

CAIO Enterprise Rollout Planner

A Practical Companion to Leading Through Alignment

Michael Stoyanovich

Artifact Classification: Practical Workbook

Version 1.1.0 | July 2026

Scope and Limitations

This workbook is intended for informational and educational purposes only. It is designed to help organizations think systematically about AI leadership, organizational readiness, governance, and implementation planning. It does not constitute legal, regulatory, compliance, audit, or professional advice. Readers should adapt the material to their organizational context and consult appropriate professionals where necessary.

Purpose

This companion workbook translates the concepts introduced in *Leading Through Alignment* into practical planning tools for organizations establishing or evolving a Chief AI Officer (CAIO) function. It provides diagnostics, planning templates, maturity models, and implementation guidance to support responsible enterprise AI adoption.

Intended Audience

Executive leaders, boards, Chief AI Officers, CIOs, CTOs, CISOs, governance professionals, transformation leaders, consultants, and organizations designing or evaluating enterprise AI operating models.

Reading Guide

The workbook is organized as a sequence of practical planning tools. Readers may complete the sections in order or use individual assessments, templates, and worksheets independently depending on organizational needs and AI maturity.

Table of Contents

Scope and Limitations.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Intended Audience.....	1
Reading Guide.....	1
Section 1: CAIO Role Fit Self-Assessment.....	4
Step 1: Assess Your AI Centrality.....	4
Step 2: Assess Your Change Velocity.....	4
Step 3: Plot Your CAIO Fit.....	5
Section 2: First 90-Day Action Templates.....	5
Strategic Architect: 90-Day Plan.....	5
Ethics & Governance Guardian: 90-Day Plan.....	6
Transformation Evangelist: 90-Day Plan.....	7
Operational Integrator: 90-Day Plan.....	8
Section 3: CAIO × Managing Digital Alignment Grid.....	9
Why This Matters.....	10
Section 4: Hybrid Role Planner.....	10
Step 1: Identify Your Hybrid Configuration.....	10
Step 2: Clarify Role Boundaries.....	11
Step 3: Design for Success.....	11
Section 5: CAIO Operating Model Canvas.....	11
The Canvas Structure.....	11
How to Use It.....	12
Section 6: Maturity Milestone Tracker.....	12
AI Maturity Stages.....	12
How to Use This Tracker.....	13
Appendix A.....	14
Appendix B.....	15
Stage 1: Exploratory — Progress Self-Check Worksheet.....	15
Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?.....	15
Reflection Prompts.....	15
Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:.....	16
Stage 2: Coordinated — Progress Self-Check Worksheet.....	16
Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?.....	16
Reflection Prompts.....	17
Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:.....	17
Stage 3: Operationalized — Progress Self-Check Worksheet.....	17
Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?.....	17
Reflection Prompts.....	18
Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:.....	18
Stage 4: Scaled — Progress Self-Check Worksheet.....	19
Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?.....	19
Reflection Prompts.....	20
Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:.....	20
Stage 5: Institutionalized — Progress Self-Check Worksheet.....	20
Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?.....	20
Reflection Prompts.....	21
Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:.....	21

Ethics, Disclosure, and Acknowledgements.....	22
Ethical Considerations.....	22
Use of AI Tools.....	22
Acknowledgements.....	22
Disclosure Statement.....	22
License & Attribution.....	22
Trademark Notice.....	22
How to Cite This Workbook.....	23
Related Works.....	23
Version History and Document Status.....	23

Section 1: CAIO Role Fit Self-Assessment

“What kind of CAIO does your enterprise actually need?”

This diagnostic tool helps executive teams quickly assess their organizational context along two critical axes defined in *Leading Through Alignment*:

- **AI Centrality:** How core is AI to your business model?
- **Change Velocity:** How quickly is your organization capable of adapting to AI-related change?

These two dimensions produce four quadrants — each aligned with a primary CAIO archetype. Use the questions below to plot your current position.

