

OVERSIGHT CALIBRATION

This tool supports board-level calibration. It is not intended to be completed, scored, or assessed. Boards may use any section independently.

1. Visibility of AI Use

Posture spectrum

- Exploratory: localised or experimental use with limited organisational reliance.
- Embedded in operations: material support to workflows, analytics, or automation.
- Embedded in decision authority: AI materially influences or replaces judgement in consequential decisions.

2. Accountability for Outcomes

Posture spectrum

- Implicit: responsibility is assumed within teams or functions.
- Defined but shared: accountability is articulated across roles or committees.
- Explicit and owned: a named executive owns outcomes, including unintended effects.

3. Third-Party Dependency

Posture spectrum

- Supplementary: supportive and replaceable.
- Material: enabling but not exclusive.
- Critical: loss or degradation would significantly impair operations or decisions.

4. Assurance of AI Behaviour

Posture spectrum

- Policy and design intent: frameworks, standards, and documentation.
- Monitoring and controls: performance metrics, alerts, and management oversight.
- Outcome and scenario evidence: exception analysis, testing, or observed behaviour under stress.

5. Change Oversight

Posture spectrum

- Informal awareness: changes occur within operational teams.
- Defined thresholds: certain changes trigger management or committee review.
- Explicit escalation triggers: material changes prompt structured board visibility

Exposure most often arises from misalignment across dimensions, rather than from any single posture.

IMPLICATIONS & DISCUSSION ANCHORS

Introduced selectively to support discussion where confidence appears untested; it is neither necessary nor expected that all dimensions are covered in a single session. These prompts are equally applicable in pre-incident calibration and post-incident reflection.

1. Visibility of AI Use

Board implication

As AI approaches decision authority, expectations around accountability and assurance rise regardless of intent.

Anchor prompts

- What decisions would still proceed if this AI capability were unavailable tomorrow?
- At what point would this use of AI require explicit board visibility?
- What would indicate that reliance has shifted from support to decision influence?

2. Accountability for Outcomes

Board implication

Shared accountability often appears workable until escalation or external scrutiny occurs.

Anchor prompts

- If an outcome is challenged externally, who would be expected to explain it?
- Where does accountability sit if the outcome was unintended but foreseeable?
- What assumptions are we making about how accountability operates in practice?

3. Third-Party Dependency

Board implication

Accountability remains internal even when capability or control is external.

No posture is inherently correct; risk emerges when reliance, accountability, and assurance move out of alignment.

Anchor prompts

- What part of this dependency would be hardest to replace quickly?
- Where do we rely on assurance from the third party rather than our own evidence?
- How would responsibility be described if the dependency failed publicly?

4. Assurance of AI Behaviour

Board implication

Confidence based solely on intent rarely survives scrutiny once reliance increases.

Anchor prompts

- What evidence gives us confidence beyond policy or design intent?
- What behaviour would surprise us if observed tomorrow?
- When was this confidence last tested outside normal operations?

5. Change Oversight

Board implication

Cumulative change is more often the source of exposure than isolated change.

Anchor prompts

- What changes would not individually trigger escalation but collectively might?
- How do we know when incremental change has altered reliance materially?
- What signal would indicate that oversight expectations should change?