

LPM Reusable Evidence Checklist

A versioned knowledge object for deciding what evidence is trusted before decisions, AI initiatives, controls, recommendations, and operating-model claims move forward.

Field	Value
Object type	LPM Knowledge Object
Primary LPM layers	Information Ecology, Governance Architecture, Decision Architecture, AI Amplification
Connected layers	Ownership Map, Communication Architecture, Platform Structure, Identity & Incentives
Primary use	Define the evidence required before decisions, AI initiatives, controls, recommendations, escalations, and operating-model claims are trusted.
Website use	Downloadable template, executive guide, AI readiness resource, JSON object for Lapemo ingestion, and future guided skill.
Version	1.0
Owner	LPM / Lapemo
Last reviewed	2026-06-24

The Evidence Checklist makes evidence explicit, owned, fresh, source-linked, AI-aware, and reviewable. It prevents polished summaries, weak dashboards, stale data, and unverified AI output from becoming enterprise truth.

The object is reusable across three company profiles: 500+, 5,000+, and 10,000+ employees.

1. Knowledge object model

This knowledge object is designed to be used as both a downloadable artifact and a future reusable Lapemo skill.

- Human guide - plain-language checklist for executives, transformation leaders, product, technology, data, risk, governance, and AI teams.
- Template artifact - a downloadable checklist teams can use before approving decisions, AI initiatives, controls, metrics, and recommendations.
- Machine-readable schema - fields, scoring logic, validation rules, mappings, prompts, review triggers, and version metadata.
- Guided skill - an AI-assisted workflow that checks evidence quality, source ownership, freshness, lineage, contradictions, AI involvement, and required follow-up object updates.

2. Why this matters for AI scaling

AI can make weak evidence look polished. It can summarize stale information, classify bad data, and recommend action from incomplete sources. The Evidence Checklist keeps trust tied to source, owner, freshness, confidence, lineage, human review, and governance context.

3. Core principles

Principle	Meaning
Evidence before confidence	Confidence should come from traceable evidence, not status updates, persuasive summaries, or executive optimism.
The claim determines the evidence	Every decision, AI recommendation, risk, control, or transformation claim should state what evidence is required to prove it.
Source systems matter	Evidence should connect to the system, data object, record, owner, timestamp, and lineage path that produced it.
Freshness is a control	Old evidence can be worse than no evidence when decisions, systems, people, or AI behavior have changed.
AI output is not evidence by itself	AI can summarize, classify, and reason over evidence, but final trust depends on source quality and human accountability.
Material decisions need replayability	A future reviewer should be able to see what was known, what was missing, what was accepted, and why the decision was made.
Evidence gaps are operating-model signals	Missing, stale, conflicting, or ownerless evidence exposes gaps across information, ownership, governance, and platform structure.

4. Canonical fields

Field	What it captures	Required?
Evidence ID	Unique identifier for the evidence item or evidence pack	Yes
Supported claim	Decision, risk, control, AI recommendation, initiative outcome, dependency, metric, or operating-model assertion being supported	Yes
Evidence type	Metric, report, policy, decision record, system log, customer signal, employee signal, financial data, audit evidence, AI output, experiment result, data lineage, vendor record, or SME attestation	Yes
Source system / location	Where the evidence lives: Jira, ServiceNow, Salesforce, Workday, Snowflake, Power BI, Confluence, Teams, Slack, GRC tool, model registry, repository, or other system	Yes
Evidence owner	Person or role accountable for evidence accuracy, freshness, and interpretation	Yes
Source owner	System, data, process, control, or platform owner accountable for the underlying source	Yes
Date captured	Date the evidence was pulled, observed, exported, generated, or approved	Yes
Freshness window	How long the evidence can be trusted before revalidation is required	Yes
Confidence rating	Low, medium, high, or verified based on source quality, lineage, recency, completeness, and review state	Yes
Lineage / provenance	How the evidence was created, transformed, summarized, or moved before use	Required for material decisions