Step 1: Assess Your AI Centrality

Score yourself from 1 (low) to 5 (high) on each item:

Question	Score (1–5)
Are AI technologies embedded in your core product/service offerings?	
Would a failure in AI systems materially disrupt operations or revenue?	
Do your strategic goals explicitly reference AI as a lever for growth?	
Are senior leaders actively involved in prioritizing AI use cases?	
Has AI investment increased significantly over the last 12 months?	
Subtotal (Max = 25)	

Interpretation

- **21–25:** High AI Centrality
- **11–20:** Moderate
- **0–10:** Low

Step 2: Assess Your Change Velocity

Score yourself from 1 (low) to 5 (high) on each item:

Question	Score (1–5)
Does your organization regularly succeed in cross-functional transformations?	
Can new tools or workflows be piloted and adopted within 6–12 months?	
Are internal change agents supported and resourced?	
Is your workforce accustomed to continuous upskilling or digital change?	
Do incentives and KPIs reward adaptability and experimentation?	
Subtotal (Max = 25)	

Interpretation

- 21–25: High Change Velocity
- 11–20: Moderate
- 0–10: Low

Step 3: Plot Your CAIO Fit

Using your two subtotals, place yourself in the matrix:

	High Change Velocity	Low Change Velocity
High AI Centrality	✅ Operational Integrator	✅ Strategic Architect
Low AI Centrality	✅ Transformation Evangelist	✅ Governance Guardian

Section 2: First 90-Day Action Templates

“What should your CAIO do first?”

Each CAIO archetype faces different urgencies and expectations. The following 90-day plans offer a practical runway tailored to your role type. Use these as scaffolds — not scripts.

Strategic Architect: 90-Day Plan

Your mission: Align AI investments with enterprise strategy.

Days 1–30

- Inventory all active and proposed AI initiatives
- Map ownership, duplication, and alignment to business units
- Identify use case clusters and strategic blind spots

Days 31–60

- Develop a 12–18 month enterprise AI roadmap
- Establish portfolio-level prioritization criteria
- Draft guiding principles for AI investments

Days 61–90

- Present AI roadmap to executive leadership
- Align roadmap with funding cycles and OKRs
- Establish shared KPIs for value realization

Watch For:

- Turf battles with delivery teams
- Over-focus on future vision without near-term wins
- Roadmap inflation (“AI everything”)

Ethics & Governance Guardian: 90-Day Plan

Your mission: Make AI safe, compliant, and auditable.

Days 1–30

- Review current data, model, and AI use policies
- Map regulatory exposure (e.g., EU AI Act, sector regs)
- Identify gaps in controls, explainability, audit paths

Days 31–60

- Draft or refine a Responsible AI governance model
 - Ethics review board
 - Risk register for models
 - Policy owners
- Conduct stakeholder interviews (Legal, Risk, CISO, HR)

Days 61–90

- Launch governance working group
- Align model documentation and review cycles with legal/compliance
- Create communication plan for external/regulatory stakeholders

Watch For:

- Resistance from innovation teams
- Compliance overreach that kills experimentation
- Disconnected governance artifacts

Transformation Evangelist: 90-Day Plan

Your mission: Translate AI into culture, language, and practice.

Days 1–30

- Conduct internal “culture scan” (surveys, interviews, listening tours)
- Identify internal AI champions in business units

- Map digital maturity across teams

Days 31–60

- Develop an AI literacy + enablement plan
- Launch pilot learning events (e.g., workshops, hands-on demos)
- Establish community-of-practice or AI guild

Days 61–90

- Roll out internal storytelling campaign (“What AI Is / Isn’t”)
- Launch internal site or playbook for AI use
- Gather feedback to refine messaging

Watch For:

- Being seen as “soft” or non-technical
- Culture push without support from HR or IT
- Misalignment with ongoing transformation efforts

Operational Integrator: 90-Day Plan

Your mission: Deliver scalable, reliable AI infrastructure.

Days 1–30

- Inventory models in production or late-stage development
- Evaluate data pipelines, MLOps maturity, observability gaps
- Engage DevOps, CISO, and data platform leads

Days 31–60

- Build or enhance a deployment playbook (CI/CD, rollback, monitoring)
- Define service levels (SLAs, uptime, retraining cycles)
- Identify team gaps: ML engineers, data scientists, platform SREs

Days 61–90

- Operationalize 1–2 high-value use cases with performance targets
- Integrate AI into core workflows (e.g., CRM, ERP, risk engines)
- Document architecture, data lineage, and failure scenarios

Watch For:

- Burnout from under-resourcing
- Confusion over roles (CTO vs CAIO)
- Too much time in tech stack, not enough in stakeholder alignment

Section 3: CAIO × Managing Digital Alignment Grid

“How do the CAIO roles reflect modern digital management principles?”

