Responsibility Matrix Builder

Generated 2026-09-14

AI-generated analysis. This report was produced by an AI system and may contain errors, omissions, or misinterpretations of the source documents. All findings should be independently verified against the original documents before being relied upon for legal, commercial, or operational decisions.

DOCUMENT RELATIONSHIP SUMMARY

Document	Purpose	Revision / Date	Apparent Authority	Relationship / Hierarchy
agreement.docx (*Acme Co Service Agreement*)	Primary agreement for ongoing maintenance services between Acme Co and Bright Path Consulting	Revision/date not stated in the provided extract	Appears to be the base contract document because it defines the parties, service term, payment term, liability cap, response time, and core deliverables	Baseline document for the extracted obligations. No explicit precedence clause is available in the provided extract.
amendment.pdf (*Acme Co Service Agreement - Amendment 1*)	Amendment updating selected terms of the original Service Agreement	Amendment number stated; effective date not visible in the provided extract	Apparent contractual authority as an amendment to the original agreement	Explicitly amends the original Service Agreement and states that all other original terms remain in effect. On the available evidence, it supersedes the original agreement only for the amended items: payment terms, liability cap, and termination notice.
deliverables.xlsx	Operational list of deliverables, frequency, owner, and notes/targets	Revision/date not shown	Operational schedule/listing only on available evidence	No explicit incorporation, amendment, or precedence language is stated. It cannot be treated as contractually controlling over agreement.docx or amendment.pdf unless further evidence is provided.

Established cross-document position

- agreement.docx
  establishes the core service responsibilities of
  Bright Path Consulting
  as Supplier, including:
  - acknowledging support requests within **4 business hours**,
  - providing a **monthly maintenance report**,
  - a **quarterly system health review**,
  - an **annual security audit**.

- amendment.pdf
  clearly updates the original agreement for:
  - invoice payment from **30 days** to **45 days**,
  - liability cap from **$50,000** to **$75,000** per 12-month period,
  - termination notice from **60 days** to **90 days**, while leaving all other original terms in force.

- deliverables.xlsx
  aligns with
  agreement.docx
  on the existence of the four service outputs and assigns
  Bright Path Consulting
  as owner for each, but introduces additional detail not proven to be incorporated:
  - maintenance report due **by the 5th working day**,
  - system health review **includes performance benchmarking**,
  - security audit **includes third-party penetration testing**,
  - support response acknowledgement target **within 2 business hours**.

Important missing references / evidence limits

- No signed or dated version of agreement.docx is available in the provided extract.
- amendment.pdf does not show the actual effective date in the extract.
- No clause references are available to tie amended terms back to specific sections of agreement.docx.
- No evidence shows that deliverables.xlsx is incorporated into the contract, issued under contract change control, or given precedence as a binding service level schedule.
- No referenced service procedures, acceptance criteria, escalation matrix, or third-party penetration testing terms are available.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Total material findings: 7

- **HIGH:** 1
- **MEDIUM:** 5
- **LOW:** 1

Overall, the document set provides a **partially usable responsibility baseline** for the Supplier's recurring service outputs, but it does **not provide a complete and authoritative responsibility matrix** without clarification. The clearest confirmed allocation is that **Bright Path Consulting** is the named performer/owner for all listed service deliverables in both agreement.docx and deliverables.xlsx. However, several material responsibility gaps remain unresolved because:

- deliverables.xlsx adds obligations and targets without proven contractual incorporation,
- client-side approval and input responsibilities are largely absent,
- a third-party dependency is introduced for the annual security audit without a defined owner, and
- some commercial and service administration terms are not fully traceable to an authoritative current baseline.

HIGH finding

- **RESP-001:** The **annual security audit** in deliverables.xlsx introduces a **third-party penetration test** not evidenced in agreement.docx, and no document assigns who must appoint, manage, approve, fund, or provide access for that third party. This creates material contractual, security, programme, and cost exposure.

