

Reusable Ownership Map

Three operating-model templates for companies scaling AI: 500, 5,000, and 10,000+ employees.

Core principle

AI does not remove ownership. It exposes whether ownership was ever defined clearly enough to scale.

Field	Definition
Use this when	AI pilots are spreading, accountability is unclear, work is crossing teams, or leaders cannot tell who owns decisions, data, platforms, and agent behavior.
Output	A living ownership map that connects outcomes, decision rights, execution, information, systems, governance, and AI amplification.
Best format	Website artifact + downloadable DOCX/PDF + machine-readable skill schema + optional Lapemo workflow.
Version	v1.0 - built as a reusable knowledge artifact, not a one-time worksheet.

Website card copy: A practical template for making hidden ownership visible before AI scales work across teams, systems, and decision paths.

From static artifact to reusable skill

The Ownership Map should not live only as a PDF. In LPM terms, it should become a reusable skill: a repeatable way for a company to diagnose, fill, score, govern, and refresh ownership as work, systems, and AI agents change.

Recommended framing
Artifact = downloadable reference. Template = repeatable worksheet. Skill = guided workflow with inputs, scoring, outputs, versioning, and update triggers. Knowledge object = the governed source of truth that people and AI can reference safely.

Reusable skill stack

Layer	What it does	Suggested format
1. Reference	Plain-language guide explaining the ownership model and why it matters for AI scaling.	Website page, PDF, DOCX
2. Template	Fillable map customized by company size and operating complexity.	DOCX, spreadsheet, web form
3. Schema	Structured fields that machines can read consistently.	JSON/YAML, database table
4. Scoring	Ownership clarity score by domain and owner type.	0-3 rubric, heatmap
5. Workflow	Guided questions, review cadence, decision prompts, and escalation rules.	Lapemo skill, AI assistant, form wizard
6. Governance	Version history, named artifact owner, approval path, and evidence sources.	Changelog, audit log, owner registry
7. Refresh	Triggers that flag stale ownership when org, systems, or AI usage changes.	Connectors, calendar reviews, system-of-record signals

Practical website packaging

- Publish one landing page for the Ownership Map skill with a simple explanation and three download cards.
- Offer downloads by company profile: 500+, 5,000+, and 10,000+.
- Include a short “Run this skill” CTA that explains how Lapemo turns the template into a living control object.
- Show metadata on every artifact: version, last updated, LPM layers covered, owner, review cadence, and compatible inputs.
- Avoid “set it and forget it.” The artifact should become a living source of truth that changes only through governed updates.

Ownership Map fields

Every version uses the same conceptual fields, but the depth changes with company size. Smaller companies need clarity without bureaucracy. Larger companies need federation, controls, and evidence.

Field	Meaning	Guidance
Work / capability domain	The capability, workflow, product area, or enterprise system being mapped.	Example: customer onboarding, product intake, finance close, AI support agents.
Outcome owner	The accountable leader for business results.	One name or role. Do not allow shared ambiguity.
Decision owner	The role with authority to make tradeoff decisions.	Defines what can be decided locally vs escalated.
Execution owner	The role that runs the process and coordinates delivery.	Usually product, operations, transformation, or process lead.
Information owner	The person accountable for data, knowledge, documentation, and context quality.	Critical for AI because poor context creates poor automation.
Platform owner	The person accountable for the system of record or workflow platform.	Example: Jira, ServiceNow, Salesforce, Workday, Teams, Confluence.
Governance owner	The person accountable for policy, risk, control, compliance, and review.	Must include control evidence, not just opinion.
AI / automation owner	The person accountable for AI use cases, agent behavior, model/tool access, and human review.	AI owner is not always the technical owner.
Evidence source	Where proof of ownership and decisions lives.	Charter, Jira project, RACI, policy, Confluence page, intake board, audit log.
Escalation trigger	What causes an ownership issue to be escalated.	No owner, conflicting owners, stale evidence, agent acting outside bounds.

Scoring rubric

Score	Definition
0 - Missing	No clear owner, no decision path, or ownership exists only through tribal knowledge.
1 - Named but weak	Owner exists, but authority, evidence, or decision rights are unclear.
2 - Defined	Owner, authority, evidence, and escalation are documented and usable.
3 - Governed and current	Ownership is actively reviewed, linked to systems of record, and safe for AI-assisted work.

