

Specimen — illustrative example

Tessellate Design Studio is a fictional organisation. This document comes from the scenario described on riskwoven.com/examples, and is not an assessment of any real entity. It is advisory output to support your own decisions: not legal advice, not a certification, and not an audit.

Written and reviewed by RiskWoven.com. Written by RiskWoven.com's AI drafting agent and checked by RiskWoven.com's independent review stage before release. The review is automated. It is not a human, legal or audit review.

AI Acceptable Use Policy

Tessellate Design Studio

Document type	policy	Version	1.0 Draft
Owner	Studio Director	Customer decision role	Managing Partner
Effective date	Upon customer release	Review cycle	Annual
Framework basis	RiskWoven AI practical best practices		
Jurisdiction	British Columbia, Canada		
Prepared for	Tessellate Design Studio	Industry	Design and creative services
Organization size	1-25	Locations	Not specified

Advisory draft for accountable-owner and professional review. Validate legal, regulatory, contractual, technical and operational requirements before customer release. This is not legal advice, a certification, or a compliance determination.

1. Purpose

This policy states what Tessellate Design Studio permits, restricts and prohibits when any member of the studio uses an AI system in the course of their work. It protects clients, the

studio and its people by ensuring that AI tools are used responsibly, that sensitive information is not exposed, and that every output reaching a client reflects a designer's professional judgement rather than unreviewed machine output.

2. Scope

This policy applies to every person who works for or on behalf of Tesselate Design Studio — employees, contractors and any other individual using studio systems or working on studio engagements — regardless of where they are located or which device they use. It covers every AI system used for studio work, whether accessed through a studio account, a personal account or a third-party platform.

3. Definitions

The following terms have the meanings given here throughout this policy and the documents that sit alongside it.

AI system. Any software that uses machine learning, large language models, generative models or similar techniques to produce, classify, recommend or transform content, code, images or other outputs in response to inputs. This includes tools embedded in platforms the studio already uses, such as AI-assisted features within Google Workspace or Adobe Creative Cloud, as well as standalone generative tools accessed through a browser or API.

Generative AI. An AI system whose primary function is to produce new content — text, images, audio, video, code or combinations of these — from a prompt or other input. Generative AI is the category most commonly used in design and pitch work and carries the highest risk of confidentiality exposure and intellectual property uncertainty.

Approved use. A specific combination of AI system, information type and business purpose that the Studio Director has recorded in the Approved AI Use Register. A use is not approved simply because the tool is familiar or widely available; it must appear in the register.

High-impact use. Any use of an AI system where an error, bias or harmful output could cause material harm to a client, a third party or the studio. At Tesselate Design Studio, high-impact uses include any AI output that will be presented to a client as part of a deliverable, any use that involves personal information, and any use that could affect a client's commercial reputation or intellectual property position.

Human review. Deliberate, documented assessment of an AI output by a qualified person before that output is used, shared or relied upon. Clicking past a result without reading it is not human review. For this studio, human review means the designer who produced the output reads and evaluates it, and a partner reads and evaluates anything that will go to a client.

4. Policy Owner and Accountability

The Studio Director owns this policy and is accountable for maintaining it, communicating it to all studio personnel, and ensuring the Approved AI Use Register is current.

The Managing Partner holds review authority for exceptions to this policy and for any decision to restrict or withdraw a previously approved use.

Every designer and contractor is personally accountable for the AI outputs they produce. Accountability does not transfer to the tool, the tool's provider or another team member who later works on the same file.

5. Approved AI Systems and Uses

5.1 The Approved AI Use Register. The Studio Director maintains a register of AI systems and uses that are approved for studio work. The register records, for each entry: the tool name and version or access method; the permitted business purposes; the categories of information that may be entered; any conditions attached to the use; and the date the entry was last reviewed. The register is accessible to all studio personnel.

5.2 Using only approved systems. Studio personnel must use only AI systems listed in the register for the purposes listed against them. Using a tool not in the register, or using a registered tool for a purpose not listed, requires an exception under Section 9 before work begins — not after.

5.3 Approved uses at Tesselate Design Studio. The studio's current approved uses are generative tools applied to first-draft copy, moodboards and image variations in client pitch work, using public brief material and the studio's own prior work as inputs. These uses are subject to the information rules in Section 6 and the review requirements in Section 7. The register is the authoritative record; this policy states the category, not the complete list.

