

AI STRATEGY · POLICY

Human Review and Accountability Policy

Establishes that a named human, not the AI tool, is always accountable for AI-assisted outputs used in the business.

How to use this: Adopt as-is and reference it directly in onboarding for any role that uses AI-assisted workflows.

Core Principle

AI tools do not carry accountability. Every AI-assisted output that leaves an internal draft stage has a named human owner who is accountable for its accuracy and appropriateness, regardless of how it was produced.

Review Requirements by Risk Level

- ☐ Low risk (internal drafts, brainstorming): no mandatory review, but spot-checks may occur
- ☐ Medium risk (internal reports feeding decisions, non-critical customer communication): review by a second person before use
- ☐ High risk (customer-facing financial, legal, or contractual content; code shipped to production; anything affecting a customer's account or data): mandatory named human review and sign-off before use
- ☐ No AI output is used or shared without an identifiable human who reviewed and takes ownership of it at medium risk or above

Accountability Record

For each high-risk AI-assisted workflow, who is the named reviewer of record?

How is review sign-off recorded (e.g. approval in ticket, sign-off field, commit review)?

What is the process if a reviewer is unavailable and a high-risk output is time-sensitive?