GOVERNANCE KIT — SAMPLE

AI delivery governance, shown at document level.

Three artifacts from the governance kit a team keeps after the AI Delivery Governance Starter. The structure is real; the contents are illustrative samples.

SAMPLE — CONTENTS FICTIONAL

JAAM Group International LLC

jaam.group · ai@jaam.group

July 2026

ABOUT THIS SAMPLE

What the kit is — and how it is built

The governance kit is what your team owns when the engagement ends: written rules for how AI participates in delivery work, the records that make that participation auditable, and the closeout discipline that keeps both honest. This sample shows the three core artifact types, filled with fictional content.

Built in a 3–4 week engagement

01 **Assess** current project-management workflows — and where AI already appears in them.

02 **Define AI autonomy and approval levels** — what AI may draft, what people decide, where the gates sit.

03 **Implement decision, risk, and documentation templates** the team will actually keep using.

04 **Pilot one AI-assisted delivery workflow** with human review points and observable evidence.

05 **Hand over the governance kit** — rules, templates, and closeout discipline your team owns.

What a full kit contains

- ✓ AI autonomy & approval matrix, set with your team
- ✓ Decision-record and risk-register templates with status discipline
- ✓ Session closeout template — what changed, what was verified, what needs a decision
- ✓ Data-boundary rules: systems of record, session context, knowledge layer, provider posture
- ✓ A written AI operating contract for the pilot workflow

> Every artifact in this PDF is a **sample**: the structure is the one we use in production; names, dates, and contents are fictional. No client names or client data appear in this document.

ARTIFACT 1 OF 3

Decision record

Append-only, one decision per record, explicit owner and review date. AI may prepare the record; the decision itself stays human.

`DR-012 · decision-record` SAMPLE

STATUS	**Accepted** · 2026-06-30 · Owner: Delivery lead · Review date: 2026-09-30
DECISION	AI-drafted weekly status reports enter the client channel **only after named-owner approval**. The owner's approval is recorded in the report footer.
CONTEXT	Status drafting consumed hours each week and often shipped without source links. Drafting is mechanical; accountability for what the client reads is not.
ALTERNATIVES	Fully manual drafting — rejected on cost. Unreviewed AI sends — rejected on accountability. Both recorded so the trade-off survives team change.
CONSEQUENCES	Weekly reports carry source links to work items; approval is a named gate in the workflow; the autonomy matrix (Artifact 2) encodes the same rule.
SUPERSEDES	— (first record for this workflow)

> Why it matters: six months later, nobody argues about *why* the gate exists — the context and the rejected alternatives are part of the record.

ARTIFACT 2 OF 3

AI autonomy & approval matrix

Set with your team during the pilot, then written down and kept. Levels make the human gates explicit — per activity, not per tool.

autonomy-matrix · v1

SAMPLE

ACTIVITY	LEVEL	AI MAY	PEOPLE OWN
Meeting briefs & agendas	L2	Prepare and file	Spot-check in closeout
Status reports	L1	Draft with source links	Approve & send
Risk register entries	L1	Propose status transitions	Confirm each transition
Decision records	L1	Prepare the record	The decision itself
Client-facing email	L1	Draft on request	Send — always
Knowledge-base updates	L2	Update from approved sources	Weekly integrity review
Scope & commitments	L0	—	Human only
Contract & pricing language	X	Out of AI scope	Human only, by rule

Levels. L0 human-only · L1 AI drafts, named owner approves · L2 AI executes within written bounds, logged and reviewed · X excluded from AI by rule. Levels are a team decision, revisited at review dates.

ARTIFACT 3 OF 3

Session closeout

Every AI working session ends with one of these. It is the audit trail in its smallest useful form — what changed, what was verified, what needs a human decision.

`closeout · 2026-07-02 · workflow: weekly-status` SAMPLE

CHANGED	Risk register — two status transitions (R-04 → mitigating, R-09 → closed); weekly status draft v03 prepared.
NOT TOUCHED	Source documents; client folders outside the engagement scope; anything under an L0/X activity.
VERIFIED	Every claim in the draft resolves to a source record; no unapproved sends; data boundaries held.
NEEDS DECISION	R-07 mitigation owner — proposal prepared for the delivery lead's review.
MARKER	**One per closeout:** no action · review · decision needed · approval needed · blocked. This session: **decision needed**.

Build yours in 3–4 weeks. One team, one workflow, a governed pilot — and this kit filled with your records instead of samples. Write to **ai@jaam.group**: the operational problem, how the work flows today, and the controls that must hold. Reply within two business days; a free 30-minute scoping call; a written scope before any work starts.