500+ employees: The scaling company

This version is intentionally lightweight. The goal is to move from founder-led or relationship-led coordination to visible ownership without creating enterprise bureaucracy.

Operating-model problem

The company has outgrown tribal coordination. Work still moves through relationships, meetings, Slack or Teams, and a handful of strong operators. AI pilots can spread quickly, but ownership does not scale at the same pace.

Recommended ownership model

- Use one accountable outcome owner per domain.
- Use a single decision-rights owner for tradeoffs: priority, budget, risk acceptance, platform choice, and AI approval.
- Keep governance lightweight: one review forum, one owner registry, one escalation path.
- Name a human owner for every AI-enabled workflow, even if the AI tool is experimental.

Domain	Outcome owner	Decision rights	Execution owner	Info / data owner	Platform owner	AI owner	Evidence + escalation
Customer experience	[Role / name]	Decision: customer-impacting process changes	[CX / Ops lead]	[Customer data steward]	[CRM / support platform owner]	[AI assist owner]	Evidence: CX charter, CRM workflow, support playbook Trigger: no owner for AI-generated response quality
Product delivery	[Role / name]	Decision: roadmap tradeoffs, delivery priority	[Product lead]	[Product docs owner]	[Jira / roadmap owner]	[AI product workflow owner]	Evidence: roadmap, Jira board, release notes Trigger: duplicate priorities or unclear DRI
Internal knowledge	[Role / name]	Decision: source-of-truth rules	[Ops / enablement lead]	[Knowledge owner]	[Confluence / Teams owner]	[AI knowledge retrieval owner]	Evidence: knowledge standards, page owners Trigger: AI answers from stale or ownerless content
People operations	[Role / name]	Decision: employee lifecycle changes	[HR ops lead]	[People data owner]	[HRIS owner]	[HR automation owner]	Evidence: HR process map, Workday/HRIS ownership Trigger: manager self-service or AI HR answers lack review
Finance / planning	[Role / name]	Decision: forecast assumptions and approval	[FP&A lead]	[Finance data owner]	[Planning system owner]	[Finance AI analysis owner]	Evidence: forecast calendar, assumptions log Trigger: conflicting numbers across reports
Governance / risk	[Role / name]	Decision: acceptable risk and review path	[Risk / legal lead]	[Policy owner]	[GRC / document system owner]	[AI risk owner]	Evidence: risk register, policy review log Trigger: AI use case lacks approval path

500+ fill-in map

Domain	Outcome owner	Decision rights	Execution owner	Info / data owner	Platform owner	AI owner	Evidence + escalation

Fast questions for the workshop

- Who is accountable for the outcome if AI makes this process faster but worse?
- Who can approve changes to the workflow without asking the founder or executive team?
- Where does the current version of the process live?
- What decision or ownership conflict slows this domain down today?
- What AI use case is most likely to expose this ownership gap in the next 90 days?

5,000+ employees: The scaled enterprise

This version assumes functional maturity but cross-functional coordination breaks. The map must show ownership across business units, functions, systems, data, governance, and AI workflows.

Operating-model problem

Each department has tools, processes, and leaders, but ownership breaks across handoffs. AI increases the speed of work while exposing unclear decision rights and fragmented context.

Recommended ownership model

- Use domain ownership plus system ownership. Do not let platform teams become de facto business owners.
- Separate outcome accountability from process execution and control ownership.
- Create an enterprise AI intake path that requires owner, data source, control owner, and human-review model.
- Use the map to identify cross-functional collisions before buying or deploying more tools.