DETAILED REGISTER

ID	RISK	STATUS / TYPE	REQUIREMENT OR ISSUE	SOURCE REFERENCE(S)	FINDING	PRACTICAL IMPACT	RECOMMENDED ACTION	WHEN
RESP-001	HIGH	UNRESOLVED / DEPENDENCY	Annual security audit scope includes a third-party penetration test, but third-party responsibility is not assigned	agreement.docx – Deliverables: “Annual security audit”; deliverables.xlsx – Security audit row: Owner Bright Path Consulting; Note: “Third-party penetration test included”	deliverables.xlsx adds a third-party input to the security audit, but no available document states whether this is contractually binding or who must procure, instruct, approve, fund, or provide access/ authorisation for the third-party tester	Risk of scope dispute, delayed audit, unbudgeted cost, security access delays, and non-delivery of the annual audit	Confirm whether third-party penetration testing is part of the contractual baseline; assign owner for procurement/management of the tester; define client approvals, access prerequisites, and deliverable acceptance route	BEFORE PROCUREMENT
RESP-002	MEDIUM	UNRESOLVED / CONFLICT	Support request acknowledgement target is inconsistent across documents	agreement.docx – Response time: “acknowledge all support requests within 4 business hours”; deliverables.xlsx – Support response row: “Target: acknowledge within 2 business hours”	The same service responsibility is stated with two different time targets, and no evidence establishes whether deliverables.xlsx is incorporated or has precedence	SLA measurement, reporting, and performance management may be disputed; Supplier commitment level is unclear	Issue one authoritative support-response baseline and document precedence/integration of deliverables.xlsx against agreement.docx	IMMEDIATE
RESP-003	MEDIUM	UNRESOLVED / SCOPE BASELINE	Monthly maintenance report has an added due-date requirement without proven incorporation	agreement.docx – Deliverables: “Monthly maintenance report”; deliverables.xlsx – Maintenance report row: “Delivered by the 5th working day”	Ownership is consistent, but the timing commitment appears only in deliverables.xlsx; no evidence confirms that this due date forms part of the binding baseline	Possible dispute over timeliness, late-delivery reporting, and expectation mismatch	Confirm whether the 5th working day requirement is approved and contractually adopted; if yes, incorporate it into the controlled baseline	BEFORE MOBILISATION
RESP-004	LOW	UNRESOLVED / SCOPE BASELINE	Quarterly system health review includes performance benchmarking only in the spreadsheet	agreement.docx – Deliverables: “Quarterly system health review”; deliverables.xlsx – System health review row: “Includes performance benchmarking”	The spreadsheet adds scope detail not evidenced in the agreement, and no client reviewer/recipient or acceptance route is stated	Limited but genuine risk of scope expansion or rework over expected review content	Confirm whether performance benchmarking is required and record the expected output, recipient, and reporting format	BEFORE ACCEPTANCE
RESP-005	MEDIUM	UNRESOLVED / APPROVAL-ACCOUNTABILITY GAP	No document assigns client review/approval responsibility or acceptance criteria for recurring deliverables	agreement.docx – Deliverables list; deliverables.xlsx – all deliverable rows with Supplier owner only	Supplier production responsibility is visible, but no available document identifies who at Acme Co receives, reviews, approves, or rejects the	Deliverables may be produced without formal acceptance, causing disputes over completion, remedial actions, and possibly invoice support	Define a deliverable approval matrix naming the client recipient/ approver, review period, and acceptance criteria for each recurring output	BEFORE MOBILISATION

					monthly report, quarterly review, or annual security audit, and no acceptance criteria are stated			
RESP-006	MEDIUM	UNRESOLVED / CLIENT DEPENDENCY	Support response obligation depends on client inputs, but submission and triage responsibilities are undefined	agreement.docx – Response time obligation for support requests; deliverables.xlsx – Support response row	Supplier acknowledgement timing depends on valid request receipt, but no evidence defines who at Acme Co can raise requests, by which channel, during what hours, or with what minimum information/ severity	SLA timing can be challenged because the request intake point and measurement trigger are undefined	Define the support request process, authorised requestors, service desk/ contact channel, service hours, and severity/triage rules	IMMEDIATE
RESP-007	MEDIUM	UNRESOLVED / DOCUMENT CONTROL-HIERARCHY	Current authoritative responsibility baseline is not fully traceable across the document set	amendment.pdf – statement that all other terms remain in effect; updated payment, liability, termination terms; agreement.docx – original terms; deliverables.xlsx – operational ownership and notes/targets with no incorporation language	The amendment clearly updates some terms, but the extract lacks effective date and clause traceability; deliverables.xlsx contains responsibility-relevant additions with no proof of contractual status or authority	Contract administration, payment responsibility, notice periods, and service responsibility baseline may be applied inconsistently	Issue a controlled document register confirming current versions, amendment effective date, and whether deliverables.xlsx is incorporated, referenced, or purely informative	IMMEDIATE

