needs model, platform or supplier information from the provider.
Shared	4	Split between your organisation and the provider.
Unresolved responsibility	0	No unresolved responsibility recorded in this sample.

Evidence-readiness summary

6 evidence files were supplied and recorded. The reviewer assessed relevance, currency and adequacy; supplying a file does not by itself satisfy a control.

AI system	Evidence position	Interpretation
Customer Support Copilot	Partially evidenced	Reviewer assessed; gaps remain
Fraud Triage Assistant	Partially evidenced	Reviewer assessed; gaps remain
Model Access Gateway	Partially evidenced	Reviewer assessed; gaps remain

Prioritised action plan

Advisory sequencing based on reviewer-confirmed findings - timing bands are not regulatory deadlines.

Priority	System — issue	Responsibility	Owner & status	Timing
Action required	Customer Support Copilot Validation	Deployer (you) · prov.	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Before go-live
Action required	Customer Support Copilot Human oversight	Deployer (you)	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Before go-live
Evidence required	Customer Support Copilot Data protection	Deployer (you) · prov.	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Within 30 days
Evidence required	Fraud Triage Assistant Traceability	Shared · prov.	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Within 30 days
Evidence required	Model Access Gateway Validation	Shared · prov.	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Within 30 days
Partially evidenced	Fraud Triage Assistant Monitoring	Shared	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Within 60–90 days
Partially evidenced	Model Access Gateway Change control	Shared · prov.	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Within 60–90 days
Action required	Organisation Accountability	Organisation	Owner: not yet assigned <i>Open - action pending</i>	Timing to agree

Recommended templates and next steps

Priority	Recommended template	Used for
1	AI Testing and Validation Plan	Validation gaps
2	AI Validation Report	Validation gaps
3	Provider Evidence Request	Validation gaps, Change control
4	Human Oversight and Override Procedure	Oversight and override controls
5	AI Privacy and DPIA Screening Form	Data protection
6	AI Full DPIA	Data protection
7	AI Logging and Traceability Standard	Traceability

Additional supporting templates are listed in the Detailed AI Governance Assessment.

Next steps

1. Assign owners and target dates for the reviewer-confirmed actions.
2. Issue Provider Evidence Requests for provider-dependent actions.
3. Complete the evidence and remediation work in priority order.
4. Reassess affected controls after remediation to confirm closure.

How to read the status labels

Status	Meaning
Established	Assessed with accepted evidence
Partially evidenced	Partly evidenced; more required
Evidence required	Applicable; evidence not yet supplied or reviewed
Reviewer confirmation	Awaiting reviewer confirmation
Action required	Reviewer-confirmed gap to address
Not assessed	Not yet assessed / information incomplete
Not applicable	Governed as not applicable

Scope, methodology and limitations

Eshalu evaluates each registered AI system against the active governed control catalogue; applicability follows the system's recorded risk, lifecycle, data, exposure and operating characteristics. Domain statuses are qualitative summaries of the underlying governed control states — no percentage or composite score is used.

This is a governance-readiness assessment. It is not legal advice, certification, conformity assessment or independent assurance. Regulatory signals are readiness indicators, not legal determinations. This summary reflects respondent-supplied information and the reviewer-completed assessment state. Material gaps have been identified; this is not a legal or compliance conclusion. Detailed control-level findings, evidence expectations and references are in the Detailed AI Governance Assessment.