

Training for Understanding and Governing AI

Six practical programmes for organisational leaders and teams

Practical, legally informed training for organisations using, building, procuring or governing AI.

OUR APPROACH

Training that connects understanding with governance

AI training should help people make better decisions in real work - not merely introduce new vocabulary. Libra Sentinel's programmes are designed around the questions organisations face when AI moves from general interest into workplace use, product development, procurement and operational reliance.

The portfolio follows a practical progression: participants first understand the technology, then identify how it is being used, recognise relevant risks and obligations, establish proportionate controls, and understand what evidence responsible governance should produce.



LEGALLY INFORMED, OPERATIONALLY GROUNDED The programmes connect legal and governance expectations with roles, workflows, approvals, controls and evidence. They are not dense lectures on legislation and do not treat governance as a policy-only exercise.

Adapted to context

Scope can be adapted by organisational role, sector, jurisdiction, AI maturity and the systems or use cases participants encounter. The result may be an executive orientation, a team-level capability workshop or a focused cross-functional programme.

No short session can cover every law, system or technical issue. Each engagement therefore begins by defining the decisions participants need to make and the limits of the proposed session.

PORTFOLIO ARCHITECTURE

Six distinct capabilities - one coherent progression

The programmes are designed to work independently. They can also be combined where an organisation needs a clear pathway from shared literacy to governance of a particular system, decision process or provider.

AI Literacy builds the mental model needed to use and discuss AI responsibly.

AI Governance Foundations explains the organisation-level machinery for ownership, risk, approval and evidence.

AI Product and Use-Case Governance applies governance to one real workflow and its consequences.

Automated Decisions, Bias and Human Oversight takes a specialist view of consequential prediction, ranking and decision systems.

Generative AI Governance focuses on content-producing tools, workplace use and output reliance.

AI Contracts, Third-Party Governance and Evidence addresses external dependencies, contractual protections and supplier evidence.

PORTFOLIO BOUNDARY Agentic AI is introduced in AI Literacy and addressed where it changes tool access, third-party dependency, human authority or incident risk. A dedicated agentic-AI programme is not implied by this brochure.

What every format preserves

- Clear scope and realistic learning outcomes.
- Role-appropriate language and examples.
- Distinction between general legal information and matter-specific legal advice.
- Proportion between session length, subject complexity and what can credibly be achieved.

PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

Compare the six programmes at a glance

The recommended formats below indicate a realistic core range. Final duration depends on audience, complexity, customisation and whether facilitated application is required.

PROGRAMME	PRIMARY FOCUS	TYPICAL AUDIENCES	REALISTIC CORE FORMATS
1. AI Literacy	Shared understanding and responsible use	Workforces, leaders, lawyers, educators, regulated professionals	75-90 min; 2 hours; half-day
2. Governance Foundations	Organisation-level governance machinery	Leadership, legal, privacy, risk, audit, security, product	90 min; 3 hours; half-day; scoped full day
3. Product and Use-Case Governance	One real workflow, launch and monitoring	Product, technology, legal, privacy, business owners, risk	2-3 hours; half-day; full day
4. Automated Decisions, Bias and Oversight	Consequential scoring, ranking and decisions	Legal, privacy, HR, product/data, risk, audit	90-min overview; half-day; sector-specific full day
5. Generative AI Governance	Inputs, outputs, reliance and workplace controls	Workforces, managers, legal/privacy, product, communications	60-90 min; 2 hours; half-day
6. Contracts, Third Parties and Evidence	External dependencies and contract-to-control governance	Legal, procurement, vendor, privacy, risk, security, product	90 min; 3 hours; half-day; scoped full day

SELECTION PRINCIPLE Choose the programme according to the decision or capability gap - not simply the technology label. A chatbot used for a consequential decision may require Product and Use-Case Governance or the Automated Decisions programme, not only Generative AI Governance.

CHOOSING A FORMAT

Match the depth of the session to the decision participants must make

EXECUTIVE OR INTRODUCTORY BRIEFING | 60-90 MINUTES

Creates a shared frame, introduces the central governance questions and clarifies leadership or workforce responsibilities. It is not a substitute for applied control design.

FOCUSED WORKSHOP | TWO OR THREE HOURS

Builds practical judgement around a defined audience, role or use case. Suitable for examples, facilitated discussion and selective application without attempting a full programme review.