MISSING INFORMATION

RELATED FINDING(S)	ITEM	WHY NEEDED
RESP-002, RESP-003, RESP-004, RESP-007	Evidence that deliverables.xlsx is contractually incorporated, approved under change control, or linked to the Service Agreement	Needed to determine whether spreadsheet targets and scope notes are binding obligations or operational guidance only
RESP-007	Signed/executed copy of agreement.docx with clause numbering, date, and any schedules	Needed to verify the authoritative base wording and trace amended clauses accurately
RESP-007	Full executed copy of amendment.pdf, including effective date and clause references	Needed to confirm when amended commercial obligations took effect and which original clauses were replaced
RESP-001	Security audit / penetration testing scope document, statement of work, or service specification	Needed to confirm whether third-party penetration testing is included, and to allocate procurement, management, approval, and access

		responsibilities
RESP-005	Deliverable acceptance criteria, review workflow, or RACI/approval matrix	Needed to identify who at Acme Co approves recurring outputs and what constitutes acceptance
RESP-006	Support process / service desk procedure / escalation matrix	Needed to define the trigger for response-time measurement and the client-side dependency for raising support requests
RESP-001	Any security, access, or third-party onboarding requirements for penetration testing	Needed to establish approvals, lead times, and dependencies before the annual audit can be delivered

PRIORITISED ACTION REGISTER

PRIORITY	WHEN	RELATED FINDING(S)	ACTION	OWNER / PARTY TO CONFIRM
1	IMMEDIATE	RESP-002, RESP-003, RESP-004, RESP-007	Issue a controlled document baseline identifying the current Service Agreement, Amendment 1 effective date, and the status of deliverables.xlsx (incorporated, referenced, or informational only)	Acme Co contract owner with Bright Path Consulting
2	BEFORE PROCUREMENT	RESP-001	Define the annual security audit scope in writing, including whether third-party penetration testing is mandatory, who appoints and pays the tester, who grants access, and who accepts the output	Acme Co security owner and Bright Path Consulting
3	BEFORE MOBILISATION	RESP-005	Publish a deliverable approval matrix naming the client recipient, approver, review timescale, and acceptance criteria for each recurring output	Acme Co service manager
4	IMMEDIATE	RESP-006, RESP-002	Define the support request operating model: authorised requestors, submission channel, support hours, severity rules, and the single response-time SLA baseline	Acme Co service manager with Bright Path Consulting

5	BEFORE ACCEPTANCE	RESP-003, RESP-004	Confirm the required content and timing for the maintenance report and system health review, then align contract/ schedule wording accordingly	Bright Path Consulting and Acme Co service manager

FINAL ASSESSMENT

For the purpose of **Responsibility Matrix Builder**, the uploaded documents support only a **partial responsibility allocation**.

What is confirmed from the evidence:

- **Bright Path Consulting** is the stated **Supplier** in agreement.docx.
- Bright Path Consulting is also the named **owner** of all listed service outputs in deliverables.xlsx.
- amendment.pdf validly appears to supersede the original agreement **only** for the amended commercial terms stated in the extract.

What is not yet sufficiently established:

- whether deliverables.xlsx is part of the binding baseline,
- who at **Acme Co** is accountable for review/approval of recurring deliverables,
- how support requests are initiated and measured from the client side,
- who owns the third-party penetration testing dependency introduced for the annual security audit.

Accordingly, the current document set is **not yet complete enough to generate a fully reliable responsibility matrix without qualification**. The most material resolution priority is the third-party security testing dependency, followed by formal clarification of document hierarchy and client-side approval/input responsibilities.