



Third-party AI Vendor Commitment

DECISION GATE BRIEFING

By Acquiris Digital

Decision: approve an enterprise commitment to deploy AI capabilities via a third-party vendor.

Decision owner	Executive Technology Committee
Scope	Third-party AI contract and production dependency (integration, retrieval if in scope, and operating controls)
Status	GO with conditions (commitment defensible only after closure of evidence gaps)
Prepared by	Acquiris Digital – STRATECH Consulting
Review window	Time-bounded review based on materials made available and stakeholder walkthroughs
Confidentiality	Redacted sample for public display

Board test

Threshold	Meaning
Minimum evidence	Data boundary and flow map; enforceable stop authority and change control; permission-safe retrieval governance; hard cost ceilings per workflow; exit and portability rights tested or evidenced.
If evidence is missing	You are not approving “AI.” You are approving a third-party dependency that will be scrutinized after impact.
Cost of proceeding without evidence	Delay, rework, emergency control retrofits, contract surprises, lock-in reversal cost, and loss of defensibility under audit or post-incident review.

Decision gate

Should leadership approve the AI vendor commitment now?

- GO — Approve the commitment. Readiness is sufficient to proceed.
- GO with conditions — Approve once listed conditions are closed and evidenced.
- NO GO — do not approve at this time. Gaps are material and require broader readiness work or structural change.

Assessment frame

This decision is not about “adopting AI.” It is about approving a third-party dependency that will touch enterprise data, influence customer-facing outputs, and become embedded in operating workflows.

Because the dependency operates outside the company boundary, assurance cannot rely on intent or future plans. The only defensible basis for approval is evidence that required controls already exist, are enforceable in production, and can be demonstrated on request to leadership, auditors, regulators, customers, or in post-incident scrutiny.

Assessment pillars

Pillar	Minimum decision requirement
Data boundary	What data leaves the boundary, through which flows, under what classification and enforcement.
Ownership & stop authority	Who owns outcomes in production, when and how work can be stopped, and how change is controlled.
Cost governance	Hard ceilings per workflow, monitoring tied to ceilings, and defined degrade/stop behavior.
Exit readiness	Portability and contract rights that make reversal possible and defensible.

Recommendation

GO with conditions — approve once conditions are closed and evidenced.

Conditions

ID	Condition	Evidence required	Owner	Due
C1	Data boundaries and flows need to be evidenced.	Inventory by workflow + boundary map + flow diagrams that identify data origin, handling, and destination.	REDACTED	REDACTED
C2	Stop authority and change control must be explicit and executable.	Named stop owner + triggers + kill switch (feature flag/gateway rule/endpoint disable) with escalation and logging + prompt/integration change control record.	REDACTED	REDACTED
C3	Retrieval must be governed and permission-safe.	Retrieval scope list + repositories approved for indexing + permission model (ACL propagation) + exclusion rules for restricted classes + enforced caps.	REDACTED	REDACTED
C4	Cost ceilings must be enforced per workflow.	Unit cost model per workflow + budgets and hard ceilings + defined degrade/stop behavior + dashboards and alerts tied to ceilings.	REDACTED	REDACTED
C5	Exit readiness must be provable, not assumed.	Portability plan + tested export method for prompts/config/logs/retrieval assets + contract clauses for termination, export rights, deletion verification, and transition support.	REDACTED	REDACTED

Risk view (if conditions remain open)

Likelihood and impact are directional and reflect exposure if the condition is not closed under intended production use.

Condition	Probability	Impact	Primary exposure
C1 — Data boundary and flows evidenced	H	H	Uncontrolled data transmission, regulatory breach, audit failure
C2 — Stop authority and change control	M	H	Delayed containment, uncontrolled change, loss of incident defensibility
C3 — Retrieval governance & permission safety	M	H	Silent leakage via retrieval; restricted classes indexed
C4 — Enforced cost ceilings per workflow	H	M	Unbounded spend; forced degradation or shutdown under cost growth
C5 — Exit strategy and readiness	M	M	Lock-in; costly reversal; delayed response to vendor/contract changes

Next step

If this reads familiar, a Decision Gate review can prevent commitment drift: in a short, time-boxed window you get a defensible GO / GO-with-conditions / NO-GO recommendation tied to decision-critical evidence, before reversal requires unplanned spend, operational disruption, and credibility loss.

Schedule a call at www.acquiris.digital

Appendix — Evidence register

Pillar / Surface	Evidence reviewed	Key finding (redacted)	Decision impact
Data	Scope + inventory	Partial by workflow; ambiguous fields; labels REDACTED.	Drove C1
Data	Boundary + classification	Allowed/prohibited classes defined; enforcement not evidenced.	Drove C1
Data	Flow diagrams	Control points missing; unmapped flows REDACTED.	Drove C1
Accountability	Stop authority	Contacts exist; no stop owner; triggers/time expectations incomplete; kill switch not evidenced end-to-end.	Drove C2
Accountability	Change control	Process exists but not evidenced as enforceable (review/test/approve/rollback/track).	Drove C2
Retrieval	Scope + permissions	Eligibility/exclusions/ACL propagation/caps not fully evidenced.	Drove C3
Cost	Cost model + ceilings	Unit economics exist; hard ceilings and degrade/stop behavior not evidenced per workflow.	Drove C4
Cost	Monitoring	Metrics exist; cost per workflow and alerts tied to ceilings incomplete/not evidenced.	Drove C4
Exit	Portability	Export method partial/not evidenced.	Drove C5
Exit	Contract terms	Export rights/deletion verification/transition support/subprocessors unclear or missing.	Drove C5

Reliance and reassessment

This document how the Decision Gate briefing was produced, including the review window, evidence collection method, participant roles, scope boundaries, and reliance assumptions.

Review window and purpose: This Decision Gate briefing is a time-bounded, pre-commitment review conducted over a short window to support an enterprise approval decision. It is designed to reach a defensible recommendation quickly through targeted evidence and focused stakeholder sessions, not broad enterprise discovery.

Evidence collection method: Evidence was collected through a requested evidence pack coordinated by the company's designated point of contact (POC), supplemented by structured sessions to validate decision-critical details and clarify gaps.

Reliance and reassessment: Findings reflect what could be evidenced within the review window. Where evidence was incomplete, controls were not assumed to exist; material gaps were recorded as closure requirements. If scope, data classes, vendor services, integration design, or contract terms change materially after this review, the recommendation should be reassessed against the updated evidence set in a timely manner. If reassessment is not feasible, the commitment decision should be deferred.

See more at www.acquiris.digital