

What We Check Before You Sign

Document ID EgD-GCF-005 · Key ID EgD-KEY-2026-07 · Status client one-pager, v1.0 · Issued 2026-08-02T21:37:15Z

SHA-256 of source 497a65f7b719122d16e427add542c4ed53facf6d61e7b0d0014eb508a716ac7a

The problem

Your vendor's AI proposal has been assessed for security, for cost, and for fit. It has almost certainly not been assessed for who ends up holding what — the part that cannot be fixed after signature.

An AI system does not merely store your data. It derives new things from it: embeddings, indices, extracted structure, tuned weights, a semantic map of how your organisation works. Those artifacts are often worth more than the source records, and are usually silent in the contract. Silence resolves in favour of whoever holds the infrastructure.

What we do

We score the proposal against eight control domains, on evidence, before signature.

	Domain	The question it answers
SD-1	Derived-data title	Who owns what the system makes from your data?
SD-2	Purpose limitation	Can your data train something that serves a competitor?
SD-3	Extractability	Can you get everything out, yourself, in full?
SD-4	Switching	What does leaving cost, and what breaks?
SD-5	Residency and inference	Where does your data rest — and where does the thinking happen?
SD-6	Substrate transparency	Whose model, on whose hardware, and who tells you when it changes?
SD-7	Access and audit	Who touched what, and can you prove it?
SD-8	Exit and deletion	When you go, does it actually go with you?

Each domain scores 0, 1 or 2. 2 is evidenced — a clause you can cite or a capability we can test. 1 is asserted — the vendor says so, on a page it can edit tomorrow. 0 is absent. A trust-centre page never scores above 1, and that rule is what makes the total mean something. Four findings override the total outright: the vendor takes title to derived artifacts, claims unbounded training rights, offers no independent extraction path, or will not say where inference runs.

What you get

A completed sixteen-point sheet with every score sourced, a written questionnaire the vendor must answer on the record, and a ranked list of the clauses to change. For the board: not we think this is fine, but we asked forty-one questions, here is what came back, and here is what we are doing about the gaps.

What it is not, and why now

It is not a security review; you have one. It is not a verdict on the vendor's competence — good suppliers score well and still show gaps, because the gaps sit in what nobody thought to ask. It is not legal advice: your counsel sets the contractual position.

Every one of the eight domains is negotiable while the vendor is selling, and none of them afterwards. The cost of asking is a fortnight. The cost of not asking is discovered at renewal, when can we leave turns out to have been settled two years earlier by a clause nobody read.

— EgD-GCF-005 · v1.0 · method: [EgD-GCF-001, the Global Compliance Framework Assessment](#) · [worked example](#) · practitioners may hand this to clients unmodified, with attribution to EVEglyphDesign. Decision support, not legal advice.