DAWGEN GLOBAL | PROPRIETARY FRAMEWORK ARCHITECTURE

COMPANION TO 'THE GOVERNANCE INVERSION THESIS'

AEGIS™

AI Enterprise Governance, Integrity & Stewardship

The Framework Architecture — five pillars, a maturity model, sector applications, and a twelve-article publication series for the operationalization of AI governance in Caribbean and globally-facing institutions.

BY DR. DAWKINS BROWN

Executive Chairman & Founder, Dawgen Global

Published by Dawgen Global | dawgen.global

FRAMEWORK ORIENTATION

AEGIS™ is the operational framework that delivers The Governance Inversion Thesis. Where the thesis identifies the three structural shifts that AI demands of governance — from periodic to continuous, from centralized to federated, from human-paced to machine-paced with anchored accountability — AEGIS™ specifies the five integrated pillars through which institutions operationalize those shifts.

The framework is built for institutions of consequence: financial services firms, insurers, healthcare systems, utilities, public sector bodies, and large-scale commercial enterprises in which AI now influences decisions of material weight. It is designed to be implemented in stages aligned to institutional maturity, to interoperate with existing ERM, model risk, IT governance, and internal audit structures, and to deliver board-credible assurance that AI is being governed — not merely deployed.

WHAT AEGIS™ IS AND IS NOT

AEGIS™ is *a connective governance architecture* that re-architects how existing risk, audit, IT, and compliance structures interact in the presence of AI.

AEGIS™ is not a parallel structure that competes with or replaces existing governance frameworks. It restructures their interaction; it does not displace them.

THE FIVE-PILLAR ARCHITECTURE

Each pillar of AEGIS™ directly answers one of the structural hurdles that traditional governance cannot resolve in an AI environment. The pillars are interdependent: weakness in anyone creates compensating pressure on the others, and the framework's integrity depends on coherent implementation across all five.

PILLAR
I

Distributed Oversight Architecture

Replacing hub-and-spoke governance with federated decision rights and central escalation authority.

What it addresses

The decentralization hurdle. AI is deployed in distributed fashion across the institution; centralized governance cannot intake, classify, and respond at the pace of distributed deployment. Bottlenecks form. Risk emerges in places the centre cannot see.

Core components

- **Federated decision-rights map** — every AI system in the institution is mapped to a domain steward with defined authority to halt, modify, or constrain that system without escalation
- **Central escalation triggers** — pre-defined thresholds that automatically elevate exposure to the central risk function, the audit committee, or the board
- **Aggregation visibility layer** — a single instrumented view that gives the centre real-time pattern visibility across federated domains without bottlenecking individual decisions
- **Domain-to-centre reporting cadence** — defined rhythm of exception reporting that respects federation while preserving central oversight

Board-level question this pillar answers

"Where in the institution is AI making consequential decisions, and who has the authority to stop those decisions if they go wrong — without waiting for me?"

PILLAR
II

Role Cartography

The three-owner principle applied to every consequential AI-influenced decision.

What it addresses

The accountability ambiguity hurdle. Traditional accountability assumes a single human decision-maker. AI introduces a triangle of decision authorship — the human who deploys the system, the model that produces the output, and the controls that constrain the model — and accountability that points to all three points equally points to none.

The Three-Owner Principle

Every consequential AI-influenced decision is mapped to three named owners with distinct, non-overlapping accountabilities:

- **The Decision Owner** — the named human who is accountable for the business outcome of the decision; the role that exists in the institution regardless of whether AI is involved
- **The Model Owner** — the named human accountable for the design, performance, drift, and integrity of the AI system that produced the decision-relevant output
- **The Control Owner** — the named human accountable for the boundaries, monitoring, and exception handling that constrain how the model is permitted to influence the decision

The three roles may be held by different individuals or, in smaller institutions, may be combined — but they must be separately documented, separately accountable, and separately reportable. Combining the roles informally is the most common failure mode, because it produces an accountability map that points everywhere and nowhere.

Core components

- **AI decision inventory** — comprehensive catalogue of every AI-influenced decision class in the institution
- **Three-owner assignment register** — for each decision class, the named individuals holding the three accountabilities
- **Accountability transition protocols** — formal handover procedures when any of the three owners change role, leave the institution, or are reassigned

Board-level question this pillar answers

"When this AI system fails, who is accountable — and is that accountability documented, defensible, and held by someone who actually had the authority to prevent the failure?"