The table below maps each CAIO archetype to the six foundational practices from *Managing Digital: Concepts and Practices*. This alignment reinforces that a successful AI rollout isn’t about heroics — it’s about structured adaptation.

Managing Digital Principle	Strategic Architect	Governance Guardian	Transformation Evangelist	Operational Integrator
Scaling & Evolution	Designs AI portfolios to evolve from pilots to enterprise-wide platforms	Builds governance maturity models that evolve with AI scope	Builds cultural readiness in sync with rollout stages	Engineers repeatable infrastructure to scale AI across workflows
Agile, Lean, DevOps	Champions lean investment and iterative prioritization	Balances agility with just-enough oversight	Translates agile values to frontline practices and language	Implements DevOps/MLOps for AI lifecycle and deployment speed
Critical Engagement with Frameworks	Adapts strategy frameworks to AI uncertainty	Reinterprets compliance/risk frameworks for AI-specific	Critiques adoption frameworks to avoid cargo cult behavior	Customizes IT/ops models to fit AI use cases and

Managing Digital Principle	Strategic Architect	Governance Guardian	Transformation Evangelist	Operational Integrator
		risks		system constraints
Hands-On Experimentation	Sponsors AI Labs for opportunity discovery and prototyping	Supports ethical stress-testing and sandboxing	Normalizes experimentation through learning campaigns and demos	Creates technical sandboxes and shadow-mode deployments
Integration & Governance	Aligns AI efforts to corporate KPIs and governance forums	Leads policy design, regulatory mapping, and internal oversight	Mediates cultural tension between innovation and caution	Builds runtime controls and platform-level guardrails
Continuous Learning	Evolves roadmaps through feedback loops and learning cycles	Incorporates regulatory shifts and audit learnings	Establishes community-of-practice and organizational storytelling	

Why This Matters:

Each CAIO role represents a structured expression of adaptive leadership. When paired with the right maturity, mandate, and *Managing Digital*-style scaffolding, these roles enable AI to scale without unraveling the enterprise.

Section 4: Hybrid Role Planner

“What if one CAIO must wear two (or more) hats?”

Most organizations won’t have the luxury of a clean, single-archetype CAIO. Instead, hybrid models emerge — by design or necessity. This section helps you diagnose, design, and de-risk these hybrid roles.

Step 1: Identify Your Hybrid Configuration

Use the matrix below to pinpoint your hybrid CAIO design. Circle the pair (or trio) that best reflects your current mandate:

Hybrid Role Pair	Typical Context	Key Tensions to Watch
Architect +	Tech-forward firms scaling	Vision outpaces delivery;

Hybrid Role Pair	Typical Context	Key Tensions to Watch
Integrator	productized AI	infrastructure underdeveloped
Guardian + Evangelist	Regulated orgs with uneven culture readiness	Ethics slows change; cultural push seen as compliance-lite
Architect + Evangelist	Vision-led transformations requiring broad alignment	Big ideas lack delivery traction; internal storytelling gap
Integrator + Guardian	Mature firms under external scrutiny (e.g., finance, health)	Auditability vs. speed; GRC tensions with infra teams
Triad (Arch + Int + Gov)	Centralized CAIOs in high-stakes AI sectors	Risk of burnout; unclear ownership and prioritization

Step 2: Clarify Role Boundaries

Use the prompts below to surface ambiguity:

Area	Questions to Ask
Mandate	What specific outcomes is the CAIO responsible for? Are these deliverables owned or shared?
Reporting Lines	To whom does the CAIO report — and is it sufficient for both halves of the hybrid?
Support Structure	Are deputies or lieutenants available to handle the <i>other</i> dimension of the role?
KPIs	Are performance metrics balanced across strategic, technical, ethical, and cultural domains?
Coverage Gaps	Is any key function being <i>neglected</i> due to dual focus (e.g., RAI left to legal only)?