HALF-DAY PROGRAMME

Allows cross-functional exploration of workflows, controls, decision rights and evidence. This is the strongest core format for several of the specialist programmes.

FULL-DAY OR SHORT SERIES

Reserved for complex, consequential or highly tailored work. A series would normally contain only two or three sessions where separation improves learning or permits application between sessions.

Illustrative pathways

- Organisation-wide adoption: AI Literacy + Generative AI Governance.
- Building governance machinery: AI Governance Foundations + Product and Use-Case Governance.
- Consequential decision system: Product and Use-Case Governance + Automated Decisions, Bias and Human Oversight.
- Material external provider: Product and Use-Case Governance + AI Contracts, Third-Party Governance and Evidence.

NO AUTOMATIC BUNDLES A combined pathway is recommended only when the subjects solve different parts of the same organisational problem. It should not repeat content or expand a focused requirement into an unnecessary course.

01 PROGRAMME PROFILE

AI Literacy: Understanding Predictive, Generative and Agentic AI

A practical foundation for understanding the main families of AI, how they behave in real work, where their limits arise and what responsible use requires. The content and examples are adapted for the decisions participants actually make.

The capability gap

AI is often treated as one technology, or as a synonym for a chatbot. That makes it harder for people to judge an output, recognise an unreliable claim, protect sensitive information or understand why an apparently useful feature may need organisational controls.

Intended audience

General workforces; boards and senior leaders; lawyers, compliance and privacy professionals; educators; and regulated professionals. These audiences would receive different versions of the programme.

Participants should leave able to

- Distinguish predictive, generative and agentic AI and explain why the distinction matters.
- Recognise common limitations and failure patterns, including when verification or escalation is needed.
- Make more responsible decisions about data, confidentiality, outputs and reliance on AI.
- Ask better questions about AI features, vendor claims and apparent system capability.
- Connect individual use of AI with the organisation's wider policies, controls and accountability.

SCOPE DISCIPLINE Learning outcomes are calibrated to the agreed duration, participant role and level of customisation. A briefing creates orientation; an applied workshop develops a deeper, role-specific capability.

01 AI LITERACY

Scope, delivery and organisational fit

Principal subjects

- Models, systems and use cases - what each term helps us see.
- Prediction, generation and action: three different governance problems.
- Data, training and outputs at the level users and decision-makers need.
- Hallucination, over-reliance, automation bias and misplaced confidence.
- Confidentiality, personal data, intellectual property and safe-use boundaries.
- Agentic features, tool access and why the ability to act changes risk.
- Verification, human judgement, escalation and responsible organisational use.

Recommended delivery formats

75-90 minute briefing. A clear, non-technical foundation for leaders or a general organisational audience.

Two-hour role-specific session. Focused on the decisions and risks faced by one professional group.

Half-day workshop. For deeper discussion, scenarios and cross-functional application.

Optional two-session series. Two 90-minute sessions separating core literacy from role-based practice.

Customisation options

- Participant role and level of technical familiarity.
- Approved tools, internal policy and common workplace tasks.
- Sector-specific examples and professional responsibilities.
- Relevant jurisdictional themes and organisational AI maturity.

WHAT THIS PROGRAMME DOES NOT CLAIM The programme does not provide engineering proficiency, certification or an exhaustive account of every AI technology or law. It is educational training, not jurisdiction-specific legal advice.

This programme may be particularly useful when...

- Employees have begun using public or enterprise AI tools without a shared foundation.
- A new AI policy or approved-tool programme is being introduced.
- Leaders need a common vocabulary before making investment or governance decisions.
- A professional team needs literacy tailored to its duties rather than a generic AI presentation.

02 PROGRAMME PROFILE

AI Governance Foundations: From Principles to Organisational Practice

An introduction to the operating machinery that allows an organisation to identify, assess, approve, monitor and evidence its use of AI across the lifecycle.

The capability gap

Many organisations have principles or an AI policy but no reliable inventory, ownership model, approval path, risk-tiering process or evidence trail. Governance activities then remain fragmented across legal, privacy, security, procurement, product and business teams.

Intended audience

Boards and senior leaders; legal, compliance, privacy, risk, audit and security teams; product and technology leaders; operational owners; and people responsible for an AI governance programme or committee.