PILLAR
III

Continuous Validation Protocols

Perpetual monitoring with defined drift thresholds replacing periodic model validation.

What it addresses

The legacy validation hurdle. Traditional model validation operates on annual or biannual cycles; AI model behaviour can change between cycles in ways that materially affect risk. Validation that arrives twelve months after deterioration began is forensics, not assurance.

Core components

- **Drift thresholds register** — for every production AI system, pre-defined statistical and behavioural thresholds that trigger review when crossed
- **Continuous monitoring instrumentation** — automated tracking of model performance, input distribution, output distribution, and decision impact against the registered thresholds
- **Tiered validation cadence** — risk-tiered review cycles ranging from continuous (for systemically critical models) through monthly, quarterly, and annual depending on model materiality and stability profile
- **Exception escalation pathway** — defined route from monitoring trigger to model owner intervention, with documented timing requirements
- **Validation evidence repository** — auditable record of all validation activities, threshold breaches, and remediation actions, sufficient for regulatory examination

Board-level question this pillar answers

"What is the current condition of every AI system in our institution right now — not at the time of the last validation — and what is being done about any system that is drifting?"

PILLAR
IV

Extended Enterprise Assurance

Vendor AI treated as a load-bearing component of the institution's own risk surface.

What it addresses

The vendor and third-party risk hurdle, intensified in the Caribbean context where institutions are predominantly consumers rather than producers of AI capability. Vendor AI determines a material share of the institution's risk profile, but is typically governed by contractual frameworks designed for software procurement, not for risk-bearing decision systems.

Core components

- **Vendor AI inventory** — comprehensive register of every vendor-supplied AI capability operating within the institution, including embedded AI within core platforms
- **Tiered vendor assurance protocol** — graduated due diligence requirements scaled to the materiality of each vendor AI to institutional risk
- **Contractual rights register** — documented contractual entitlements covering model transparency, change notification, audit rights, performance reporting, and termination triggers
- **Concentration risk assessment** — analysis of vendor AI concentration across critical institutional functions, with defined exposure limits
- **Vendor exit and substitution playbook** — operational plan for replacing or removing a critical vendor AI without cascading disruption

Board-level question this pillar answers

"What share of our institutional risk is determined by AI systems we do not own and cannot directly modify — and are we contractually and operationally positioned to manage that exposure?"

PILLAR
V

Adaptive Compliance Posture

Regulatory horizon-scanning embedded in the governance cadence itself.

What it addresses

The shifting regulatory environment hurdle. AI regulation is being developed in real time across multiple Caribbean and international jurisdictions; reactive compliance produces continuous remediation costs and reputational exposure. Anticipatory positioning produces lower transition costs and stronger supervisory relationships.

Core components

- **Regulatory horizon register** — actively maintained inventory of in-development AI regulation across all jurisdictions in which the institution operates or holds material exposure
- **Anticipatory compliance mapping** — analysis of how emerging requirements map to current institutional practice, with identified gaps and proactive remediation timelines
- **Supervisory engagement protocol** — structured cadence of pre-emptive engagement with relevant regulators on AI governance matters
- **Industry standard tracking** — monitoring of emerging international standards (ISO/IEC 42001, NIST AI RMF, EU AI Act applications, regional supervisory guidance) and their implications for institutional practice
- **Board-level regulatory posture review** — quarterly or semi-annual board engagement on regulatory trajectory, with explicit decisions on adoption of anticipated requirements ahead of mandate

Board-level question this pillar answers

"Are we positioned ahead of where regulation is going, or are we positioned to be remediated by it when it arrives?"

HOW THE PILLARS INTEGRATE

The five pillars of AEGIS™ are designed to operate as a single integrated architecture. They are not independent workstreams to be implemented in isolation. The integration logic is the source of the framework's defensive strength.

The Integration Logic

Pillar I (Distributed Oversight) establishes *where* accountability sits in the institution. **Pillar II (Role Cartography)** establishes *who* holds the accountability at each location. **Pillar III (Continuous Validation)** establishes *how* the accountabilities are exercised in real time. **Pillar IV (Extended Enterprise Assurance)** extends the accountability map across the institutional perimeter to vendor-supplied AI. **Pillar V (Adaptive Compliance Posture)** ensures the entire architecture is calibrated to where regulation is going, not where it has been.