5.4 New tools and use cases. Before using any AI system not already in the register, the person proposing the use must follow the Third-Party AI Review Procedure. The Studio

Director records the outcome in the register. Work using the new tool may not begin until the register entry exists.

6. Information Rules

6.1 What may be entered into an AI system. The following categories of information may be entered into an approved AI system for an approved purpose:

- Publicly available brief material that the client has not marked confidential.
- The studio's own previously published or internally approved work.
- General creative references and publicly available imagery or text that the studio has the right to use.

6.2 What must not be entered into an AI system that retains prompts. The following must not be entered into any AI system that retains, logs or trains on user inputs, unless the Studio Director has confirmed in writing that the specific tool and specific information category are approved:

- Client material marked confidential or provided under a non-disclosure agreement.
- Unreleased campaign assets, product information or creative work belonging to a client.
- Personal information about any individual, including employee records and client contact details.
- Studio financial records.
- Any information whose disclosure would breach a contractual or legal obligation.

6.3 Confirming retention behaviour. Before entering any information into an AI system, the user must confirm whether that system retains or trains on prompts. If this cannot be confirmed from the tool's published documentation, the information must be treated as though the tool retains it, and the rules in 6.2 apply.

6.4 Relationship to other policies. The Data Classification and Handling Standard sets the classification levels that determine how information must be handled. The Privacy and Personal Information Policy governs personal information. This policy applies the same protections to AI use specifically. Where there is any conflict, the more protective rule applies.

7. Human Review Requirements

7.1 Every output must be reviewed before use. No AI output may be used in studio work, shared with a client or incorporated into a deliverable without human review. The review must be genuine: the reviewer reads, evaluates and takes responsibility for the output.

7.2 Designer review. The designer who used the AI system is the first reviewer. They are accountable for checking the output for accuracy, factual errors, bias, unintended meaning, confidentiality risk, intellectual property concerns and suitability for the client and purpose.

7.3 Partner review for client-facing material. Any AI-assisted output that will be presented to a client — in any form, at any stage — must be reviewed by a partner before it leaves the studio. The partner's review is recorded in the project file. This requirement applies regardless of how much the designer has reworked the original AI output.

7.4 High-impact uses. For any use classified as high-impact under Section 3, the designer must document what the AI system produced, what changes were made, and what the reviewer assessed. The Studio Director sets the format for this record; the record must be retained in the project file.

7.5 No unreviewed output to clients. Sending, presenting or publishing AI-generated content to a client without completing the reviews required by this section is a breach of this policy.

8. Prohibited Uses

The following uses are prohibited at all times, regardless of whether a tool is otherwise approved.

8.1 Deception. Representing AI-generated imagery as original photography. Representing AI-generated text as entirely human-authored when the client has asked or when the representation would mislead. Concealing the use of generative AI from a client when the studio has committed to disclose it or when the client's brief or contract requires disclosure.

8.2 Unlawful uses. Using an AI system to produce, reproduce or distribute content that infringes copyright, breaches a confidentiality obligation, constitutes defamation, or violates applicable law in British Columbia or any jurisdiction relevant to the client's work.

8.3 Unsafe or harmful outputs. Producing, retaining or sharing AI outputs that are discriminatory, harassing, threatening or otherwise harmful to any person.

8.4 Consequential decisions without human review. Using an AI system to make or communicate a decision that affects a client's commercial position, a person's rights or the studio's contractual obligations, without the human review required by Section 7.

8.5 Unapproved consequential uses. Using an AI system for any purpose that could have a material effect on a client, a third party or the studio, where that use has not been approved under Section 5.

8.6 Circumventing controls. Using a personal account, a private device or any other method to access an AI system in a way that bypasses the information rules in Section 6 or the review requirements in Section 7.

9. Exceptions

A person who needs to use an AI system or information category not covered by an existing approved use must request an exception from the Studio Director before proceeding. The Studio Director records the exception, the conditions attached to it, and its expiry date. The Managing Partner holds review authority for any exception that involves confidential client material or a high-impact use. Exceptions are time-limited; the Studio Director reviews outstanding exceptions on a cycle set by the studio. A starting point of quarterly review is offered here and is not derived from any cited control. Exceptions that have passed their expiry date without renewal are treated as withdrawn.