Field	What it captures	Required?
Data classification	Public, internal, confidential, restricted, regulated, customer, employee, financial, model, or legal-sensitive	Yes
AI involvement	None, AI summarized, AI classified, AI recommended, AI generated, AI executed, or autonomous AI involved	Yes
Human reviewer	Named person or role that validated evidence when material, risk-bearing, or AI-assisted	Required when material
Contradictory evidence	Known evidence that conflicts with or weakens the claim	Required if known
Evidence gap	Missing evidence, stale evidence, unclear owner, unknown source, broken lineage, or unresolved conflict	Required if present
Decision / object link	Link to Decision Log, Decision Rights Matrix, AI Initiative Owner Register, Escalation Map, Ownership Map, control record, or initiative record	Required when connected
Review status	Draft, submitted, reviewed, verified, rejected, stale, superseded, or archived	Yes
Review date	Date when evidence must be reviewed, refreshed, replaced, or retired	Yes
Version	Artifact version, owner, last reviewed date, and change history	Yes

5. Evidence scoring logic

Score	Meaning
0	Evidence is informal, anecdotal, stale, undocumented, or dependent on individual interpretation.
1	Evidence exists but source ownership, recency, lineage, confidence, or review status is unclear.
2	Evidence is documented but not consistently tied to claims, decisions, AI output, or governance controls.
3	Evidence is source-linked, owner-backed, fresh, reviewed, confidence-rated, and connected to the decision or operating object.
4	Evidence is governed, lineage-aware, AI-readable, auditable, automatically refreshed or flagged, and connected to live operating-model control.

Evidence health score: average of source quality, owner clarity, freshness, completeness, lineage, contradiction handling, AI review, sensitivity control, and replayability.

High-risk flag: source missing, owner missing, freshness expired, low confidence used for a material decision, AI involved without reviewer, sensitive data unclassified, contradictory evidence unresolved, or decision made without evidence link.

6. Evidence types

Type	Use	Common source
Metric / KPI	Performance, cycle time, cost, quality, productivity, adoption, value, or risk metric	Dashboard, BI tool, warehouse, product analytics
Decision evidence	Facts used to approve, reject, defer, or supersede a decision	Decision Log, meeting record, product brief, governance forum
Control evidence	Proof that policy, approval, risk review, security, privacy, audit, or compliance control occurred	GRC, audit tool, risk register, workflow system
System evidence	Logs, tickets, changes, access records, workflow state, incident records, or integration events	Jira, ServiceNow, GitHub, CI/CD, IAM, observability
Data evidence	Source data, lineage, quality score, definition, data owner approval, or reconciliation result	Warehouse, catalog, BI semantic layer, data quality tool
People evidence	Role, ownership, staffing, readiness, behavior, adoption, training, or incentive evidence	Workday, LMS, survey, org system, enablement record
Customer evidence	Customer feedback, support trend, churn, NPS, satisfaction, contract issue, or external commitment	CRM, support platform, research repository
AI evidence	Prompt, model output, model card, evaluation result, human review, agent action log, or boundary test	Model registry, AI platform, eval harness, agent log
SME attestation	Named expert judgment when system evidence is incomplete or not yet instrumented	Attestation record with owner and expiration date

7. Evidence quality dimensions

Dimension	Question	Pass condition
Source quality	Is the evidence pulled from an authoritative system or from an informal summary?	Authoritative source identified
Owner quality	Is there a named evidence owner and source owner?	Both owners named
Freshness	Is the evidence recent enough for the decision or risk tier?	Freshness window active
Completeness	Does the evidence cover the whole claim, not just the favorable part?	No material missing fields
Lineage	Can the evidence path be traced from source to use?	Provenance documented
Contradiction check	Has conflicting evidence been surfaced and resolved?	Known contradictions captured
AI review	Was AI-generated or AI-summarized evidence reviewed by a human when material?	Human reviewer named
Sensitivity control	Is data classification and access handling clear?	Classification recorded
Replayability	Can a future reviewer understand what was known and why it was trusted?	Decision/object link present

8. Version for 500+ employee companies

Use when the company is scaling beyond founder-led or relationship-led coordination and needs a practical evidence discipline without heavy governance.

Area	Typical condition	LPM standard
Primary problem	Evidence lives in people's heads, decks, Slack/Teams threads, spreadsheets, and founder/operator memory	Create a simple evidence standard before AI pilots and scaling decisions become opinion-driven
Minimum evidence pack	Claim, source, owner, date, confidence, decision link, evidence gap, next review date	Keep it lightweight and repeatable
Owner standard	Every evidence item has one evidence owner and one source owner	No ownerless evidence
AI standard	AI output can support analysis but cannot be the only evidence for customer, employee, financial, or control decisions	Human validation required
Review rhythm	Review before major decisions, AI pilots, funding approvals, operating-model changes, and quarterly planning	Do not overbuild governance too early
Website artifact use	Download as a workshop checklist and AI readiness self-assessment	Simple, founder-to-executive friendly

9. Version for 5,000+ employee companies

Use when evidence is fragmented across functions, systems, vendors, dashboards, programs, risk groups, and transformation rhythms.