THE FAILURE TEST

A useful test of any AI governance architecture is the failure scenario: a material AI failure has occurred. The institution must, within 72 hours, demonstrate to the board, the regulator, and the affected stakeholders: (1) who was accountable, (2) what controls existed, (3) why they did not prevent the failure, (4) what is being done now, and (5) what is being changed to prevent recurrence. An AEGIS™-implementing institution can answer all five questions because the architecture was built to produce those answers as a by-product of normal operation. An institution without an integrated framework typically cannot answer any of them within 72 hours — and the cost of that inability is paid in regulatory action, reputational damage, and stakeholder confidence.

THE AEGIS™ MATURITY MODEL

Institutional implementation of AEGIS™ proceeds through five identifiable maturity stages. The model is diagnostic, not prescriptive: most institutions begin at Stage 1 or 2, and well-designed transition pathways can move an institution from Stage 2 to Stage 4 within twelve to eighteen months. Stage 5 represents the leading-practice frontier and is the appropriate aspiration for systemically important institutions.

LEVEL	STAGE	WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE
1	**Latent**	AI is in use across the institution, but no dedicated governance architecture exists. Accountability is implicit. Validation, if performed, is periodic and inconsistent. Vendor AI is governed under generic procurement contracts. The institution is exposed but does not yet know how exposed.
2	**Emergent**	AI governance has been recognized as a strategic priority. Initial inventories exist. Some federated assignments have been made informally. A model risk policy may exist on paper. Implementation is fragmentary and inconsistent across business units.
3	**Structured**	All five AEGIS™ pillars exist in documented form. Decision rights are formally federated. Three-owner accountability is assigned for material decision classes. Continuous monitoring is in place for the most critical models. Vendor AI is formally inventoried and tiered. Board engagement is regular.
4	**Integrated**	The five pillars operate as a single architecture. Cross-pillar exception patterns are identified and acted upon. Continuous monitoring covers all material models. Vendor assurance includes contractual rights with audit and transparency provisions. Regulatory horizon-scanning is embedded in board reporting.
5	**Adaptive**	The architecture self-adjusts based on operational learning. Thresholds, escalation pathways, and assurance protocols evolve in response to observed performance. Supervisory engagement is proactive and substantive. The institution is positioned ahead of regulatory expectations and shapes industry practice.

Movement Between Stages

Movement from one stage to the next is not a function of elapsed time; it is a function of deliberate architectural work. An institution remaining at Stage 1 or Stage 2 for an extended period is not 'maturing slowly' — it is accumulating governance debt that will be paid in regulatory transition costs, audit findings, or material incidents.

The AEGIS™ Board Readiness Diagnostic, delivered by Dawgen Global, places an institution on this maturity scale across each of the five pillars and identifies the specific architectural moves required to advance. Most institutions discover they are at different maturity stages across different pillars — strong on, for example, regulatory tracking but weak on extended enterprise assurance — and the remediation roadmap is sequenced accordingly.

SECTOR APPLICATIONS

The AEGIS™ framework architecture is universal across institutional types of consequence, but its operationalization differs meaningfully by sector. Four sector applications are developed in companion modules; each preserves the five-pillar architecture while tailoring the specific risks, regulatory environment, and decision categories addressed.

Financial Services

The most developed sector application. Covers AI in credit decisioning, anti-money laundering and fraud detection, market conduct surveillance, customer interaction, claims handling (for insurers), and regulatory reporting. Tightly aligned with Bank of Jamaica supervisory direction, the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force regional standards, and emerging supervisory practice across the Eastern Caribbean Currency Union, Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados, and the Cayman Islands. Includes specific provisions for systemically important financial institutions, deposit-taking institutions, insurers, and securities firms.

Healthcare

AI in clinical decision support, diagnostic imaging interpretation, triage classification, administrative decision automation, and population health management. The three-owner principle assumes particular weight in clinical settings where the decision owner (the clinician) may not be in a position to challenge a model output without architectural support. Includes provisions for medical device AI under emerging regional regulatory frameworks and integration with clinical governance structures.

