

One questionnaire. Four different answers.

A fictional example of what happens when product, contracts, AI use and evidence are not joined around one decision.

NORTHSTAR CLOUD · FICTIONAL

B2B SaaS product with an AI assistant. An enterprise customer sends a questionnaire due in 30 days. Management must approve one answer about AI use, IP ownership and data handling.

What the first review shows

OWNERSHIP

The Founder, CTO and counsel each hold part of the answer. No role owns the final response.

AI

The vendor is known. The use-case list, limits and human-review record are incomplete.

IP

Contractor agreements exist, but critical product components are not mapped to the rights relied on.

DATA

A technical flow exists, but the facts are not organised for an approved external answer.

WORKING ANSWER

Northstar Cloud should not state that these controls are fully evidenced. It can first name the response owner, separate confirmed facts from assumptions and build a small evidence index for the questions that matter to this customer.

This scenario illustrates a method. It is not a diagnosis, compliance conclusion, legal opinion or statement about a real company.

The first move is not a new policy

01 NAME ONE RESPONSE OWNER

Decision: the COO owns the customer response and the authority to resolve conflicting internal answers. Action: record the scope and review path. Evidence: an approved decision record and named contributors.

02 VERIFY RIGHTS AND LIMITS

Decision: the Product Owner maps the AI vendor and contractor-built components to the product. Questions that require legal qualification go to the appropriate specialist. Evidence: a product-to-contract map and a closed list of specialist questions.

03 BUILD THE MINIMUM EVIDENCE INDEX

Decision: Product Operations records the source, owner, date and approval status for each customer answer. Evidence: a controlled response log linked to the records management is prepared to stand behind.

WHY THIS MATTERS

Without one owner, one external question produces different answers. Without a source and approver, every new deal restarts the same work.

A route management can actually assign

WINDOW	ACTION	OWNER	RESULT
DAYS 1-5	Record the decision scope and appoint the response owner.	COO	Approved decision record.
DAYS 6-10	Map AI components, vendors and contracts; isolate specialist questions.	Product Owner	Product-to-dependency map.
DAYS 11-15	Create the evidence index and draft the deal-critical answers.	Product Operations	Sources and approvers named.
DAYS 16-23	Review facts, assumptions and disclosure boundaries.	CTO + specialist	Limitations stated clearly.
DAYS 24-30	Approve the response pack and move other gaps into a separate backlog.	COO	One approved response pack.

WHAT THIS SHOWS

The method links a live trigger to a decision, an owner, the evidence behind the answer and the next assigned action.

OUTSIDE THIS EXAMPLE

Real company facts, document review, interviews, formal legal or compliance opinions, cyber or model testing, certification and proof of client results.

If the question crosses several functions or needs a broader evidence review, the next step may be a separately scoped Technology Governance Readiness Diagnostic.