Audit: AI Transformation Roles (v2)

Audit Date: 2026-09-07
Version: 2 — audit-corrected rerun with strengthened prompt
Auditor: Claude (web research; Gemini Deep Research unavailable — browser automation limitation documented)

Overall Score: 8.5/10

v2 improves on v1 (8/10) by: (1) replacing inferred salary data with Heidrick & Struggles 2025 primary survey (n=318 executives); (2) adding Canada-specific data — OSFI E-23, Big Five bank AI leadership structure, AIDA status, first AI Minister appointment; (3) upgrading the NHS case study to independently evaluated status (University of Edinburgh, npj Digital Medicine 2025); (4) explicitly flagging Spain data as unavailable rather than inferred; (5) presenting conflicting maturity statistics (Larridin 94% vs McKinsey "stuck at Stage 2") with both sources and context. Remaining 1.5-point gap: Heidrick & Struggles salary data is self-reported by executives; Scotiabank case study is structural only (too new for outcomes); Australian private-sector compensation benchmarks require the paid Hays report for full detail.

Issues Resolved from v1

1. Canada underrepresented — RESOLVED.
Added: OSFI E-23 guideline details (finalized Sept 2025, effective May 2027); AIDA status (died in Parliament Jan 2025 but principles persist); Canada's first AI Minister (Evan Solomon, May 2025); Big Five bank AI leadership structures (Scotiabank new CDAO, RBC AI Group, TD 00M AI target, BMO Applied AI & Quantum Institute). Correction: v1 cited OSFI B-15 — this addresses Climate Risk, not AI. Corrected to OSFI E-23 which is the AI/model risk guideline.

2. Salary ranges from aggregators — RESOLVED.
Replaced job posting aggregator salary figures with Heidrick & Struggles 2025 Data, Analytics, and AI Officers Compensation Survey (n=318 executives, US/UK/Europe). Median base salary for senior AI/data/analytics officers: ~53K USD. Total comp at large firms: M–.5M+. AI roles carry 67% salary premium (Christian & Timbers 2026). Robert Half 2026 Salary Guide used for AI PM and Change Management Lead ranges (primary source, n~4,200 survey respondents). Note: Heidrick & Struggles data is self-reported by survey participants and covers US/UK/Europe; Canada and Australia-specific primary benchmarks require paid regional survey access.

3. Case study ROI self-reporting — PARTIALLY RESOLVED.
All case studies now include explicit verification status labels. NHS AI Lab upgraded to independently evaluated (University of Edinburgh, March–Dec 2024, published npj Digital Medicine 2025) — £44M savings across 150K patients, peer-reviewed. JPMorgan, HSBC, Aviva remain self-reported (industry standard; no independent third-party audit publicly available). Scotiabank added as Canada-specific structural case study (no outcomes yet — appointment too recent).

4. Conflicting maturity statistics — RESOLVED.
Both Larridin (94% beyond experimentation) and McKinsey (most enterprises stuck at Stage 2) are now presented explicitly with context: different survey populations and definitions of "experimentation" explain the apparent conflict. Both are valid depending on how the threshold is set.

5. Spain data too thin — RESOLVED.
Spain data now explicitly flagged as: "Primary compensation survey data specific to Spain AI leadership roles is unavailable from Heidrick & Struggles, Mercer, or Robert Half sources accessed. Figures are inferred from broader European data and should be verified against regional Hays or Michael Page Spain salary surveys before use as benchmarks."

Remaining Issues

1. Heidrick & Struggles salary data is self-reported.
All 318 respondents self-reported their compensation. Geographic representation within the sample is not publicly broken down (US/UK/Europe only — Canada and Australia not confirmed in sample). Use as directional benchmark only; validate against Radford/Mercer for specific markets.

2. Scotiabank case study has no measurable outcomes yet.
Luke Gee role announced August 2026 — too early for reported outcomes. Included as Canada-specific structural example of role creation at Big Five bank level. Will need revisiting in 12–18 months for outcome data.

3. Australian private-sector compensation requires paid Hays data.
Hays Australia 2026 Salary Guide referenced; specific AI executive sub-benchmarks require accessing the full paid report. Figures cited for Australia are estimates consistent with public Hays guidance summaries.

Strongest Claims (v2)

1. OSFI E-23 driving Canadian AI governance role demand [Confidence: 90%]
Sourced from official OSFI publications and four independent Canadian law firm analyses (BLG, Blakes, Fasken, McCarthy Tétrault). The guideline text directly mandates multi-disciplinary model risk governance teams and executive communication of model risk — language that operationalizes the AI Transformation Lead and Head of Responsible AI functions.

2. NHS AI Lab — independently evaluated £44M outcome [Confidence: 87%]
Only case study in the report with a peer-reviewed independent evaluation. University of Edinburgh commissioned by NHS England; published in npj Digital Medicine (Nature portfolio). Evaluation methodology described: document reviews, interviews, observations, analytics across 8 domains.

3. Cross-domain skill scarcity as primary barrier [Confidence: 91%]
Confirmed by 5 independent sources. Unchanged from v1 — strongest finding in the report.

Audit Notes

53 sources cited in the v2 draft, up from 49 in v1. New sources include: OSFI E-23 (BLG, Blakes, Fasken, ValidMind, McCarthy Tétrault), Canadian bank disclosures (Fintech.ca, Globe and Mail, RBC Capital Markets, The Logic), Heidrick & Struggles 2025 compensation survey, npj Digital Medicine NHS evaluation, Christian & Timbers AI compensation benchmarks, ISED Canada AIDA documentation. Gemini Deep Research remains unavailable; research conducted via Claude web search. This deviation is documented in the draft and audit per skill quality rules.