Step 3: Design for Success

You can make hybrid CAIO roles sustainable with a few key moves:

- **Declare the blend explicitly** — Avoid vague titles like “CAIO” with no model.
- **Balance the team** — Pair a visionary with an operational counterpart (e.g., Chief Data Architect, Head of RAI).
- **Align incentives** — Dual roles need blended KPIs, not contradictory ones.

- **Enable autonomy** — Don't force all decisions through a single gate; use steering groups or shared charters.
- **Revisit regularly** — Hybrid roles often evolve; reassess after 6–12 months.

Section 5: CAIO Operating Model Canvas

“What does your CAIO actually own — and how does it work?”

Use this canvas to clarify the design, dependencies, and value pathways of your CAIO function. This helps avoid role ambiguity, scattered execution, and misplaced expectations.

The Canvas Structure

Block	Purpose
1. Strategic Mandate	What is the CAIO ultimately accountable for? (e.g., “Align AI with competitive advantage,” “Ensure safe, ethical use”)
2. AI Role Archetype(s)	Which CAIO model(s) apply? (Architect, Guardian, Evangelist, Integrator — or hybrid?)
3. Key Responsibilities	List core responsibilities mapped to the selected archetype(s)
4. Organizational Partners	Who are the CAIO's most critical internal collaborators? (CTO, CISO, CHRO, Legal, etc.)
5. Core Resources	What people, platforms, budget, or data assets must the CAIO have to succeed?
6. Governance & Decision Rights	Where does the CAIO have authority vs. advisory input? What is the escalation path?
7. Success Metrics	What does success look like in 6–12 months? How is it measured? (Strategic, operational, ethical, adoption)
8. Risks & Constraints	What could derail this role? (e.g., conflicting mandates, underresourcing, unclear reporting lines)
9. Integration Plan	How will the CAIO function integrate with business-as-usual? What gets operationalized when?

How to Use It

- **Use during CAIO onboarding, restructuring, or role scoping.**
- **Revisit quarterly to reflect shifts in AI maturity or enterprise goals.**

- Can be completed in a 60-minute workshop with key stakeholders.

Section 6: Maturity Milestone Tracker

AI adoption does not leap from pilot to platform overnight. The table below offers a staged maturity model, with practical markers at each level. It helps situate your CAIO's work in the broader evolution of enterprise AI and guides expectation management.

"Where is your organization on the AI journey — and what comes next?"

AI Maturity Stages

Stage	Description	CAIO Focus Area(s)	Key Indicators	Next Milestone
1. Exploratory	Ad hoc AI experiments in pockets of the org, often isolated or vendor-driven	Evangelist / Architect	Pilot fatigue, scattered tools, lack of ownership	Define AI strategy and initial governance structure
2. Coordinated	Strategic roadmap exists; basic policies, roles, and governance begin to form	Architect / Guardian	Use case pipeline, working groups, early RAI policies	Formalize AI ops, enable cross-functional execution
3. Operationalized	AI embedded in select products or processes, with repeatable deployment paths	Integrator / Guardian	MLOps maturity, model documentation, incident response, internal dashboards	Drive enterprise-scale platformization
4. Scaled	AI used across business units; integrated with KPIs and enterprise architecture	Architect / Integrator / Hybrid	AI part of enterprise scorecard, multiple use cases deployed, auditability	Build resilience, trust, and long-term capabilities
5. Institutionalized	AI seen as core strategic differentiator; CAIO embedded in strategic planning	Hybrid (all 4 roles)	Governance maturity, learning loops, regulatory readiness, talent pipelines	Revisit CAIO structure and evolve operating model

How to Use This Tracker:

- **Use it as a baseline diagnostic at the start of a transformation effort.**
- **Review with board/executive stakeholders every 6 months.**
- **Align CAIO mandate and resourcing with maturity stage to prevent overreach or underutilization.**
- **Combine with Section 1's Role Fit Self-Assessment for sharper clarity.**