10. Transparency with Clients

Tesselate Design Studio discloses to clients when generative AI tools have contributed to a deliverable. The studio does not represent AI-generated imagery as original photography. The form and timing of disclosure is a matter of professional judgement for the partner leading the engagement, but the obligation to disclose is not discretionary. Where a client's contract or brief requires a specific form of disclosure, that requirement governs.

11. Reporting Obligations

11.1 What must be reported. Any studio personnel who becomes aware of the following must report it to the Studio Director without delay:

- An AI output that contains a material factual error and has already been shared with a client.
- Confidential client information, personal information or other restricted information that has been entered into an AI system in breach of Section 6.
- An AI output that is discriminatory, harmful or otherwise in breach of Section 8.
- A suspected failure of an AI system that has affected or could affect a client deliverable or studio data.
- Any other event that suggests an AI system has behaved in an unexpected or harmful way.

11.2 How to report. Reports go to the Studio Director. If the Studio Director is the subject of the concern, reports go to the Managing Partner. The reporter states what happened, when, which tool was involved, and what information or output is affected.

11.3 Response. The Studio Director assesses the report and determines whether it triggers the AI Incident Response Procedure, the Privacy Breach Response Procedure or the Security Incident Response Procedure. More than one procedure may apply. The Studio Director records the report and the response in the studio's incident log.

11.4 No retaliation. No person who reports in good faith under this section will face any adverse consequence for doing so.

12. Training

Every person covered by this policy must complete AI acceptable use training before using any AI system for studio work, and on a cycle set by the Studio Director thereafter. A starting point of annual completion is offered here and is not derived from any cited control. The Studio Director records completion. A person who has not completed the required training must not use an AI system for studio work until they have done so. Training covers the rules in this policy, the information categories that may and may not be entered into AI systems, the review requirements, and how to report a concern.

13. Monitoring and Metrics

The Studio Director monitors compliance with this policy and reports to the Managing Partner on the following measures on a cycle set by the studio. A starting point of annual reporting is offered here and is not derived from any cited control:

- The number of approved AI use cases recorded in the Approved AI Use Register.
- The percentage of studio personnel who have completed current AI acceptable use training.
- The percentage of required partner reviews of client-facing AI-assisted outputs that were completed and recorded on time.
- The number of approved exceptions that have passed their expiry date without renewal.
- The number of material control failures reported under Section 11 and the number of corrective actions that remain open past the date set for their completion.

These measures are the minimum. The Studio Director may add measures that reflect the studio's current AI use.

14. Relationship to Other Studio Documents

This policy sits within a set of governance documents. The following instruments are directly relevant and must be read alongside this policy:

- The **AI Governance and Accountability Policy** sets the studio's overall accountability structure for AI. Where that policy and this one address the same matter, the more specific provision in this policy governs for acceptable use questions.
- The **AI Risk Management Standard** sets the testable requirements that implement both policies. Designers and partners should consult it for specific thresholds and controls.
- The **Third-Party AI Review Procedure** governs how a new AI tool is assessed before it is added to the Approved AI Use Register.
- The **AI Incident Response Procedure** governs the studio's response once a report under Section 11 is assessed as an AI incident.
- The **Privacy and Personal Information Policy** and the **Privacy Breach Response Procedure** govern personal information. The rules in Section 6 of this policy apply the same protections to AI use specifically.

- The **Data Classification and Handling Standard** defines the information classification levels referenced in Section 6.
- The **Third-Party Risk Management Policy** governs the studio's relationship with AI tool providers as third parties.

This policy does not duplicate what those instruments own. Where a gap exists between this policy and a sibling document, the Studio Director is responsible for identifying and resolving it.

15. Review and Amendment

The Studio Director reviews this policy annually and whenever a material change occurs — including the introduction of a significant new AI tool, a change in the studio's client base or information handling practices, a material incident, or a change in applicable law. The Managing Partner holds review authority for any amendment. The review is recorded, including the date, the reviewer and any changes made. Amended versions are communicated to all studio personnel before they take effect.

16. Breaches

A breach of this policy is a serious matter. Breaches are assessed by the Studio Director and reported to the Managing Partner. The response may include corrective action, additional training, restriction of access to AI tools, or other measures appropriate to the nature and severity of the breach. Repeated or deliberate breaches may result in disciplinary action consistent with the studio's employment practices. Nothing in this section limits the studio's rights or obligations under applicable law or a client contract.

