Daniel Young Advisory
FRACTIONAL CIO · CYBERSECURITY · AI GOVERNANCE · DUBAI, UAE

daniel@danielpyoung.com
danielpyoung.com
+971 58 563 9178

AI GOVERNANCE DIAGNOSTIC · FIXED-FEE GOVERNANCE DIAGNOSTIC

A board-ready assessment of your AI governance position - tool exposure, policy gaps, and a prioritised adoption framework, delivered in three weeks

Scoped for GenAI and third-party AI adoption across internal and client-facing workflows. Does not cover model validation or algorithm-driven investment, credit, or trading systems.

AED 28,000	Up to 4 days	2-3 wks	1
FIXED FEE, NO DAY-RATE BILLING	INTERVIEWS AND EVIDENCE REVIEW	ENGAGEMENT TO DELIVERY	WRITTEN REPORT, BOARD-READY

THE PROBLEM

AI adoption is already ahead of governance

Staff at most regulated firms are already using generative AI tools informally - in research, client communications, and workflow support - well before any policy, data classification, or approval process exists to govern that use.

UAE financial regulators already expect governed AI adoption. In June 2026, the DFSA confirmed that its existing Rulebook requirements - on governance, risk management, operational risk, and third-party oversight - already apply in full to AI use by DIFC Authorised Firms, alongside the 2021 joint Guidelines for Financial Institutions Adopting Enabling Technologies. A board that cannot evidence its position against these expectations carries live regulatory exposure, not a future compliance question.

THE OUTCOME

A documented governance position the board can approve

An independent review of current AI usage and governance maturity, producing a single written report the board or risk committee can act on directly - what is actually in use, where the exposure sits, and what a defensible governance position requires.

Findings are risk-rated and sequenced, so the immediate question - what needs putting in place first - has a documented answer rather than a working assumption.

Deliverable: an executive summary and top-five actions, an AI/GenAI tool inventory with ownership and provisional risk tiers, risk-rated findings mapped to relevant UAE AI governance expectations, a 90-day remediation roadmap, and a board briefing section covering the governance decisions and reporting cadence required.

WHAT'S REVIEWED

Six review modules, built from a live enterprise AI governance framework

POLICY & DATA CLASSIFICATION
Whether an AI acceptable use policy exists, and whether data classification defines what cannot enter a public AI tool.

TOOL EXPOSURE & SHADOW AI
Assessment of the firm's visibility over AI tool use, and the gap between what's declared, what's approved, and what the evidence shows.

AUTHORISATION WORKFLOW
Whether a default-ban or whitelist position exists, and whether staff have a usable route to request tools.

AI REGISTER
Whether a live register of approved tools, named owners, and risk classifications is maintained - including use-case purpose, data handled, and client impact, not just approval status.

SUPPLIER & THIRD-PARTY EXPOSURE
Whether AI embedded in supplier or vendor services handling client data is assessed or controlled.

GOVERNANCE & REGULATORY MAPPING
For DIFC firms, findings mapped to the DFSA's confirmed position (4 June 2026) that existing Rulebook governance, risk management, and third-party oversight requirements apply in full to AI use. For ADGM firms, no equivalent FSRA confirmation currently exists; findings are mapped to FSRA's existing governance, risk management, and outsourcing requirements by extension, on the same basis regulators globally are applying technology-neutral rules to AI pending dedicated guidance.

Each finding is risk-rated and sequenced into a single remediation roadmap - not a checklist, a prioritised plan the board can approve and track.

SCOPE & BOUNDARIES

This is a governance and exposure review, not a technical AI security assessment and not model risk validation - it does not validate AI or algorithmic models, assess model performance or bias, or review automated client-facing decisioning, including investment, credit, pricing or suitability decisions - those requirements are separately scoped. It also does not cover general cybersecurity controls (identity, incident response, SOC readiness) or operational resilience (service mapping, RTO/RPO) - those are separate, scoped engagements available where this review identifies the need. Findings are mapped to the DFSA's existing Rulebook requirements confirmed as applicable to AI, and to the 2021 joint Enabling Technologies Guidelines, proportionate to the firm's activities - this is an independent assessment, not a legal or compliance opinion. Where a policy, classification, or control is absent, it will be identified, risk-rated, and prioritised - full policy drafting or implementation is out of scope unless separately commissioned.

> *Where the review identifies material gaps, next steps are typically one of: a separately scoped remediation project, policy or documentation drafting, or an ongoing fractional advisory retainer for firms that want continuity of ownership through implementation.*

DIFC & ADGM-REGULATED FIRMS

AI governance is not a future compliance issue. Firms adopting GenAI without a documented position carry live, unmanaged exposure - not a future compliance question.

- Establish the firm's visibility over AI tool use, and the gap between declared, approved, and evidenced use.
- Identify and risk-rate gaps in policy, data classification, authorisation, and supplier oversight.
- Map findings to the DFSA's existing Rulebook requirements and the 2021 joint Enabling Technologies Guidelines, proportionate to the firm's activities.
- Deliver a single, prioritised roadmap into a board-approved governance position - not a list of issues without a plan.

Built from a governance framework taken from board-approved position to enforced control at an FCA-regulated wealth manager, applied directly to the DFSA and FSRA context.

> *Engagements begin with a short scoping call to confirm fit, followed by structured interviews and evidence review over up to four days, with the written report delivered within two to three weeks. Fixed fee, agreed before the work begins.*

Scope assumes one regulated legal entity, up to six stakeholder interviews, and review of available documentation and declared tool usage. Comprehensive shadow-AI discovery, additional entities, and model risk validation are separately scoped.

Sources: DFSA, Guidelines for Financial Institutions Adopting Enabling Technologies (2021); DFSA, "Regulatory expectations on artificial intelligence risk management in the DIFC," Dear SEO letter, 4 June 2026.