



OPERATIONAL INTELLIGENCE AUDIT™

DELIVERABLE 05 OF 07 · ILLUSTRATIVE DELIVERABLE

GUARD RAIL™ · GOVERNANCE AND RISK FRAMEWORK

An illustrative governance framework

A proposed set of principles, review points and workflow roles that a live engagement could adapt to its own data, people and terms.

CLIENT	MATURITY	WORKFLOWS IN SCOPE
Hartwell M&E Group	2.4 · of 5.0	6
SUGGESTED CADENCE	PREPARED BY	STATUS
Quarterly	BuiltAI Intelligence Ltd	● Example framework

Illustrative worked example: fictional project and parties; figures, names and dates are fictional scenario details.

5	3	6	Quarterly
Governance principles	Data classification tiers	Workflows in scope	Suggested review cadence

01

PRINCIPLES

Five principles, one rule: people decide

This example sets out five proposed principles for a live workflow: assign human review; agree what data is needed and how it is handled; keep source references and versions; adapt review to risk; and revisit the approach as the engagement develops.

THE RULE UNDER ALL FIVE

A live engagement could assign a competent person to review drafts and make the relevant decisions before use.

02

GATES

Example data tiers and review roles

This example groups data into three tiers and suggests reviewer roles by output. A live engagement could define its own categories, safeguards and review responsibilities to fit its data and terms.

EXAMPLE OUTPUT	EXAMPLE RISK	POSSIBLE REVIEWER ROLE
RAMS and safety documentation	High	Competent H&S reviewer, then Operations Director
Client-facing commercial submissions	High	QS or Commercial Manager, then Commercial Director
Tender responses and bid documents	Medium to high	Estimating Lead, with Commercial Director on high-value bids
Variation narratives and notices	Medium	QS or Contract Manager, with Commercial Director on high-value claims
Monthly contract reports	Medium	Contract Manager
Internal summaries and action logs	Low	Workflow user, self-review

UNDER TIME PRESSURE

A live engagement could define review steps that remain workable near a deadline; this example does not establish controls already in operation.

03

TRAIL

Example recordkeeping approach

An engagement could define records for inputs, drafts, reviews and final outputs, with access and retention periods set by its approved terms.

For a live tender or client request, check the applicable requirement and use wording agreed for that engagement; this framework suggests openness without setting a universal disclosure rule.

POSSIBLE PROCESSING LOG Inputs, steps and exceptions, if defined for the engagement	POSSIBLE VERSION RECORD Draft, reviewed and final versions, if required by agreed terms	POSSIBLE REVIEW RECORD Reviewer, approver and decision details, as agreed
---	---	---

04

ROLES

Example responsibilities to assign

Before a live workflow, an engagement could assign responsibilities such as the example roles below to suit its people, controls and terms.

EXAMPLE ROLE	POSSIBLE RESPONSIBILITY	EXAMPLE ROLE HOLDER
Framework owner	The controls, the review cadence and any change to them	Operations Director
Data classification	The tier of each data set and any restricted-data approval	Commercial Director
Competent reviewer	Checking each draft against its source before approval	Named per output in the gate table
Approver	The sign-off decision and the outcome that follows it	Director named per output in the gate table
Workflow user	Running the workflow within the controls and raising exceptions	Each trained user

05

REVIEW

Keeping the framework live

This example suggests a review cycle that a live engagement could adapt to its needs and approved terms.

QUARTERLY, FIRST YEAR Suggested example cycle for reviewing the proposed framework and decisions	ANNUALLY, THEREAFTER Suggested lighter review after the first year, if appropriate to the engagement	ON A MATERIAL CHANGE Consider an earlier review after a material change, such as a new workflow or changed requirement
--	--	--

Reference

BAI-HME-AUD-005

Scope

Six workflows

Review

Quarterly, then annually