Participants should leave able to

- Recognise the core components of an operational AI governance system.
- Map responsibility and decision rights across the AI lifecycle.
- Understand how inventories, risk classification and approvals work together.
- Identify the records and evidence needed to support governance decisions.
- Prioritise realistic next steps for the organisation's present level of maturity.

SCOPE DISCIPLINE Learning outcomes are calibrated to the agreed duration, participant role and level of customisation. A briefing creates orientation; an applied workshop develops a deeper, role-specific capability.

02 AI GOVERNANCE FOUNDATIONS

Scope, delivery and organisational fit

Principal subjects

- AI lifecycle roles, ownership and governance forums.
- AI inventories, intake and use-case visibility.
- Risk classification, proportional controls and escalation.
- Policies, standards, approvals and decision authority.
- Human oversight, monitoring, change management and incidents.
- Documentation, governance evidence and defensible decision records.
- Connections with privacy, security, procurement, audit and product governance.

Recommended delivery formats

90-minute executive briefing. What leaders need to understand about the governance operating model and their role.

Three-hour foundations workshop. A focused cross-functional introduction with practical examples.

Half-day working session. For deeper application to existing structures, priorities and governance gaps.

Full-day or two-part programme. Reserved for cross-functional operating-model work, not a general introduction.

Customisation options

- Existing policies, committees, inventories and review processes.
- Organisation size, sector, risk profile and AI portfolio.
- Relevant governance frameworks and jurisdictional themes.
- Whether the organisation is beginning, formalising or reviewing its programme.

WHAT THIS PROGRAMME DOES NOT CLAIM A briefing or workshop does not create a complete governance programme, certify compliance or replace an organisation-specific assessment. The programme is not a formal audit.

This programme may be particularly useful when...

- An AI committee or governance owner has been appointed but the operating model is unclear.
- AI use is distributed across teams and the organisation lacks a reliable inventory.
- A policy exists on paper but is not connected to approvals, monitoring or evidence.
- Customers, regulators or internal assurance teams are asking how AI is governed.

03 PROGRAMME PROFILE

AI Product and Use-Case Governance: Governing the Real Workflow

A practical programme for assessing an AI system in the context of what the organisation actually plans to do with it, who may be affected and what consequences may follow.

The capability gap

An AI product cannot be governed in the abstract. Risk changes with the workflow, data, users, affected people, degree of reliance and decision consequence. Generic tool reviews often miss the controls and evidence required for the organisation's actual deployment.

Intended audience

Product and technology teams; legal, compliance and privacy professionals; business and operational owners; risk and security teams; and, where relevant, HR, procurement and vendor-management teams.

Participants should leave able to

- Define an AI use case in operational rather than marketing terms.
- Identify affected people, material consequences and dependencies across the workflow.
- Distinguish product capability from the organisation's proposed deployment and reliance.
- Formulate proportionate launch conditions, controls and decision authority.
- Establish monitoring, change and reassessment triggers for the use case.

SCOPE DISCIPLINE Learning outcomes are calibrated to the agreed duration, participant role and level of customisation. A briefing creates orientation; an applied workshop develops a deeper, role-specific capability.

03 AI PRODUCT AND USE-CASE GOVERNANCE

Scope, delivery and organisational fit

Principal subjects

- Purpose, users, affected individuals and the complete workflow.
- Inputs, outputs, actions, decision points and human authority.
- Data flows, provenance and third-party dependencies.
- Potential harms, legal touchpoints and operational consequences.
- Testing questions, acceptance thresholds and launch conditions.
- Notices, intervention, contestability and routes for correction.
- Monitoring, change control, incidents and governance evidence.

Recommended delivery formats

Two- or three-hour workshop. Best for one clearly defined proposed or live use case.

Half-day programme. Allows deeper workflow mapping, control discussion and cross-functional alignment.

Full-day programme. Appropriate for a complex or consequential use case with several stakeholder groups.

Optional two-session sequence. Assessment first; controls, evidence and monitoring in the second session.

Customisation options

- One proposed or live product, feature or organisational use case.
- Lifecycle stage: concept, procurement, pilot, launch, review or remediation.
- Sector, affected population, materiality and relevant jurisdictions.
- Existing product, privacy, security, risk and approval artefacts.

