

# WWAIOS Agent Trust Readiness Case Study

How WWAIOS converts AI-agent uncertainty into a decision-ready governance roadmap

|                            |                                              |                                          |                                       |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>DATE</b><br>Sep 17 2026 | <b>PRODUCT LINE</b><br>Agent Trust Readiness | <b>WORKFLOW</b><br>Mid-market assessment | <b>STATUS</b><br>Approved for release |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

Buyer context: A mid-market company with AI-enabled tools already present in sales, service, finance, and operations needed to understand whether those workflows were ready to scale. The company did not need to replace its enterprise platforms first. It needed an independent, vendor-neutral trust assessment of the decisions and actions those tools were beginning to influence.

## PROBLEM

### AI ACTIVITY WAS OUTPACING GOVERNANCE

Agents, copilots, workflow automations, and AI-assisted decisions were appearing across departments. Ownership was not uniformly assigned, authority boundaries varied by workflow, and audit-ready evidence was scattered across systems.

### BUSINESS RISK

Leadership could not easily answer: which AI workflow touched which decision, what context it used, whether the action was authorized, and what evidence would stand up after the fact.

## SOLUTION

WWAIOS applied a 10-business-day Agent Trust Readiness Assessment. The work was deliberately platform-complementary: it did not compete with agent-control, CRM, identity, security, data, or GRC platforms. It assessed whether the buyer's current environment could produce trustworthy decisions and usable evidence across those platforms.

### INVENTORY

Known and planned AI-enabled workflows were listed with owners, systems, and affected business processes.

### DECISION MAPPING

AI touchpoints were mapped to operational decisions, customer impact, revenue exposure, and compliance relevance.

### EVIDENCE REVIEW

The assessment tested whether actions could be reconstructed, explained, and reviewed by leadership or external stakeholders.

## GOVERNING IMPLICATION

The useful question was not which agent platform the company should buy. It was whether the company's AI-supported decisions could be trusted across the tools already in motion.

## RESULTS

|                                                                  |                                                               |                                                           |                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>6</b><br><b>DECISION CLASSES MAPPED</b><br>Assessment finding | <b>8</b><br><b>READINESS CATEGORIES</b><br>Standard scorecard | <b>10</b><br><b>PRIORITY ACTIONS</b><br>Executive roadmap | <b>10 days</b><br><b>ASSESSMENT WINDOW</b><br>Commercial scope |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|



**Jimmy Standaert**

Sr. Principal Forward Deployed Architect | Founder, WWAIOS

913-221-3137 | [Jimmy@RiGiGroup.com](mailto:Jimmy@RiGiGroup.com) | [www.RiGiGroup.com](http://www.RiGiGroup.com)

PUBLIC-SAFE | APPROVED FOR DISTRIBUTION

SCAN TO CONNECT



# Evidence and Readiness Findings

What WWAIOS made visible for leadership without exposing protected internals

## DECISION CLASSES

| Decision Class      | AI Touchpoint                                            | Why it Matters                         |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Sales qualification | Lead scoring, follow-up guidance, account prioritization | Revenue and customer experience        |
| Service response    | Suggested replies, triage, escalation paths              | Customer trust and SLA performance     |
| Finance review      | Exception flags, renewal signals, spend recommendations  | Margin, cash, approval quality         |
| Compliance support  | Policy lookup, control evidence, review queues           | Audit readiness and governance posture |
| Operational handoff | Task routing, status checks, workflow summaries          | Execution reliability                  |
| Executive decisions | Briefing inputs, risk summaries, action recommendations  | Leadership confidence                  |

## READINESS SCORECARD

|                              |                        |        |                                                          |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Agent Visibility             | <div><div></div></div> | 58/100 | Known workflows found; shadow usage still possible       |
| Ownership and Accountability | <div><div></div></div> | 52/100 | Owners existed in some areas but not all                 |
| Authority Boundaries         | <div><div></div></div> | 46/100 | Allowed actions and review gates were uneven             |
| Context Integrity            | <div><div></div></div> | 63/100 | Useful context existed but was not consistently verified |
| Evidence and Auditability    | <div><div></div></div> | 41/100 | Decision reconstruction depended on manual effort        |
| Decision Impact Awareness    | <div><div></div></div> | 67/100 | Leaders knew high-value areas but lacked a map           |
| Platform Fit                 | <div><div></div></div> | 70/100 | Existing platforms could support controls if configured  |
| Scale Readiness              | <div><div></div></div> | 49/100 | Scale should wait for ownership and evidence fixes       |

Evidence status: Scores are representative assessment findings designed for public-safe collateral. They show the type of executive clarity WWAIOS produces, not confidential client telemetry or a published benchmark.



# Governed Adaptation and Commercial Implication

How the case converts into an actionable mid-market offer

## GOVERNED LEARNING LOOP

WWAIOS treats learning as a governed improvement process, not silent authority expansion. Feedback from completed reviews can refine future assessment guidance only after human review, regression checks, and explicit promotion. Learning does not authorize publication, external egress, pricing changes, commitments, disclosure, or platform-specific behavior.

### OBSERVE

Collect authorized evidence from current workflows and tools.

### SCORE

Assess readiness across visibility, authority, context, and evidence.

### REVIEW

Require human review before changes become operational guidance.

### IMPROVE

Promote only bounded improvements with explicit approval.

## 30 60 90 DAY ACTION PLAN

### FIRST 30 DAYS

Name owners for every AI-enabled workflow. Set review gates for customer-impacting and revenue-impacting actions. Establish a minimum evidence record for each decision class.

### DAYS 31 TO 60

Configure existing platforms to support traceability. Close high-risk authority gaps. Add executive reporting for the most material AI-supported workflows.

### DAYS 61 TO 90

Run regression checks, confirm auditability, and decide where purpose-built agent-control or governance tooling is justified by risk and value.

## GOVERNING IMPLICATION

**WWAIOS effectiveness is the ability to turn scattered AI activity into a board-readable map of trust, risk, evidence, and next action.**

## COMMERCIAL USE

This case supports a fixed-fee Agent Trust Readiness Assessment for mid-market companies with approximately \$20M to \$100M in revenue or ARR. It is strongest when a buyer already has AI activity underway and needs leadership clarity before committing to a larger platform spend, formal governance program, or broader agent rollout.

Complementary positioning: WWAIOS is not a replacement for IBM, Salesforce, Okta, Broadcom, Microsoft, Dataiku, or other agent-control platforms. It helps leaders decide whether AI-supported actions and decisions can be trusted across the operating environment they already have.

Validation disclaimer: This document is public-safe and uses a sanitized representative scenario. It excludes private client data, internal prompts, protected architecture, unpublished pricing, raw communications, proprietary mechanics, and replication-enabling details. This release version is approved for public distribution.



**Jimmy Standaert**

Sr. Principal Forward Deployed Architect | Founder, WWAIOS

913-221-3137 | [Jimmy@RiGiGroup.com](mailto:Jimmy@RiGiGroup.com) | [www.RiGiGroup.com](http://www.RiGiGroup.com)

PUBLIC-SAFE | APPROVED FOR DISTRIBUTION

SCAN TO CONNECT