Area	Typical condition	LPM standard
Primary problem	Evidence is fragmented across functions, platforms, BI tools, vendors, PMO rituals, risk teams, and transformation programs	Create cross-functional evidence standards tied to decisions, owners, and governance
Minimum evidence pack	Claim, source system, owner, lineage, freshness, confidence, data classification, AI involvement, reviewer, contradictory evidence, decision/object link	Make evidence reviewable across functions
Owner standard	Evidence owner, source owner, decision owner, control owner, and AI boundary owner where relevant	Separate evidence ownership from decision authority
AI standard	AI-summarized or AI-recommended evidence requires provenance, reviewer, source quality score, and review status	AI cannot hide weak source data
Review rhythm	Review at portfolio, governance, risk, architecture, AI initiative, and value realization checkpoints	Connect to operating rhythms
Website artifact use	Download as an enterprise operating template and Lapemo onboarding object	Prepared for structured ingestion

10. Version for 10,000+ employee companies

Use when evidence must work across business units, regions, legal entities, systems of record, AI platforms, governance forums, and regulated control paths.

Area	Typical condition	LPM standard
Primary problem	Evidence conflicts across business units, regions, legal entities, systems of record, data domains, governance forums, and AI platforms	Federate evidence capture while centralizing standards, lineage, controls, and replayability
Minimum evidence pack	Full evidence object with claim, authority source, lineage, owner chain, confidence score, sensitivity, control mapping, AI trace, contradictions, retention, and supersession rules	Enterprise-grade evidence control
Owner standard	Evidence owner, source owner, data owner, system owner, control owner, legal/entity owner, decision owner, AI boundary owner, and value owner where needed	Complexity requires formal role separation
AI standard	AI use requires prompt/model trace, evaluation result, human review, automated monitoring where available, and stop-control evidence for autonomous workflows	AI evidence must be auditable and revocable
Review rhythm	Review through enterprise governance, risk, audit, regulatory, portfolio, model-risk, and operating-model control cadences	Material evidence must be replayable
Website artifact use	Download as an executive guide and machine-readable control object for large enterprises	Designed for federation and central control

11. AI involvement rules

Level	What it means	Required control
Level 0 - No AI	Evidence is human-created or system-generated without AI interpretation	Normal evidence owner and source owner required
Level 1 - AI summarizes evidence	AI compresses source content into a summary	Source links, reviewer, and summary limitations required
Level 2 - AI classifies evidence	AI assigns category, severity, confidence, ownership, or risk tier	Classification logic and human spot-check required
Level 3 - AI recommends from evidence	AI recommends a decision, priority, risk response, or escalation path	Decision owner and reviewer required before material action
Level 4 - AI generates evidence artifact	AI creates a brief, decision pack, control memo, or evidence synthesis	All claims must be tied to sources and reviewed
Level 5 - AI acts on evidence	AI triggers workflow, routes work, changes state, blocks work, or executes an action	AI boundary owner, stop path, audit trail, and control owner required

12. Evidence checklist worksheet

Use this as the downloadable working template. Each row should be completed for material decisions, AI initiatives, control evidence, escalation evidence, and operating-model claims.

Field	Entry	Guidance
Evidence ID		Unique evidence item or evidence pack identifier
Supported claim		What decision, risk, AI recommendation, control, metric, or operating claim does this support?
Evidence type		Metric, decision record, control evidence, system log, data evidence, AI output, SME attestation, etc.
Source system / location		Where does the evidence live?
Evidence owner		Who owns accuracy and interpretation?
Source owner		Who owns the source system, data, process, or control?
Date captured		When was it captured or approved?
Freshness window		How long can it be trusted?
Confidence rating		Low, medium, high, verified

Field	Entry	Guidance
Lineage / provenance		How did it move from source to use?
Data classification		Public, internal, confidential, restricted, regulated, customer, employee, financial, model, legal-sensitive
AI involvement		None, summarized, classified, recommended, generated, executed, autonomous
Human reviewer		Required when material or AI-assisted
Contradictory evidence		What evidence challenges the claim?
Evidence gap		What is missing, stale, disputed, or ownerless?
Decision / object link		Decision Log, AI Initiative Owner Register, Escalation Map, control record, Ownership Map, etc.
Review status		Draft, submitted, reviewed, verified, rejected, stale, superseded, archived
Review date		When must this be refreshed or retired?