WHAT THIS PROGRAMME DOES NOT CLAIM The programme does not provide independent technical validation, a complete impact assessment, a formal legal opinion or a guarantee that a system is ready to launch.

This programme may be particularly useful when...

- A pilot is moving into production and governance questions remain unresolved.
- An AI feature is being inserted into an existing human or digital workflow.
- A system may materially affect customers, workers or members of the public.
- Teams disagree about what the tool does, who owns the risk or what evidence is sufficient.

04 PROGRAMME PROFILE

Automated Decisions, Bias and Human Oversight: Governing Consequential AI

A specialist programme on systems used to profile, score, rank, recommend or influence decisions about people, with particular attention to bias, explanation, review and safeguards.

The capability gap

Consequential AI may sit behind neutral labels such as scoring, recommendation or decision support. Bias can enter through data, proxies, labels, thresholds and feedback loops, while nominal human review may be too rushed or constrained to change an outcome.

Intended audience

Legal, compliance and privacy teams; HR and people teams; product and data teams; risk and audit; public-sector and regulated professionals; and leaders responsible for consequential decision systems.

Participants should leave able to

- Recognise profiling, scoring, ranking and automated-decision patterns in real workflows.
- Identify common pathways through which bias, proxies and feedback loops affect outcomes.
- Assess whether proposed human oversight is informed, authorised and meaningful.
- Design procedural safeguards for notice, review, correction and contestability.
- Connect explainability, monitoring and evidence to the needs of different stakeholders.

SCOPE DISCIPLINE Learning outcomes are calibrated to the agreed duration, participant role and level of customisation. A briefing creates orientation; an applied workshop develops a deeper, role-specific capability.

04 AUTOMATED DECISIONS, BIAS AND HUMAN OVERSIGHT

Scope, delivery and organisational fit

Principal subjects

- Decision architecture: recommendation, support, partial automation and full automation.
- Data, labels, variables, proxies, thresholds and performance disparities.
- Bias across design, deployment, context and feedback loops.
- Explainability for affected people, reviewers, management and assurance teams.
- Meaningful human review: authority, competence, time, information and independence.
- Notice, access, challenge, correction and escalation safeguards.
- Monitoring, complaints, logs and evidence of oversight in practice.

Recommended delivery formats

90-minute executive or legal overview. A scoped orientation to the issues and governance questions.

Half-day multidisciplinary workshop. The recommended core format for practical application and safeguards.

Full-day sector-specific programme. For consequential contexts requiring deeper scenarios and control design.

Optional two-module series. Two two-hour sessions separating decision risks from oversight and contestability.

Customisation options

- Decision domain, affected population and potential consequence.
- Participant role, including reviewers, product owners or assurance teams.
- Relevant legal jurisdictions and sector expectations.
- Technical depth and the organisation's existing oversight model.

WHAT THIS PROGRAMME DOES NOT CLAIM The programme is not a statistical bias audit, model validation or assurance that a human-in-the-loop design is legally sufficient. It does not determine obligations in every applicable jurisdiction.

This programme may be particularly useful when...

- AI is used in hiring, fraud, eligibility, moderation, recommendation or service allocation.
- A team relies on the presence of a human reviewer as its principal safeguard.
- Fairness concerns, disparate outcomes or proxy variables have been identified.
- Complaints or internal review reveal that affected people cannot understand or challenge outcomes.

05 PROGRAMME PROFILE

Generative AI Governance: Practical Controls for Chatbots, Copilots and Content Tools

A practical programme on responsible organisational use of tools that generate text, images, audio, code or other content, including the controls required around inputs, outputs and human reliance.

The capability gap

Generative AI adoption often moves faster than policy and oversight. Outputs can look authoritative even when they are incorrect, sensitive information may enter third-party systems, and responsibility for verification, copyright, disclosure and workplace use may remain unclear.

Intended audience

General organisational workforces; leaders and managers; legal, privacy and compliance teams; product and technology teams; communications and marketing; educators; and regulated professionals.

Participants should leave able to

- Decide which tasks, information and contexts are unsuitable for generative AI use.
- Recognise common output failures and apply proportionate verification.
- Use practical controls for prompts, inputs, outputs, storage and external sharing.
- Identify confidentiality, personal-data, copyright and provenance questions.
- Understand expectations for human review, accountability, escalation and record-keeping.

