

AI Readiness Scorecard

The scoring instrument we use in the One Bit Audit. It records where your business stands on data, capability, operations and governance, ranks candidate use cases, and ends in a 30-day plan you can act on with or without us.

At a glance

The scoring instrument behind the One Bit Audit.

- Eighteen criteria across data, capability, operations and governance, scored 0 to 4
- A use-case ranking by value, feasibility and risk
- A readiness summary and a 30-day plan

Read in 10 minutes. Scores are blank here; the one worked row is labelled illustrative.

How to use this document

This is the template. In a real audit we fill it in with you over five business days and hand it back complete. Scores are ours, evidence is what we saw, and blank fields are yours to keep updating. If you are reading the sample: nothing here is a result. Every score cell is empty on purpose.

Client

Audit dates

Onebit-AI lead

Client sponsor

01 How the audit works

The One Bit Audit is a fixed-scope engagement: USD 1,500, five business days, one deliverable set. Default terms; Onebit-AI and the client agree any variation per engagement.

What we ask you for before day one

- ☐ A one-page description of the business and how it makes money

Existing
material
is
fine.
We
do
not
need
it
polished.

- ☐ A list of the systems you run: CRM, ERP, ticketing, finance, file storage, messaging

Names
and
owners.
Access
comes
later,
and
read-
only
is
enough.

- ☐ Three people we can interview for 45 minutes each

Typically
an
owner
or
executive,
an
operations
lead,
and
someone
who
does
the
daily
work.

☐ Any existing policies on data, privacy, security or AI use

If
there
are
none,
say
so.
That
is
a
finding,
not
a
problem.

☐ Your top three pain points, in your own words

We
test
these
against
what
we
see.
They
are
often
not
the
best
first
build.

The five days

DAY	ACTIVITY	OUTPUT
1	Kickoff and interview 1. Confirm scope, collect inputs, agree access.	Interview notes, inputs checklist
2	Interviews 2 and 3. Systems walkthrough with the person who administers them.	Systems inventory, data map draft
3	Scoring. We score all four dimensions against evidence and list every candidate use case.	Draft scorecard
4	Ranking and recommendation. Use cases scored, integration path chosen, risks written up.	Draft plan
5	Handoff. 60-minute session walking through findings and the 30-day plan. Questions answered.	Final document set

What you receive

- This scorecard, filled in with scores and evidence
- Top three use cases, ranked, with the reasoning shown
- One integration recommendation: what to connect first and how

- Risk notes covering data, regulatory and operational exposure
- A 30-day plan you can run yourself or hand to any supplier
- The 60-minute handoff, recorded if you want it

We do not build during the audit. If we find something urgent, we tell you on the day rather than saving it for the report.

02 **Scoring rubric**

Every criterion in Section 03 is scored 0 to 4. The scale is the same across all dimensions so scores can be compared. We score what we can evidence, not what we are told.

SCORE	LEVEL	WHAT IT MEANS IN PRACTICE
0	Absent	Nothing exists. Nobody owns it. The question has not been asked before.
1	Informal	It happens, but it lives in someone's head or inbox. It would not survive that person leaving.
2	Documented	It is written down and mostly followed. Exceptions are common and not tracked.
3	Managed	It is written down, followed, owned, and checked. Problems are found and fixed.
4	Ready	An AI system could rely on it tomorrow without us building a workaround. This is rare and that is fine.

Reading the scores. A low score is not a verdict on the business. Scores of 1 or 2 on most rows are normal for a first assessment and do not stop a first build. The scorecard exists to show which rows a first build depends on, so effort goes where it changes the outcome. A 4 on a row nobody needs is worth less than a 2 on the row the first use case relies on.

03 Scorecard

Four dimensions, 18 criteria. The "what 4 looks like" column is the fixed standard. Score and evidence are filled in during the audit.

Data

CRITERION	WHAT "4" LOOKS LIKE	SCORE	EVIDENCE
Availability	The data a use case needs exists, is retained long enough to matter, and can be exported without a vendor ticket.		
Quality	Key fields are complete and consistent. Someone can say what "correct" means for each and how often it is checked.		
Access and permissions	Who can read what is defined per system, matches roles, and can be granted to a service account without sharing a person's login.		
Lineage	For any important number, you can trace where it came from, which system is the source of truth, and what transformed it.		
Privacy classification	Personal, confidential and public data are labelled, and the label decides where the data may go, including to a model provider.		