Enterprise domain	Executive sponsor	Business owner	Decision authority	Process owner	Data / knowledge owner	System owner	Control owner	AI workflow owner	Evidence + health
Customer onboarding	[Exec sponsor]	[BU owner]	Decision: onboarding policy, exceptions, SLA	[Process owner]	[Customer data steward]	[CRM / workflow owner]	[Risk/control owner]	[AI workflow owner]	Evidence: journey map, SLA, CRM config Health: [0-3]
Revenue operations	[Exec sponsor]	[Sales ops owner]	Decision: lead routing, pipeline definitions	[RevOps lead]	[Revenue data owner]	[CRM / BI owner]	[SOX / policy owner]	[AI sales assist owner]	Evidence: pipeline policy, data dictionary Health: [0-3]
Product portfolio intake	[Exec sponsor]	[Portfolio owner]	Decision: priority, funding, sequencing	[Portfolio ops owner]	[Roadmap data owner]	[Jira / Aha owner]	[Governance owner]	[AI planning owner]	Evidence: intake board, scoring model Health: [0-3]
Employee service	[Exec sponsor]	[HR service owner]	Decision: service tiers, policy exceptions	[HR ops lead]	[People knowledge owner]	[HRIS / service platform owner]	[Policy owner]	[HR AI support owner]	Evidence: service catalog, policy pages Health: [0-3]
Data and BI	[Exec sponsor]	[Analytics owner]	Decision: metric definitions, certified sources	[BI operations owner]	[Data product owner]	[Warehouse / BI owner]	[Data governance owner]	[AI analytics owner]	Evidence: semantic layer, metric catalog Health: [0-3]
AI pilot intake	[Exec sponsor]	[Business use-case owner]	Decision: pilot approval, risk acceptance	[Transformation / product owner]	[Input data owner]	[AI platform owner]	[AI governance owner]	[Human-in-loop owner]	Evidence: intake record, model card, controls Health: [0-3]

5,000+ fill-in map

Enterprise domain	Executive sponsor	Business owner	Decision authority	Process owner	Data / knowledge owner	System owner	Control owner	AI workflow owner	Evidence + health

Cross-functional ownership questions

- Where does business accountability differ from system ownership?
- Which decisions are trapped between functions because no one owns the tradeoff?
- Which data or knowledge source would an AI workflow depend on?
- Who owns the control evidence if an AI-assisted decision is challenged?
- What work should be stopped until the ownership chain is clear?

10,000+ employees: The federated enterprise

This version assumes geographic, business-unit, regulatory, and platform complexity. Ownership must be federated: global standards with local authority, clear controls, and evidence that survives audit.

Operating-model problem

The enterprise already has governance, but it is often fragmented across regions, legal entities, shared services, and platforms. AI creates new control paths that require named owners across policy, data, systems, agent behavior, and audit evidence.

Recommended ownership model

- Define global accountable owner, regional/local owner, process owner, system owner, data owner, control owner, and AI/model owner separately.
- Use a federated ownership chain: global principle, local implementation, platform control, audit evidence.
- Tie AI workflows to policy, data provenance, human review, and exception handling before deployment.
- Make ownership queryable. Leaders should be able to ask who owns a decision, control, agent, dataset, or system and get the current answer.

Global domain	Global accountable owner	Regional / BU owner	Decision rights	Process / service owner	Data / knowledge owner	Platform owner	Control / policy owner	AI / model owner	Audit evidence + trigger
Global customer operations	[Global owner]	[Region / BU owner]	Decision: global standards vs local exceptions	[Service owner]	[Customer data owner]	[CRM / service owner]	[Control owner]	[AI service agent owner]	Evidence: global standard, regional exception log Trigger: local variation lacks approved owner
Enterprise data foundation	[Global owner]	[Data domain owner]	Decision: certified source, metric definition, access	[Data product owner]	[Data steward]	[Warehouse / lakehouse owner]	[Data governance owner]	[AI data usage owner]	Evidence: data catalog, lineage, access reviews Trigger: AI uses uncertified or stale data
Workforce operations	[Global owner]	[Region / legal entity owner]	Decision: policy, employee data use, local labor rules	[HR service owner]	[People knowledge owner]	[HRIS owner]	[Legal / compliance owner]	[AI HR agent owner]	Evidence: policy inventory, country addenda Trigger: AI output crosses policy or regional boundary
Technology portfolio	[Global owner]	[Platform / domain owner]	Decision: investment, rationalization, architecture	[Portfolio ops owner]	[App/system data owner]	[ITSM / portfolio owner]	[Architecture governance owner]	[AI software delivery owner]	Evidence: app catalog, architecture decision records Trigger: duplicate AI tools or ownerless apps
Risk and controls	[Global owner]	[Risk domain owner]	Decision: control standard, risk acceptance	[Control operations owner]	[Control evidence owner]	[GRC platform owner]	[Policy owner]	[AI risk assessment owner]	Evidence: control library, test results, issue log Trigger: AI-assisted control lacks accountability
Agentic AI operations	[Global owner]	[Business use-case owner]	Decision: agent permissions, autonomy, rollback	[Agent operations owner]	[Prompt/context owner]	[AI platform owner]	[AI governance owner]	[Model/agent owner]	Evidence: model card, evals, approvals, incidents Trigger: agent acts outside policy or lineage