Appendix A

Maturity Stage	Description	CAIO Focus	Key Indicators	Next Milestone
1. Exploratory	Ad hoc AI pilots, scattered ownership, vendor-driven.	Evangelist / Architect	Pilots underway, tool fragmentation, unclear ownership.	Define AI strategy and governance structure.
2. Coordinated	AI roadmap and governance begin to form, coordination starts.	Architect / Guardian	Defined use case pipeline, basic governance in place.	Formalize ops and cross-functional execution.
3. Operationalized	AI embedded in select products/processes, repeatable ops.	Integrator / Guardian	MLOps maturity, documentation, early impact metrics.	Drive platformization and scale.
4. Scaled	AI used across business units, integrated with enterprise goals.	Architect / Integrator	Cross-BU use, platform integration, KPI alignment.	Build resilience, trust, and long-term capability.
5. Institutionalized	AI is core differentiator, embedded in strategic planning.	Hybrid (all 4 roles)	Sustained trust, learning systems, external credibility.	Evolve CAIO model, institutionalize adaptive governance.

Appendix B

Stage 1: Exploratory — Progress Self-Check Worksheet

Definition:

AI work is exploratory and fragmented. Experiments may be underway, but ownership, coordination, and strategy are lacking.

Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?

Rate each statement on a 0–2 scale:

(0 = No / Not Yet, 1 = Partial, 2 = Yes)

Statement	Score (0–2)
AI initiatives are occurring in at least one business unit or function	
Efforts are mostly uncoordinated and driven by individual teams or external vendors	
There's little to no shared AI governance or policy across the enterprise	
Leaders are uncertain who owns AI or where it fits organizationally	
Data access and quality for AI are major friction points	
There is no formal AI strategy, roadmap, or investment framework in place	
Risk, ethics, or compliance issues are being raised ad hoc, if at all	
There is minimal visibility into what other teams are doing with AI	
Total Score (out of 16): _____	
• 0–5: Still pre-exploratory. • 6–10: Early exploratory. • 11–16: Ripe for coordination.	

Reflection Prompts:

- Where are AI activities most concentrated — and most invisible?
- Are early pilots producing learnings that others can build on?
- Is AI showing up in strategic conversations, or just “below the radar”?

Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:

(Typically Evangelist or Architect at this stage)

- Conduct an AI initiative inventory and stakeholder map
- Launch a listening tour: what's working, what's stalled, what's hidden
- Start internal storytelling to normalize "AI is happening here"
- Draft a lightweight playbook of known use cases and prototypes
- Define a charter or working group to guide the transition to coordination

Stage 2: Coordinated — Progress Self-Check Worksheet

Definition:

AI efforts are now visible, loosely aligned, and beginning to be governed. Strategy is emerging, but execution is uneven and still siloed.

Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?

Rate each statement on a 0–2 scale:

(0 = No / Not Yet, 1 = Partial, 2 = Yes)

Statement	Score (0–2)
There is a documented AI roadmap or use case pipeline	
A cross-functional working group or steering committee has been formed	
Governance for data access, model use, or ethics has begun — even if limited	
The organization has a common language for discussing AI (terms, goals, concerns)	
There is a centralized view (dashboard, registry, or report) of major AI initiatives	
Executive sponsors or champions have been identified and engaged	
Early wins or promising pilots are being shared across teams	
AI risk management is beginning to surface as a formal topic (e.g., bias,	

statement

Score (0–2)

compliance, security)

total Score (out of 16): _____

- 0–5: Still fragmented.
- 6–10: Coordinated, but fragile.
- 11–16: Ready to operationalize.

Reflection Prompts:

- Is coordination enabling acceleration, or creating bottlenecks?
- Where are pockets of resistance — and are they cultural, technical, or political?
- Is governance supporting or stifling innovation?

Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:

(Typically Architect and/or Guardian at this stage)

- Formalize governance roles, escalation paths, and documentation practices
- Refine the AI roadmap into short-, mid-, and long-term streams
- Standardize how new use cases get proposed, prioritized, and tracked
- Align AI investments with business objectives and capacity
- Begin publishing “AI operating norms” — simple, repeatable practices

Stage 3: Operationalized — Progress Self-Check Worksheet

Definition:

AI is embedded into select business processes or products. Systems, controls, and feedback loops are emerging to support safe, repeatable deployment.

Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?