Utilities and Infrastructure

AI in grid optimization, predictive maintenance, demand forecasting, outage management, and customer service automation. Continuous validation requirements are particularly stringent given the real-time nature of utility decision systems. Vendor concentration risk is typically elevated. Sector application includes integration with critical infrastructure resilience frameworks.

Public Sector and Regulators

AI in public service delivery, regulatory supervision, tax administration, social benefits assessment, and law enforcement applications. This sector application includes the distinctive case of regulators themselves adopting AI for supervisory purposes — a domain that combines the highest accountability requirements with the lowest current governance maturity in most Caribbean jurisdictions. Particular emphasis on procedural fairness, algorithmic accountability to citizens, and the procurement architecture required for public sector AI.

THE AEGIS™ PUBLICATION SERIES

AEGIS™ will be brought to the Caribbean professional community through a twelve-article publication series, distributed through Caribbean Boardroom Perspectives, the Dawgen Global firm newsletter, and the dawgen.global thought leadership platform. The series is designed for board members, audit committee chairs, chief risk officers, chief technology officers, internal audit leaders, and senior executives in regulated industries.

#	ARTICLE TITLE	CORE ARGUMENT
01	**The Governance Inversion Thesis**	The intellectual foundation — why AI requires governance to be re-architected, not extended. (Landmark companion essay.)
02	**Introducing AEGIS™**	The five-pillar architecture in overview, with the maturity model and the integration logic.
03	**Distributed Oversight Architecture**	Pillar I deep-dive: federated decision rights, central escalation, aggregation visibility, and the design of the central-domain interface.
04	**The Three-Owner Principle**	Pillar II deep-dive: decision owner, model owner, control owner; assignment methodology and the most common failure modes.
05	**Continuous Validation Protocols**	Pillar III deep-dive: drift thresholds, tiered cadences, exception escalation, and the move from forensic to anticipatory validation.
06	**Extended Enterprise AI Assurance**	Pillar IV deep-dive: vendor AI as load-bearing risk, the contractual architecture, concentration limits, and the exit playbook.
07	**Adaptive Compliance Posture**	Pillar V deep-dive: regulatory horizon-scanning, supervisory engagement protocols, and the design of anticipatory compliance.
08	**AEGIS™ in Financial Services**	Sector application: credit, AML, surveillance, claims, and the alignment with Caribbean financial supervisory direction.

#	ARTICLE TITLE	CORE ARGUMENT
09	**AEGIS™ in Healthcare**	Sector application: clinical decision support, diagnostic AI, and the three-owner principle in clinical settings.
10	**AEGIS™ in Utilities and Critical Infrastructure**	Sector application: real-time decision systems, vendor concentration, and continuous validation at infrastructure scale.
11	**AEGIS™ for Regulators and the Public Sector**	The distinctive case: governance for institutions that both adopt AI and supervise others doing so.
12	**The Failure Test**	Synthesis: applying the full architecture to a worked failure scenario, demonstrating the integrated assurance the framework produces.

Publication Cadence: weekly through the Caribbean Boardroom Perspectives newsletter, with cross-publication to the Dawgen Global firm newsletter and amplified through LinkedIn, the dawgen.global blog, and BATV editorial channels. Estimated series duration: twelve weeks, with subsequent supplementary articles addressing emerging regulatory developments and sector-specific case applications.

ENGAGE DAWGEN GLOBAL

AEGIS™ Advisory Services

Dawgen Global delivers AEGIS™ through four primary engagement modalities, scalable to institutional size, sector, and current maturity. Engagements are structured to deliver board-ready outcomes within defined timeframes and to integrate with existing risk, audit, IT, and compliance functions rather than displace them.

ENGAGEMENT 01

AEGIS™ Board Readiness Diagnostic

A confidential, structured assessment of the institution's current AI governance maturity against each of the five AEGIS™ pillars. Delivered as a board-ready report with positioning on the AEGIS™ Maturity Model, a gap analysis, and a prioritized remediation roadmap. The recommended entry point for boards seeking an objective baseline before committing to a full implementation programme.