Capability

CRITERION	WHAT "4" LOOKS LIKE	SCORE	EVIDENCE
Team skills	At least one person can read a log, test a prompt against real cases, and say when an output is wrong. They have time allocated to do it.		
Existing tooling	Core systems have APIs or exports that are already in use. Automation tools, if any, are owned and monitored, not abandoned.		
Vendor relationships	You know who to call at each critical vendor, what the contract allows, and whether your data can leave their platform.		
Budget clarity	There is a named budget for the first build and its running costs, with an owner who can approve it without a new business case.		

Operations

CRITERION	WHAT "4" LOOKS LIKE	SCORE	EVIDENCE
Process documentation	The process a use case would touch is written down step by step, including the exceptions, and matches what people actually do.		
Where decisions are made	For each step, it is clear who decides, on what information, and what happens if they are unavailable.		
Approval paths	Approvals are explicit, with thresholds. Nothing important depends on a verbal OK or a message thread.		

CRITERION	WHAT "4" LOOKS LIKE	SCORE	EVIDENCE
Measurement	The process has a number attached today: volume, time, cost or error rate. It is tracked, so an improvement can be seen.		

Governance

CRITERION	WHAT "4" LOOKS LIKE	SCORE	EVIDENCE
Policies	A written position on acceptable AI use, data handling and vendor approval exists, is short enough to be read, and staff know it.		
Risk appetite	Leadership can state which mistakes are tolerable, which are not, and where a human must remain the final decision.		
Regulatory exposure	You know which regimes apply (for example GDPR, the EU AI Act, POPIA, or sector rules) and what each one requires of an automated system.		
Audit needs	You can say who will ask for a record of what the system did, how far back, and in what form. Logging is designed for that request.		
Human oversight	For each automated action there is a named person who reviews, can override, and is told when the system is unsure.		

04 Use-case ranking

We list every candidate use case surfaced in the interviews, then score each on three axes. Priority is our judgement, not a formula, and we state the reason in the handoff.

- **Value 1–5:** how much the business gains if it works, in time, money or risk removed.
- **Feasibility 1–5:** how close the data, systems and process are to supporting it today, using the scores in Section 03.
- **Risk 1–5:** how much harm a wrong output causes, and how hard it is to catch. 5 is highest risk.

USE CASE	VALUE	FEASIBILITY	RISK	PRIORITY
<i>Illustrative example:</i> Support inbox triage. Classify incoming email by type and urgency, draft a reply for a person to approve.	<i>e.g. 3</i>	<i>e.g. 4</i>	<i>e.g. 2</i>	<i>e.g. First</i>

The example row shows the format only. It is not a result from any engagement. A good first build is usually mid-value, high-feasibility and low-risk: it proves the plumbing before anything important depends on it.

05 Readiness summary

Completed on day 4 and reviewed with you on day 5. The overall score is the average across all 18 criteria, shown alongside the four dimension averages so weak areas are visible rather than hidden in the mean.

Overall score (0–4)

Data / Capability / Operations / Governance

Headline finding

Top risk 1

Top risk 2

Top risk 3

Recommended first build

Integration recommendation

30-day plan

Five to eight actions, each with an owner and a date. Written so that any competent supplier, or your own team, could execute it. The first actions are usually fixes to the scorecard rows the first build depends on, not the build itself.

1. Action / owner / date

2. Action / owner / date

3. Action / owner / date

4. Action / owner / date

5. Action / owner / date

06 **Handoff and next step**

The 60-minute handoff is where we walk through every score and every ranking with the people who gave us the evidence. Disagreement is welcome: if you show us something we missed, we change the score and reissue the document.

After the handoff you own the plan. There is no obligation to continue with us. If you do decide to build with Onebit-AI, the default term is that the audit fee is credited in full against a build that starts within 60 days of the handoff date. Onebit-AI and the client confirm this term, or any variation, in the engagement agreement.

Handoff date

Fee credit valid until (handoff + 60 days,
default)

Agreed next step

Signed for Onebit-AI · name · date

Signed for the client · name · date