SCOPE DISCIPLINE Learning outcomes are calibrated to the agreed duration, participant role and level of customisation. A briefing creates orientation; an applied workshop develops a deeper, role-specific capability.

05 GENERATIVE AI GOVERNANCE

Scope, delivery and organisational fit

Principal subjects

- How generative AI works - only as far as responsible use requires.
- Confidentiality, personal data, retention and provider use of inputs.
- Hallucination, source validation and levels of permissible reliance.
- Copyright, training data, ownership claims and output provenance.
- Workplace acceptable use, disclosure and public-facing content.
- Embedded assistants, tool access and emerging agentic features.
- Human review, approval, monitoring and supplier change.

Recommended delivery formats

60-90 minute workforce briefing. For safe-use foundations and a clear set of organisational expectations.

Two-hour role-specific workshop. For a professional team using generative AI in defined tasks.

Half-day governance workshop. For leaders and control functions designing or improving practical controls.

Optional two-session series. Two 90-minute sessions covering responsible use and manager-level governance.

Customisation options

- Approved tools, enterprise configurations and internal policy.
- Participant roles, tasks and the degree of output reliance.
- Internal use, customer-facing use or AI-enabled product features.
- Sector, professional duties, jurisdictions and organisational maturity.

WHAT THIS PROGRAMME DOES NOT CLAIM The programme does not provide a universally safe prompt list, guarantee that outputs are reliable, or replace a specific copyright, privacy, security or technical assessment.

This programme may be particularly useful when...

- An enterprise chatbot or copilot is being introduced across teams.
- Unmanaged use of public tools has created confidentiality or quality concerns.
- AI-generated content will be used externally or in professional decision-making.
- An acceptable-use policy exists but staff and managers need practical application guidance.

06 PROGRAMME PROFILE

AI Contracts, Third-Party Governance and Evidence: Governing External Dependencies

A cross-functional programme on the diligence, contractual protections, operational controls and evidence needed when an organisation relies on AI vendors, external models or embedded AI services.

The capability gap

Using a vendor does not transfer the organisation's accountability. Important facts may remain opaque; data and training rights may be unclear; products and models may change; and contractual promises may not connect to testing, monitoring, incidents or a usable evidence trail.

Intended audience

Legal teams; procurement and vendor-management teams; privacy professionals; risk, audit and security; product and technology owners; and people responsible for AI governance or third-party assurance.

Participants should leave able to

- Distinguish due-diligence questions according to the proposed use and level of risk.
- Identify the principal data, training, performance, change and responsibility issues in AI contracts.
- Connect contractual protections with testing, monitoring, incident response and internal controls.
- Recognise the evidence needed to support selection, approval and continued use of a provider.
- Plan for model changes, subcontractors, exit, deletion and other continuing dependencies.

SCOPE DISCIPLINE Learning outcomes are calibrated to the agreed duration, participant role and level of customisation. A briefing creates orientation; an applied workshop develops a deeper, role-specific capability.

06 AI CONTRACTS, THIRD-PARTY GOVERNANCE AND EVIDENCE

Scope, delivery and organisational fit

Principal subjects

- Mapping the provider, model, service, data flow and downstream dependencies.
- Risk-based diligence and information sufficiency.
- Data access, retention, training use and intellectual-property positions.
- Performance information, testing, documentation and audit or access rights.
- Model and product changes, subcontractors and service evolution.
- Security events, AI incidents, notification and cooperation duties.
- Exit, deletion, continuity and contract-to-control evidence.

Recommended delivery formats

90-minute executive or procurement briefing. A decision-focused view of external AI dependency and accountability.

Three-hour clause-and-control workshop. For legal, procurement and governance teams working across the lifecycle.

Half-day cross-functional programme. The recommended format for diligence, contracting and evidence together.

Full-day or two-part programme. For complex vendor portfolios or a deeper split between diligence and contract-to-control practice.

Customisation options

- Buyer-side or supplier-side context and stage of procurement.
- One material use case, vendor category or contract family.
- Existing diligence questions, templates and governance records.
- Relevant jurisdictions, sector expectations and dependency risk.

WHAT THIS PROGRAMME DOES NOT CLAIM The programme is not procurement outsourcing, contract drafting for a specific transaction, an independent vendor or model audit, or jurisdiction-specific legal advice.

