AIGOV-20261105-EU

EU AI Act preliminary assessment

Prepared for Your organisation on 05 November 2026

Other

NOT LEGAL ADVICE · AUTOMATED ASSESSMENT

RESULT

Advanced governance maturity

Based on the answers given, this organisation's overall governance maturity is 85%, and the high-risk use-case screen came back negative. See the detailed findings below for what drove this determination and what to do about it.

No high-risk system identified

Overall maturity: 85%

GOVERNANCE MATURITY OVERVIEW

AI system inventory Q3	100%
Governance ownership Q5	55%
Policy & documentation Q6	100%
Human oversight & transparency Q7	100%
Data protection overlap Q8	100%
AI literacy & training Q9	55%

DETAILED FINDINGS

01 · Scope & regulatory role

INPUT GIVEN

Other, 1-49 employees, operations in Other EU country, Outside the EU.

FINDING

The organisation acts exclusively as a deployer under the AI Act, not a provider. That means a narrower but still substantive obligation set centred on correct use, oversight, and worker information duties rather than product-level conformity assessment.

SOURCE

Q1, Q2

REFERENCE

Art. 3(4) · Art. 2(1)(b)

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689

02 · AI system inventory

INPUT GIVEN

Answer given: Fully documented.

FINDING

A documented inventory is in place across procured and adopted tools. That is the foundation the rest of this assessment builds on.

Score: 100% · On track

SOURCE

Q3

REFERENCE

Feeds Art. 4 literacy scope and Art. 6 classification

03 · High-risk use case screening

INPUT GIVEN

No high-risk use case selected.

FINDING

No high-risk use case was identified from the answer given. This is based on self-reported answers only and does not rule out use cases the organisation has not yet inventoried (see Clause 02).

Classifier: no high-risk system identified

SOURCE

Q4

REFERENCE

Annex III: no match found

04 · Governance ownership

INPUT GIVEN

Answer given: Ad hoc / informal.

FINDING

Without a dedicated owner, deadline-bound obligations elsewhere in this report have no accountable party to carry

SOURCE

Q5

REFERENCE

Art. 26(2)–(5), oversight assignment

them through.

Score: 55% · Needs attention

05 · Policy & documentation

INPUT GIVEN

Answer given: Yes.

FINDING

A formal policy is in place, giving staff a clear reference for tool approval, data handling, and escalation.

Score: 100% · On track

SOURCE

Q6

REFERENCE

Art. 26(1),

instructions for use

06 · Human oversight & transparency

INPUT GIVEN

Review: Always. Disclosure: Yes.

FINDING

Human review of AI-influenced decisions is consistently in place. People are informed when interacting with an AI system, in line with Article 50(1).

Score: 100% · On track

SOURCE

Q7

REFERENCE

Art. 14 · Art. 50(1)

07 · Data protection overlap

INPUT GIVEN

Answer given: Not applicable.

FINDING

No personal data was reported as involved, so a DPIA is not expected to apply. Revisit this if that changes.

Score: 100% · On track

SOURCE

Q8

REFERENCE

GDPR Art. 35

BDSG §26

08 · AI literacy & training

INPUT GIVEN

Answer given: Informal only.

FINDING

Training is informal only. Article 4 has applied to all providers

SOURCE

Q9

REFERENCE

Art. 4, in force

since 2 Feb 2025

and deployers, for every AI system, since 2 February 2025. This is already in force, not a future deadline.

Score: 55% · Needs attention

Prioritized recommendations

1. **Assign a named AI governance owner.** Every other recommendation here needs an accountable party to carry it through.
2. **Stand up structured Article 4 literacy training.** This obligation is already overdue, not upcoming.

METHODOLOGY & DISCLAIMER

This is a preliminary, self-reported assessment generated from ten intake questions. It is not a compliance audit and does not constitute legal advice. Risk classifications and article references, particularly any high-risk determination in Clause 03 and any co-determination assessment, should be verified with qualified counsel before being relied on.

A summary was sent to info@chroix.ch.