

SAMPLE · AI DELIVERY EVIDENCE SPRINT

Client-Ready Evidence Pack

A human-reviewed record of one AI-assisted delivery workflow. It answers four principal buyer questions, shows what the supplied records genuinely support, and states limitations plainly.

WORKFLOW ASSESSED

AI-assisted market and competitor analysis report

PREPARED FOR

Halden AI (fictional consultancy)

EVIDENCE CUT-OFF

13 February 2026

PACK VERSION

v2.0 illustrative sample

TARGET TURNAROUND

48 hours after complete intake is confirmed

SCOPE

One AI-assisted workflow · four principal buyer questions

The evidence story in one page

The workflow has visible human review and a clear final deliverable. The strongest records are the analyst review notes and version comparison. The weakest points are source linkage, AI-instance records and the approval note. The pack therefore supports some buyer answers directly and others only with an explicit limitation.



HEADLINE READ	
EVIDENCED	Human review is evidenced. Analyst checks and substantive senior edits are supported by dated review notes and a version comparison.
PARTIALLY EVIDENCED	The AI starting point is incomplete. Prompt extracts exist, but the AI first draft and model/version record were not retained.
PARTIALLY EVIDENCED	Approval is visible but thin. Release approval is documented, but the record does not name the review criteria or final version ID.
BLOCKING ACTION	Two final-report claims lack source links. Those claims should be sourced, rewritten or removed before being repeated to a buyer.

How to read this pack. Artefact availability and claim support are assessed separately. A record can be supplied but still fail to prove the statement attached to it.

- SUPPLIED
- PARTIAL
- NOT SUPPLIED
- EVIDENCED
- PARTIALLY EVIDENCED
- CONFLICTING / UNSUPPORTED

Four questions, answered directly

Each answer states the current support status, the evidence IDs relied on and the limitation that should travel with the answer. This is the buyer-facing layer; the claim matrix on page 05 shows the underlying judgement.

Q1 Where did AI contribute?

PARTIALLY EVIDENCED

AI produced a first-pass structured synthesis, extracted selected figures, and drafted the initial executive summary and recommendations. An analyst checked claims and figures; a senior consultant rewrote the recommendations.

EVIDENCE EV-03, EV-06, EV-07

LIMITATION The complete prompt set, AI first draft, model and version were not retained.

Q2 Who reviewed and checked the work?

EVIDENCED

R. Okafor checked claims and figures on 11 February and recorded four corrections. S. Mehta completed a substantive edit on 12 February, including replacement of several AI-drafted recommendations.

EVIDENCE EV-06, EV-07

LIMITATION The spot-check of two extracted figures is visible in the version history but was not logged as a separate review event.

Q3 Who approved release?

PARTIALLY EVIDENCED

A. Doyle approved release to the client on 13 February after reviewing the final draft.

EVIDENCE EV-08

LIMITATION The approval email does not state the criteria checked or identify the approved version by ID.

Q4 What supported the final output?

PARTIALLY EVIDENCED

The final report drew on the agreed brief, a source register, purchased market reports and analyst review notes. Most claims can be traced to supplied source material.

EVIDENCE EV-01, EV-02, EV-06, EV-10, EV-11

LIMITATION Two claims in the delivered report have no source link in the supplied record and should not be repeated without correction.

How the work moved from brief to client

The workflow is read top to bottom. Each stage identifies who acted, the evidence created and the buyer question the stage helps answer.

01	Brief and scope HUMAN Client research questions agreed and brief written.	EVIDENCE BUYER Q	EV-01 Q4
02	Source selection HUMAN Public sources and two purchased reports selected.	EVIDENCE BUYER Q	EV-02, EV-11 Q4
03	AI first pass AI Structured synthesis, extracted figures and drafted opening sections.	EVIDENCE BUYER Q	EV-03; EV-04/05 missing Q1
04	Source verification HUMAN Analyst checked claims and corrected four figures.	EVIDENCE BUYER Q	EV-06 Q2, Q4
05	Senior edit HUMAN Senior consultant reshaped recommendations and edited for accuracy.	EVIDENCE BUYER Q	EV-07 Q2
06	Approval APPROVAL Delivery lead approved release to the client.	EVIDENCE BUYER Q	EV-08 Q3
07	Client delivery HUMAN Final report issued to the client strategy team.	EVIDENCE BUYER Q	EV-09, EV-10 Q4

AI did not: select final recommendations, decide the figures used, approve release, or send the work to the client. Those were human decisions supported by EV-06 to EV-10.

Record limitation: the team identified the tool used, but no retained record proves the specific model, version or complete prompt sequence for this instance.

What the records prove - and what they do not

The matrix tests the statements a consultancy may want to make to a buyer. Support status is based on the supplied records, not on whether the statement sounds plausible.