Rate each statement on a 0–2 scale:

(0 = No / Not Yet, 1 = Partial, 2 = Yes)

Statement

Score (0–2)

At least one AI use case is in stable production with measurable business impact

Deployment and retraining processes are documented and repeatable

MLOps practices (e.g., monitoring, version control, rollback) are partially in place

Governance includes model performance reviews and accountability paths

Cross-functional teams (tech + business + risk) are involved in ongoing operations

Responsible AI practices (e.g., fairness, explainability, data minimization) are embedded

Leadership has visibility into AI KPIs or dashboards

Failures or issues (drift, bias, outages) trigger structured learning or postmortems

Total Score (out of 16): _____

- 0–5: Not yet stable.
- 6–10: Operational, but fragile.
- 11–16: Ready to scale.

Reflection Prompts:

- Are AI deployments reliable enough to drive decisions or revenue?
- What's the weakest link — data quality, tooling, ownership, or feedback loops?
- Are people avoiding AI in practice due to trust or performance issues?

Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:

(Typically Integrator + Guardian roles become central)

- Establish full MLOps lifecycle: CI/CD, model monitoring, incident playbooks
- Embed AI observability into enterprise systems (dashboards, alerts)
- Standardize documentation for all production models (purpose, risk, owners)
- Create red/green thresholds for model performance and retraining

- Partner with compliance to stress-test governance for live systems

Stage 4: Scaled — Progress Self-Check Worksheet

Definition:

AI is being used across multiple business units and functions. Platforms, standards, and strategic alignment drive execution at scale.

Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?

Rate each statement on a 0–2 scale:

(0 = No / Not Yet, 1 = Partial, 2 = Yes)

Score (0–2)

Multiple departments are independently deploying and maintaining AI solutions

AI platforms or shared services (e.g., APIs, model registries) are in place and being reused

Enterprise KPIs explicitly include AI-driven impact (e.g., efficiency, revenue, experience)

Model lifecycle management is integrated into enterprise architecture and ops tooling

Governance scales across orgs: common policies, templates, training

Responsible AI principles are institutionalized (e.g., audits, oversight boards, red-teaming)

AI is regularly part of executive and board-level discussions

AI performance, ethics, and usage are tracked with internal and external transparency

Total Score (out of 16): _____

- 0–5: Not yet scalable.
- 6–10: Scaled in parts.
- 11–16: Fully scaled, approaching institutionalization.

Reflection Prompts:

- Are AI successes repeatable across domains — or highly context-specific?
- What bottlenecks (tech, talent, governance) are emerging at scale?
- Are ethical, legal, and reputational risks escalating with expansion?

Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:

(Typically Architect + Integrator hybrid, with Guardian and Evangelist supporting)

- Build enterprise-wide platforms for scalable reuse (infra, tools, skills)
- Institutionalize AI governance bodies and escalation paths
- Align scaled deployment with trust-building — not just efficiency
- Coordinate AI funding, hiring, and upskilling as shared capabilities
- Develop internal certification or policy enforcement for high-risk use cases

Stage 5: Institutionalized — Progress Self-Check Worksheet

Definition:

AI is recognized as a core strategic asset. Practices for value delivery, risk management, and workforce transformation are institutionalized across the enterprise.

Quick Diagnostic: Where Do You Stand?

Rate each statement on a 0–2 scale:

(0 = No / Not Yet, 1 = Partial, 2 = Yes)

Statement	Score (0–2)
AI strategy is integrated into enterprise planning and capital allocation processes	
The CAIO or equivalent role has clear strategic authority and executive sponsorship	
AI governance includes internal audit, external assurance, and compliance with AI regulation	
AI capability is sustained through hiring, upskilling, and internal knowledge	

Statement

Score (0–
2)

transfer

AI ethics and trust are treated as ongoing functions, not one-time reviews

Lessons from past AI failures or incidents have led to policy or design changes

AI models and tools are aligned with enterprise architecture, not bolted on

The organization participates in AI policy, standards, or industry consortia

Total Score (out of 16): _____

- 0–5: Still at scale, not yet institutionalized
- 6–10: Strong foundation, not yet self-sustaining
- 11–16: AI is a managed, resilient capability

Reflection Prompts:

- Is AI maturity durable across leadership changes or tech shifts?
- What happens to trust or safety if scale accelerates again?
- Is there a continuous feedback loop between strategy, ethics, and operations?

