

AI Risk Diagnostic

Fellowship Intelligence

AI governance and control-layer advisory

Client: [Redacted – Real Estate Firm]

Date: April 2026

Prepared by: Fellowship Intelligence

1. Executive Summary

The organization is currently utilizing AI across select areas of its operations, primarily in support of communication, internal workflows, and light analysis. Based on structured evaluation, the organization is operating with a **moderate level of AI-related risk exposure**.

AI usage is occurring in the following areas:

- Marketing and listing-related communication
- Internal operational support and documentation
- General analysis and drafting
- AI usage appears distributed across client-facing and internal support functions, with adoption occurring at the individual team member level without defined coordination

At present, AI usage appears to be **informal and operator-driven**, with limited centralized oversight or defined standards. This creates exposure related to:

- Inconsistent handling of internal or client-related information
- Variation in how AI outputs are reviewed and used across the organization

Overall Risk Score: 42 / 100

Risk Tier: Moderate

Recommendation:

Assurance Assessment Recommended

2. AI Usage Overview

AI is currently being used within the organization in the following functional areas:

Primary Use Cases

- Marketing and listing communication — **Moderate**
- Internal documentation and drafting — **Moderate**
- General analysis and support tasks — **Light to Moderate**

General Observations

- Usage appears **decentralized and informal**
 - AI is being used primarily for **efficiency and content generation**
 - Leadership visibility into usage is **partial**
 - Adoption is growing without a defined structure
-

3. Risk Scoring Summary

Total Score: 42 / 100

Risk Tier:

- Moderate (25–49)

Category Breakdown

Category	Score (0–20)
Data Exposure Risk	9
Decision Impact Risk	8

Workflow Dependence	7
Governance & Policy Gaps	11
Visibility & Accountability Gaps	7

4. Key Risk Exposures

1. Inconsistent Data Handling Practices

Internal and client-related information may be entered into AI tools without clear standards, creating variability in exposure.

2. Lack of Defined Usage Standards

There are no formal guidelines governing how AI should be used, leading to differences in behavior across team members.

3. Informal Review and Oversight

AI-generated outputs appear to be reviewed at the individual level, without consistent expectations or accountability structures.

4. Decentralized Adoption Without Visibility

AI usage is expanding organically, limiting leadership's ability to fully assess exposure or enforce consistency.

5. Immediate Priority Actions

The following actions are recommended to reduce immediate exposure:

- Establish basic visibility into how AI is currently being used across teams
- Limit entry of sensitive or client-specific information into AI tools until expectations are clarified
- Ensure consistent review of AI-generated outputs before external use
- Define initial internal expectations for appropriate AI usage

Note: These actions are intended to reduce immediate exposure and do not constitute a complete governance solution.

This document reflects an assessment of governance-layer exposure and does not constitute legal advice. Organizations with regulatory, privacy, or enforcement obligations should consult qualified legal counsel.

6. Recommended Next Step

Assurance Assessment Recommended

Rationale

AI usage is occurring without defined standards or centralized oversight across multiple functional areas. The absence of governance structure creates active exposure that will increase as adoption continues. A structured assessment is required to establish appropriate controls before usage patterns become entrenched without defined controls.

A structured Assurance Assessment will:

- Provide a formal evaluation of AI-related risk and exposure based on current usage patterns
 - Define required governance controls based on actual operations
 - Establish a clear path to implementing a controlled AI usage framework
-

7. Closing Statement

This Diagnostic provides an initial view into AI usage and associated risk exposure. It is designed to establish visibility and support decision-making regarding next steps.

Further evaluation is required to define appropriate governance structures and controls aligned to the organization's operations.

Fellowship Intelligence is an AI governance and control-layer advisory firm. The AI Risk Diagnostic is the first stage in a structured engagement pathway: it establishes an initial

view of AI usage, identifies risk exposure, and determines whether a formal assessment is warranted. The Assurance Assessment evaluates that exposure in depth and produces a defined governance framework aligned to the organization's operational environment; Implementation installs it — the policy layer, workflow controls, ownership structure, and oversight mechanisms required to operate AI with accountability and consistency. Continuity provides the ongoing monitoring, auditing, and governance maintenance required to sustain that framework as AI usage evolves.