



ARTISANAL INTELLIGENCE

Pilot Toolkit Guide

v0.6 Release Candidate

English edition

Website publication edition · 17 August 2026

PUBLIC PILOT EDITION · NOT CERTIFICATION

Toolkit status. This guide accompanies the v0.6 Release Candidate Pilot Toolkit. The templates support bounded pilots and validation; they do not create certification, audit assurance or legal compliance. The profiles Basic, Enhanced and Critical are provisional and require empirical calibration.

Use the smallest set of templates that preserves a challengeable line from scope and consequence to evidence, conclusion and action.

1. What the toolkit contains

The Pilot Toolkit consists of a separate English workbook and Dutch workbook. Each contains instructions, controlled lists, 20 working templates and a formula-driven dashboard. The workbooks are deliberately compact. They are not a case-management system and should not duplicate existing records, evidence repositories or risk registers.

The toolkit implements the v0.6 method; the Assurance Manual remains the controlling method document. If a template appears to conflict with the Manual, follow the Manual and record the issue as validation feedback.

2. Before you begin

Assign at least:

- an executive sponsor who can accept scope and act on material results;
- a pilot lead who coordinates the work;
- an assessor or assessment team with sufficient competence and functional independence for the consequence context;
- an accountable knowledge authority with access to relevant material and a mandate to challenge and escalate;
- owners for evidence, findings and corrective actions.

Select one bounded Knowledge Assurance Object. Record its intended use, upstream and downstream dependencies, exclusions and stopping rule. A boundary is adequate only when further discovery is unlikely to change the consequence profile, evidence sufficiency, conclusion or required action. Reopen it when a newly discovered dependency could change one of those elements.

3. Recommended sequence

1. **Charter and scope** - define the management question, success criteria, object, intended use, dependencies, exclusions and stopping rule.
2. **Consequence** - select a provisional Basic, Enhanced or Critical profile from potential impact, reversibility, scale, duration, legal effect and dependency concentration.
3. **Knowledge map** - identify Source, Craft and Generated Knowledge and actively search for undocumented people, supplier, system and exception dependencies.

4. **Awareness** - classify each material dependency as known and evidenced; known but incompletely evidenced; or unknown or falsely assumed.
5. **Evidence plan** - state claims and identify Minimum Sufficient Evidence. Reuse existing controls where they address the same claim and avoid correlated evidence being counted as independent.
6. **Property assessment** - assess Integrity, Provenance, Authority, Understandability and Resilience separately.
7. **Challenge and test** - verify material claims through proportionate sampling, observation, interviews, technical checks or reconstruction.
8. **Conclusion and action** - issue one controlled formal outcome, preserve the five property positions, record limitations and agree actions.
9. **Reassess** - reopen the assessment after a material change, expiry, adverse evidence or failed corrective action.

4. Controlled formal outcomes

Use only the following wording for the overall assessment outcome:

- **Sufficiently assured**
- **Sufficiently assured with limitations**
- **Insufficiently assured**
- **Not assessable**

An overall outcome never replaces the five property-specific conclusions. Do not average away a serious weakness. The most consequential unresolved property can determine whether reliance is appropriate.

5. The 20 templates

No.	Template	Use
01	Pilot Charter	Management question, objective, success criteria, roles, dates and exclusions.
02	Scope Definition	Object, intended use, lifecycle, dependencies, downstream use, exclusions and stopping rule.
03	Knowledge Process Inventory	Processes and their Source, Craft and Generated Knowledge. Classification is role-relative.
04	Risk Driver Register	People, technology, supplier and organisational changes that could affect one or more properties.
05	Consequence Assessment	Rationale for the provisional Basic, Enhanced or Critical profile.
06	Decision Register	Material scoping, method, module, reliance and acceptance decisions.
07	Evidence Register	Claim-specific evidence, verification, provenance, limitations and correlation or common-source risk.
08	Artisanal Case File	A traceable sample connecting sources, professional reasoning, transformations, authority and result.

No.	Template	Use
09	Knowledge Assurance Profile	The One-Page Assessment: object and use; profile and awareness; five properties; evidence basis; reliance outcome and limitations; accountable authority, validity and action. Links preserve detailed metadata.
10	KCR Checklist	Components and verification state of the Knowledge Continuity Reserve.
11	Interview Guide	Interviews designed as evidence collection and challenge, not as undocumented opinion.
12	Craft Knowledge Capture	Contextual reasoning, cues, exceptions and lessons. It is a targeted assurance aid, not a mandate to document all tacit knowledge.
13	Provenance Record	Origin, agents, versions, transformations, AI or automation use, validation and source links.
14	Authority Matrix	Who establishes, validates, approves, changes, challenges and escalates; includes accountable mandate.
15	Reconstruction Test Plan	Scenario, capability acceptance criterion, Knowledge Recovery Objective, alternate performer, permitted inputs, result and retest.
16	Findings Log	Evidence-bounded findings, property, awareness, consequence, materiality and ownership.
17	Corrective Action Plan	Action, owner, due date, verification, residual uncertainty and closure evidence.
18	Management Summary	Concise decision messages linked to supporting evidence and required management action.
19	Executive Dashboard	A small set of management indicators; it is not a substitute for the evidence file.
20	Pilot Evaluation Report	Usefulness, measurability, reproducibility, burden, failures and recommendations for method validation.

6. Optional Assurance Modules

A valid lightweight assessment must remain possible without a module. Consider one only when a material trigger requires specialised depth, repeatable automation, a standards mapping or another bounded method.

Record the module decision in the Decision Register. Any used module must disclose:

- purpose and material trigger;
- assurance properties addressed;
- inputs and method;
- evidence or output;
- limitations and validity;
- module owner, version, category and compatibility with v0.6.

Core-maintained, standards-mapping and third-party modules may use human, automated, algorithmic or AI-assisted methods. Method type does not determine evidential strength. The organisation and assessor retain accountability. Independent verification is proportionate when consequence, uncertainty, limitations or material dependence make it necessary.

7. Evidence and traceability rules

- Start from the claim, not from the document.
- Count evidence as equivalent only when it addresses the same claim with comparable relevance, reliability, currency and coverage.
- Record whether apparently different items share a source, transformation, reviewer or failure mode.
- Preserve provenance and limitations when knowledge is reclassified downstream. A Generated output may become an operational source, but that role change does not erase its origin.
- Treat interview notes as evidence only when the interviewee, context, question, response, corroboration and limitation are recorded.
- Treat a human review of AI output as strong evidence only when the reviewer has competence, access, time, authority and a real mandate to challenge.
- Keep hyperlinks or identifiers to the actual evidence repository; do not embed sensitive material in the workbook unless authorised.

8. Completion and quality check

Before closing a pilot, confirm that:

- the scope and stopping rule remain defensible;
- all material dependencies and adverse evidence were considered;
- each property has a conclusion and rationale;
- the overall outcome uses controlled wording;
- limitations and residual uncertainty are visible;
- the KRO states both a time and a capability acceptance criterion;
- material module triggers are addressed, whether or not a module was used;
- corrective actions have owners, dates and verification methods;
- the accountable authority signs or formally accepts the result;
- the reassessment trigger and validity period are explicit;
- the Pilot Evaluation Report records burden, disagreement, failure and learning rather than only success.

The workbook is an interface to an evidence-based assessment. A completed spreadsheet without challengeable evidence is not assurance.