Owner review items

The drafting process identified the following in the supplied answers. Resolve each before customer release.

Type	Detail	Where
gap	The organisation has not specified a jurisdiction beyond British Columbia, Canada, and has not identified which privacy legislation applies to its operations. The studio handles employee personal information and client contact details. British Columbia has its own private-sector privacy legislation, and federal legislation may also apply depending on the nature of the studio's interprovincial or international client work. The Privacy and Personal Information Policy should address this, but this policy cannot confirm what that sibling document says.	Section 6 and Section 11

gap	The Approved AI Use Register is referenced throughout this policy as the authoritative record of permitted tools and uses. The organisation has not confirmed that this register exists in a current, maintained form. If it does not exist, it must be created before this policy takes effect.	Section 5
gap	The policy requires that partner review of client-facing AI-assisted outputs be recorded in the project file. The organisation has not described its project file system or confirmed that a consistent record-keeping practice exists. The AI Risk Management Standard should specify the format and location of these records.	Section 7.3
gap	The policy requires an incident log for reports made under Section 11. The organisation has not confirmed that such a log exists or described where it is held. The Studio Director must establish this log before the policy takes effect.	Section 11.3
vague	The organisation's answer states that clients are told when generative tools contributed to a deliverable, but does not describe the form, timing or record of that disclosure. Section 10 preserves the partner's professional judgement on form and timing but makes the obligation non-discretionary. The studio should consider whether its client contracts or standard engagement terms need to be updated to reflect this commitment.	Section 10
gap	The organisation has not described its training programme for AI acceptable use. Section 12 requires training before first use and on a recurring cycle. The Studio Director must design and deliver this training and establish a completion record before the policy can be enforced.	Section 12
gap	The information supplied does not confirm what the AI Governance and Accountability Policy says about accountability structure. Section 14 states that this policy governs for acceptable use questions where the two policies address the same matter. The Studio Director must reconcile the two documents to confirm there is no conflict.	Section 14
gap	No framework identifiers were supplied. The document is grounded in RiskWoven AI practical best practices as described in the specification. No control identifiers, clause numbers or publication dates have been cited, consistent with the instruction that no framework clause may be invented.	Throughout

Information the organization must supply

These values were not available from the intake and are required before this document can operate:

- Confirm that the Approved AI Use Register exists and is current, or create it before this policy takes effect. The register must record, for each approved use: the tool name and access method, the permitted purposes, the permitted information categories, any conditions, and the date last reviewed.
- Confirm which privacy legislation applies to Tesselate Design Studio's operations in British Columbia and, if the studio works with clients in other provinces or internationally, whether additional legislation applies. This confirmation should be made by a qualified

legal reviewer and reflected in the Privacy and Personal Information Policy. Candidate instruments for the legal reviewer to check in

- Set the exception review cycle — the frequency at which the Studio Director reviews outstanding exceptions to confirm they are still valid or have expired. Quarterly is offered as a starting point and is not derived from any cited control.
- Set the training recurrence cycle — how often studio personnel must complete AI acceptable use training after their initial completion. Annual recurrence is offered as a starting point and is not derived from any cited control.
- Set the metrics reporting cycle — how often the Studio Director reports the metrics in Section 13 to the Managing Partner. Annual reporting is offered as a starting point and is not derived from any cited control.
- Establish an incident log for recording reports made under Section 11 and the responses to them. Confirm where the log is held and who has access to it.
- Confirm or establish a consistent project file system that can hold the partner review records required by Section 7.3 and the high-impact use records required by Section 7.4. The AI Risk Management Standard should specify the format.
- Review the studio's standard client engagement terms and any existing client contracts to confirm whether they need to be updated to reflect the disclosure commitment in Section 10.
- Reconcile this policy with the AI Governance and Accountability Policy to confirm there is no conflict between the two documents on accountability structure or review authority.
- Design and deliver the AI acceptable use training programme required by Section 12, and establish a completion record before enforcing the training prerequisite in that section.

Written and reviewed by RiskWoven.com. Written by RiskWoven.com's AI drafting agent and checked by RiskWoven.com's independent review stage before release. The review is automated. It is not a human, legal or audit review.