This programme may be particularly useful when...

- A material AI vendor is being selected, renewed or expanded into a new use case.
- An existing provider has introduced AI or changed the underlying model or data practice.
- Teams are receiving incomplete answers because information is described as proprietary.
- Customer, regulator or audit requests require evidence of third-party AI governance.

DELIVERY AND CUSTOMISATION

A defined engagement built around the audience and the decision

Training may be delivered online or in person, subject to availability, location and agreed arrangements. The most appropriate format depends on whether the requirement is leadership orientation, team capability, cross-functional alignment or applied governance of a particular system or use case.

Available engagement forms

- Executive and board briefings focused on decisions, accountability and oversight.
- Team workshops adapted to a professional role, function or recurring task.
- Cross-functional programmes for legal, privacy, product, risk, procurement, security and operational stakeholders.
- Tailored organisational programmes combining two or three sessions only where modular delivery adds clear value.

How a programme may be adapted

- Role: what participants do, approve, review, build, procure or rely upon.
- Sector: the operating context, affected people and material consequences.
- Jurisdiction: the legal themes that need emphasis, without converting training into a general legal opinion.
- AI maturity: first adoption, policy implementation, operating-model development, product launch or review.
- System context: approved tools, a proposed feature, one use case, a vendor category or an existing control environment.

What delivery can include

Depending on scope and duration, delivery may use practical examples, role-based scenarios, facilitated discussion and selective exercises. Any preparatory review, participant materials or post-session output would be defined in the engagement scope rather than assumed.

SCOPING FIRST A prior discussion identifies the audience, capability gap, relevant AI context, jurisdictions, intended outcome and realistic depth. This is what keeps the training useful, bounded and commercially proportionate.

INTENDED AUDIENCES

Not every programme is designed for every participant group

The table identifies the strongest audience fit. A programme may be adapted for an additional group where its role is material to the subject, but the audience and learning outcomes should remain specific.

PROGRAMME	PRIMARY AUDIENCES	ALSO RELEVANT WHEN TAILORED
AI Literacy	General workforces; leaders; lawyers; educators; regulated professionals	Privacy, compliance, HR, procurement and product teams needing a shared foundation
Governance Foundations	Boards; senior leaders; legal; privacy; compliance; risk; audit; security	Product, technology and operational owners participating in governance
Product and Use-Case Governance	Product; technology; business owners; legal; privacy; risk	HR, procurement, vendor and security teams connected to the selected use case
Automated Decisions, Bias and Oversight	Legal; privacy; HR; product/data; risk; audit	Leaders, reviewers and regulated professionals responsible for consequential decisions
Generative AI Governance	Workforces; managers; legal/privacy; product; communications; educators	Professional teams using generative tools in defined or public-facing work
Contracts, Third Parties and Evidence	Legal; procurement; vendor management; privacy; risk; security	Product and technology owners, audit and AI governance leads

Audience design matters

A board briefing, workforce session and cross-functional control workshop should not use the same depth, examples or expected outcomes. Where several groups attend together, the session is scoped around the decisions they share and the points at which their responsibilities connect.

PARTICULARLY SUITABLE FOR CROSS-FUNCTIONAL LEARNING AI Governance Foundations, Product and Use-Case Governance, Automated Decisions, Bias and Human Oversight, and AI Contracts, Third-Party Governance and Evidence can be especially valuable when responsibility is distributed across functions.

DISCUSS A TRAINING REQUIREMENT

Start with the capability gap - then define the right programme

Libra Sentinel welcomes enquiries from organisations seeking a focused briefing, practical team workshop or tailored programme. A short scoping discussion is used to define what the training should achieve, what it should not attempt to cover and which format is proportionate.

Please include

- The programme or subject of interest.
- The intended audience and their roles.
- Approximate participant numbers.
- Organisational or sector context.
- Preferred delivery format: online or in person, briefing, workshop or tailored programme.
- Relevant jurisdictions.
- Desired timing.
- The principal capability gap, risk or challenge the training should address.

CONTACT US: gayanthi@libra-sentinel.com

Fees, delivery arrangements, preparation and any agreed materials will be proposed after the scope and objectives are understood. Prices are not included in this brochure.

LIBRA SENTINEL

Practical Governance for Data, AI and Emerging Technology

Training for Understanding and Governing AI