Suggested Priorities for the CAIO:

(Typically a hybrid of all four roles — Architect, Guardian, Evangelist, Integrator)

- Evolve CAIO's structure to reflect embedded, horizontal accountability
- Refresh AI governance frameworks in light of regulation and standards
- Integrate AI risk into enterprise risk management and audit functions
- Establish resilience practices: model backup, fallbacks, scenario planning
- Champion transparency, equity, and interoperability — internally and externally

Ethics, Disclosure, and Acknowledgements

Ethical Considerations

This workbook does not draw on private, sensitive, or personally identifiable data. All examples, scenarios, planning tools, and implementation guidance are illustrative or derived from publicly available concepts and organizational practices. No human-subjects research was conducted.

The ethical purpose of this workbook is practical: to help organizations introduce, govern, and scale AI capabilities responsibly. It encourages clear accountability, proportional governance, thoughtful organizational design, and responsible decision-making throughout AI adoption. Organizations should adapt these tools to their own legal, regulatory, operational, and cultural contexts.

Use of AI Tools

AI language models (including ChatGPT) were used during the development of this workbook as drafting and thinking aids, including brainstorming, structural refinement, wording improvements, consistency review, and editorial feedback. AI-generated material was treated as draft input rather than authoritative source material. Responsibility for the final structure, planning guidance, recommendations, and conclusions remains solely with the human author.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the many practitioners, colleagues, and informal reviewers whose discussions, questions, and practical experiences helped shape the ideas reflected in this workbook. Their perspectives strengthened the focus on implementation, governance, organizational change, and responsible AI leadership. Any remaining errors or omissions are solely the responsibility of the author.

Disclosure Statement

This workbook was developed independently. The views expressed are the author's alone and do not necessarily represent those of any current or former employer, client, professional association, or affiliated organization. No financial or professional conflicts of interest are declared.

License & Attribution

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license. You are free to share, adapt, and build upon this work for any purpose, including commercial use, provided appropriate attribution is given. No additional permissions are required.

Full license terms: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Trademark Notice

The Four Philosophers Framework™ and The 4-Philosophers Framework™ are unregistered trademarks of Michael Stoyanovich. The CC BY 4.0 license does not apply to these

trademarks. Use of the trademarked names is permitted for scholarly citation or descriptive reference but may not be used in connection with commercial products, services, or branding without permission. Use of these marks in educational or training materials is permitted when properly attributing this work; however, use as product branding requires permission.

How to Cite This Workbook

Stoyanovich, M. (2026, July). *CAIO Enterprise Rollout Planner: A Practical Companion to Leading Through Alignment* (Version 1.1.0). <https://www.mstoyanovich.com>

Related Works

This workbook is a practical companion to *Leading Through Alignment: A Framework for the Chief AI Officer*. It extends that paper by providing assessments, planning templates, maturity models, and implementation guidance for organizations designing or evolving a Chief AI Officer (CAIO) function.

It complements the following works within the broader corpus:

- Philosophy, Cognitive Science, and Policy: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Generative AI from Wittgenstein, Lewis, Dennett, and Nagel — the conceptual foundation for the Four Philosophers Framework™.
- The 4-Philosophers AI Use Discipline — operational practices for responsible day-to-day use of AI.
- Automate the Repeatable, Own the Judgment — a three-layer operational model for determining what to automate, what requires human judgment, and how to govern the handoff between them.
- The Accountable Mediation Checklist — a practical checklist for maintaining traceability, proportionality, and accountable professional judgment in AI-assisted work.
- The CONTEXT Prompt Framework — a structured approach to improving prompt quality through explicit context, assumptions, constraints, examples, and verification.

Version History and Document Status

This workbook is intended to evolve alongside advances in enterprise AI governance, organizational practice, and responsible AI implementation. Future editions will incorporate lessons from real-world deployments, emerging governance frameworks, and changes in technology, regulation, and organizational design. Major revisions are recorded below to preserve transparency and scholarly traceability.

Version	Date	Description
1.1.0	July	Updated publication matter to align with the corpus publication standard by adding front matter, ethics, acknowledgements, disclosure,

Version	Date	Description
	2026	licensing, trademark notice, citation guidance, related works, and standardized version history. No substantive changes to the workbook content.