10,000+ fill-in map

Global domain	Global accountable owner	Regional / BU owner	Decision rights	Process / service owner	Data / knowledge owner	Platform owner	Control / policy owner	AI / model owner	Audit evidence + trigger

Federated ownership questions

- Which decisions are global standards and which are local exceptions?
- Who owns evidence when work crosses region, platform, legal entity, or AI workflow?
- What owner can approve or reverse agent permissions?
- Where does policy conflict with business speed?
- What must be queryable by executives, auditors, and AI copilots?

Make the Ownership Map a living knowledge object

For the LPM website, treat the download as the entry point, not the product. The stronger move is to make every artifact part of a governed knowledge system that companies can reuse, update, score, and eventually connect into Lapemo.

Component	Meaning	Website / product use
Knowledge object	A versioned source of truth with metadata, owners, inputs, outputs, and update rules.	Every artifact has a canonical page and downloadable versions.
Guided skill	An AI-assisted workflow that interviews the company, fills the map, identifies gaps, and produces actions.	The website can offer “Run this map with your team.”
Company profile logic	500, 5,000, and 10,000+ profiles change the depth of ownership required.	The same skill can adapt to company complexity.
Auto-refresh signals	Events that should trigger review: org change, new AI workflow, system migration, control issue, stale documentation.	Automation flags issues; humans approve updates.
Evidence-first updates	Changes should reference proof, not memory.	Jira, Confluence, policy docs, system catalog, HRIS, GRC, model cards.
Lapemo integration	Ownership maps become part of the control layer.	Dashboards can show ownerless domains, stale evidence, AI risk, and broken lineage.

Suggested metadata for every website artifact

Metadata field	Recommended value
artifact_id	lpm.ownership_map.v1
artifact_type	Template + Skill
company_profiles	500+, 5,000+, 10,000+
lpm_layers	Identity & Incentives, Decision Architecture, Communication, Information Ecology, Platform Structure, Governance Architecture, AI Amplification
review_cadence	Quarterly or event-driven
update_triggers	Org change, system migration, new AI workflow, control failure, stale evidence, owner departure
human_approval_required	Yes

Review cadence by company profile

Profile	Cadence	Main triggers
500+	Monthly gap review; quarterly owner registry refresh; pre-production AI ownership check.	Ownerless AI workflow, founder escalation, stale knowledge source.
5,000+	Monthly cross-functional gap review; quarterly AI workflow and control review; semiannual domain map refresh.	Unresolved dependency, conflicting system owner, stale evidence, unclear human review.
10,000+	Monthly exception review; quarterly global/regional control review; event-driven updates after org, regulatory, or platform change.	Regional exception without owner, agent permission change, audit issue, policy conflict.

45-minute workshop format

Time	Activity	Output
0-5 min	Select one domain	Pick a real AI-relevant workflow, not the whole company.
5-15 min	Name owners	Outcome, decision, execution, information, platform, governance, AI.
15-25 min	Identify evidence	Find the source of truth or mark it missing.
25-35 min	Score clarity	Use 0-3 scoring by field and domain.
35-45 min	Commit actions	Assign owner, due date, and next review trigger.

Action log

Gap	Domain	Owner assigned	Action	Due date	Evidence to update	Status

Version history

Version	Date	Change	Approved by
v1.0	2026-06-23	Initial reusable Ownership Map template with three company-size versions.	LPM