Typical duration: 6 to 8 weeks
Primary audience: Boards, audit committees, risk committees, CEOs, CROs

ENGAGEMENT 02

AEGIS™ Implementation Engagement

Full architecture, design, and operationalization of the AEGIS™ framework within the institution. Covers federated decision-rights mapping, three-owner accountability assignment across material decision classes, continuous monitoring design and instrumentation, vendor AI assurance protocol and contractual remediation, regulatory horizon-scanning infrastructure, and board reporting design. Scoped to institutional size, sector, and current maturity.

Typical duration: 4 to 9 months
Primary audience: CROs, CTOs, Heads of Internal Audit, Heads of Compliance, executive sponsors

ENGAGEMENT 03

AEGIS™ Board & Executive Briefing

A facilitated session for the board, audit committee, or executive team — delivered in person at the institution's premises or virtually. Walks through the Inversion Thesis, the AEGIS™ five-pillar architecture, and the specific implications for the institution and its sector. Includes pre-read materials, live facilitated discussion, and a written follow-up brief capturing decisions and next-step recommendations.

Typical duration: Half-day to full-day
Primary audience: Full boards, executive committees, senior leadership teams

ENGAGEMENT 04

Sector-Specific AEGIS™ Application Studies

Tailored deep-dive engagements applying AEGIS™ to the specific regulatory, operational, and risk environment of the institution's sector. Available for financial services, healthcare, utilities, and public sector institutions. Delivered as a sector-customized assessment with sector-specific control libraries, regulatory mapping, and reference implementation patterns.

Typical duration: 8 to 12 weeks
Primary audience: Sector-specific executives and regulatory liaisons

TO COMMISSION AN ENGAGEMENT

Three Ways to Begin

1. Submit a Request for Proposal. Direct RFP submissions are welcomed. Dawgen Global responds to RFPs within three business days with a detailed proposal scoped to the institution's requirements, timeline, and budget envelope.

2. Request a Confidential Consultation. A no-obligation initial discussion with Dr. Dawkins Brown or a senior member of the Dawgen Global advisory team, scoped to the institution's current position and intended direction. Discussions are conducted under strict confidentiality and produce a written summary at the institution's option.

3. Commission a Briefing. Schedule the AEGIS™ Board & Executive Briefing as a structured introduction to the framework for the board, audit committee, or executive team. The briefing is frequently the most efficient route from initial interest to informed engagement decision.

CONTACT DAWGEN GLOBAL

info@dawgen.global

dawgen.global

47 Trinidad Terrace, New Kingston, Jamaica

Operating across 15+ Caribbean territories

Dawgen Global is an independent, integrated multidisciplinary professional services firm. Engagements are delivered by cross-functional teams drawing from audit and assurance, advisory, risk management, IT and digital transformation, cybersecurity, business advisory, and legal services capability — uniquely positioned to deliver AI governance work that integrates across the full institutional surface rather than addressing a single functional silo.

NOTES ON THE FRAMEWORK

Intellectual Property

AEGIS™ — the AI Enterprise Governance, Integrity & Stewardship framework — is a proprietary framework of Dawgen Global. All five pillars, the maturity model, the three-owner principle, and the supporting publication series are the intellectual property of Dawgen Global. The framework is made available to client institutions under engagement, and to the wider Caribbean professional community through the publication series. Reproduction, distribution, or operational adoption outside of a Dawgen Global engagement is by written licence only.

Interoperability

AEGIS™ is designed to interoperate with established international standards including ISO/IEC 42001 (AI management systems), the NIST AI Risk Management Framework, COSO ERM, the COBIT 2019 governance and management framework, the EU AI Act risk classification (where relevant to Caribbean institutions with EU exposure), and Caribbean national supervisory guidance as it develops. Implementation engagements include explicit mapping between AEGIS™ pillars and the relevant external frameworks applicable to the institution.

Related Dawgen Global Frameworks

AEGIS™ sits within the wider Dawgen Global proprietary framework architecture, with deliberate interfaces to D-AGENTICA™ (the Caribbean AI Adoption Imperative — covering pre-deployment readiness), CARISK™ (the Caribbean Risk Horizon — covering broader risk landscape), DAGAF™ (Digital Asset Governance and Assurance — covering tokenization and digital asset governance), and D·RIS™ (risk infrastructure). Institutions implementing AEGIS™ typically benefit from cross-framework engagement design, and Dawgen Global structures advisory work to draw across the framework portfolio as the institution's needs require.