13. Validation rules

Condition	System response	Reason
No supported claim	Block evidence record approval	Evidence must support something specific
No source system or location	Mark low confidence	Evidence without source is weak
No evidence owner	Block material use	Evidence needs accountable interpretation
No source owner	Flag source-governance gap	Underlying source must be accountable
Date captured missing	Require timestamp	Freshness cannot be evaluated
Freshness window expired	Mark stale and require refresh	Old evidence may mislead decisions

Condition	System response	Reason
Low confidence used for material decision	Require reviewer or alternate evidence	Material decisions need stronger evidence
AI involved but no human reviewer	Block material use	AI-assisted evidence needs accountability
Restricted data without classification	Escalate to control owner	Sensitive data must be governed
Contradictory evidence unresolved	Flag decision risk	Conflicting evidence must be resolved or explicitly accepted
Decision made but no evidence link	Require Decision Log update	Decisions must be replayable
Repeated evidence gap	Create operating-model correction	Recurring gaps point to information ecology or ownership failure

14. Mapping rules

Target object	Mapping
Ownership Map	Evidence owner, source owner, data owner, system owner, control owner, and AI boundary owner should map to named ownership.
Decision Rights Model	Materiality of evidence determines who can accept weak evidence, approve exceptions, or require more proof.
Decision Rights Matrix	Decision evidence maps to decider, recommender, consulted, informed, implementation owner, and control owner.
Decision Log	Every material decision should link to the evidence that supported it and identify what evidence was missing.
Escalation Map	Stale, missing, contradictory, ownerless, or AI-risk evidence can trigger escalation.
AI Initiative Owner Register	AI initiatives must define evidence for value, risk, model behavior, control readiness, and human review.

Target object	Mapping
Incentive Alignment Checklist	Evidence gaps often reveal teams are rewarded for activity, output, or optics instead of verified outcomes.
Information Ecology	Evidence quality is a direct signal of information health, lineage, trust, and source discipline.
Platform Structure	Evidence should trace to systems, workflows, repositories, observability, and BI/control platforms.
Governance Architecture	Control evidence, audit evidence, privacy evidence, security evidence, and model-risk evidence map to governance owners.

15. AI prompts for the future skill

- Assess whether this evidence is sufficient to support the stated decision, risk, control, AI recommendation, or operating-model claim.
- Classify the evidence by source quality, freshness, owner clarity, lineage, sensitivity, confidence, AI involvement, and review status.
- Identify missing evidence, stale evidence, contradictory evidence, weak-source evidence, and ownerless evidence.
- Generate an executive-ready evidence summary with claim, source, confidence, gaps, contradictions, reviewer, and next action.
- Determine whether this evidence requires a Decision Log entry, Escalation Map trigger, AI Initiative Owner Register update, or governance review.
- Detect when AI is being treated as evidence instead of a tool for summarizing or reasoning over evidence.
- Generate the correct checklist version for a 500+, 5,000+, or 10,000+ employee company.

16. Render targets

Output	Use
Word document	Workshop, consulting, operating-model design, internal enablement, website download
PDF guide	Executive education, AI readiness briefing, governance design, transformation playbook
Website page	Downloadable resource and educational landing page
Interactive form	Guided evidence intake and quality scoring
CSV import	Bulk import of evidence items, owners, source systems, classifications, and review status
JSON object	Lapemo ingestion, scoring, validation, and mapping rules
In-app workflow	Live evidence health, decision evidence packs, AI evidence review, and stale evidence alerts

17. Review triggers

- Company crosses 500, 5,000, or 10,000+ employees
- New AI initiative, agent, model, automation, or decision-support workflow is introduced
- Major decision, escalation, audit finding, incident, or governance exception occurs
- Source system, BI tool, data warehouse, GRC tool, workflow platform, or model registry changes
- Evidence owner, source owner, data owner, control owner, or AI boundary owner changes
- Evidence becomes stale, contradictory, incomplete, disputed, or unsupported by source lineage
- Regulatory, legal, privacy, security, financial, customer, or employee-impacting requirement changes

18. Website positioning copy

A reusable LPM method for defining the evidence required before decisions, AI initiatives, controls, recommendations, escalations, and operating-model claims are trusted.

Use it as a downloadable checklist now and as a future Lapemo skill that checks evidence quality, source ownership, AI involvement, and decision readiness automatically.