ID	BUYER-FACING CLAIM	EVIDENCE	SUPPORT STATUS	JUDGEMENT
C-01	AI produced the first-pass synthesis and draft recommendations.	EV-03, EV-06, EV-07	Partially evidenced	Prompt extract and human edits exist; the AI first draft and model record do not.
C-02	An analyst verified claims and corrected figures before senior review.	EV-06, EV-07	Evidenced	Dated notes record four corrections and the version comparison reflects them.
C-03	A senior consultant substantively edited the recommendations.	EV-07	Evidenced	Version comparison shows major replacement and restructuring of recommendation text.
C-04	Every claim in the delivered report is linked to a source.	EV-02, EV-10, EV-11	Conflicting	The source register is incomplete and two final-report claims remain unlinked.
C-05	The delivery lead approved the final version before release.	EV-08	Partially evidenced	Approval exists, but criteria and approved version ID are absent.
C-06	The delivered file is the final report identified in this pack.	EV-09, EV-10	Evidenced	Delivery email and final-report metadata identify the same file and date.

Human publication rule. “Partially evidenced”, “Conflicting” and “Unsupported” statements do not become approved buyer answers automatically. A human reviewer either narrows the statement, adds the limitation, obtains more evidence, or removes the claim.

- EVIDENCED
- PARTIALLY EVIDENCED
- MANAGEMENT ASSERTION
- INFERRED
- CONFLICTING
- UNSUPPORTED

Who checked the work, and what is evidenced

The trail below separates review activity from the record that proves it. It does not treat a release email as proof of every review criterion.

DATE	REVIEWER	WHAT WAS CHECKED	RECORD	SUPPORT
11 Feb	R. Okafor Research analyst	Claims and figures checked against sources; four figures corrected.	EV-06 review notes	Evidenced
12 Feb	S. Mehta Senior consultant	Full edit for accuracy, clarity and feasibility; recommendations reshaped.	EV-07 version comparison	Evidenced
12 Feb	S. Mehta Senior consultant	Two AI-extracted figures spot-checked against source PDFs.	Visible in EV-07; no separate log	Partially evidenced
13 Feb	A. Doyle Delivery lead	Final draft approved for release to the client.	EV-08 approval email	Partially evidenced

WHAT THE TRAIL SUPPORTS

- Named people reviewed the work before delivery.
- The analyst corrected figures against sources.
- The senior consultant materially changed AI-drafted recommendations.
- Release approval occurred before client delivery.

WHAT IT DOES NOT YET PROVE

- The criteria used for final approval.
- The exact version ID approved for release.
- A separate record of the two-figure spot-check.
- The complete AI starting point before human correction.

APPROVED DISCLOSURE - WITH LIMITATION

“The report was checked by an analyst for factual accuracy, substantively edited by a senior consultant and approved by the delivery lead before release. The approval email confirms release, but does not record the criteria checked or the final version ID.”

Evidence: EV-06, EV-07, EV-08 · Support status: Partially evidenced

What must change before stronger claims are made

The Sprint provides simple action priority on one workflow. It does not score a framework, diagnose root causes across multiple workflows or redesign the operating model.

BLOCKING

G-01 · AFFECTS Q4 · C-04

Two final-report claims have no traceable source link.

REQUIRED ACTION Add a source, narrow the wording or remove each claim before external use.

OWNER Research analyst

MATERIAL

G-02 · AFFECTS Q1 · C-01

The AI first draft, model and version were not retained.

REQUIRED ACTION Retain the first draft and record tool, model, version and prompt steps for the next workflow.

OWNER Delivery operations

MATERIAL

G-03 · AFFECTS Q3 · C-05

The approval record does not state criteria or approved version.

REQUIRED ACTION Use a one-line approval note naming what was checked and the final version ID.

OWNER Delivery lead

IMPROVEMENT

G-04 · AFFECTS Q1-Q4

Evidence IDs and source links are not captured consistently.

REQUIRED ACTION Create one evidence log with IDs, owners and final-output links.

OWNER Project lead

The records assessed for this sample

Availability describes whether the artefact was supplied. It does not, by itself, determine whether the artefact supports a buyer-facing claim.

ID	ARTEFACT	AVAILABILITY	WHAT IT SHOWS	LOCATION
EV-01	Analysis brief	Supplied	Scope and questions	Project folder
EV-02	Source register	Partially supplied	Sources used; two links missing	Project folder
EV-03	Prompt extract	Partially supplied	Selected AI instructions	Analyst notes
EV-04	AI first draft	Not supplied	AI starting point	Not retained
EV-05	Model/version record	Not supplied	Specific AI instance	Not retained
EV-06	Analyst review notes	Supplied	Checks and four corrections	Project folder
EV-07	Version comparison	Supplied	Human edits and recommendation changes	Document store
EV-08	Approval email	Supplied	Release approval	Mailbox
EV-09	Delivery email	Supplied	Date and recipient of delivery	Mailbox
EV-10	Final report	Supplied	Buyer-facing output	Document store
EV-11	Market report extracts	Supplied	Supporting source material	Licensed source folder

DOCUMENT CONTROL

CLIENT	Halden AI - fictional sample
WORKFLOW	Market and competitor analysis
EVIDENCE CUT-OFF	13 February 2026
VERSION	v2.0 illustrative sample
PREPARED BY	Audital
SCOPE	One workflow · four questions

BOUNDARY STATEMENT

This is an illustrative fictional sample. Audital provides evidence organisation and human-reviewed analysis. It does not constitute legal advice, regulatory certification, compliance approval, audit assurance, procurement approval, or guaranteed commercial outcome.

The customer remains responsible for the accuracy of source records, final external statements and all legal, regulatory, contractual, security and delivery decisions.