

This document was translated from English by machine and may contain mistakes. The English original is at <https://www.novaracg.com/2026/08/30/the-procurement-file-is-the-governance-system/>.

O Processo de Compras É o Sistema de Governança

Heather Grizzle · August 30, 2026

This article argues that AI governance becomes real only in the procurement file, where institutions must document evidence justifying deployment decisions affecting disabled people.

1. Conteúdo

1. Resumo Executivo
2. A Governança Eventualmente Precisa Alcançar a Transação
3. O Processo de Compras como Instrumento de Responsabilização
4. 1. Uso Pretendido e Uso Proibido
5. 2. Análise da População Afetada
6. 3. O Registro das Alegações do Fornecedor
7. 4. Garantia Independente
8. 5. Failure and Fallback Architecture
9. 6. Performance Boundaries and Known Unknowns
10. 7. Logging, Traceability, and Reconstruction
11. 8. Complaint, Contestability, and Redress
12. 9. Model Change and Revalidation
13. 10. Suspension and Exit Authority
14. From AI Policy to Institutional Evidence
15. NCG Policy Position
16. Closing Position

Por Heather Grizzle, Novara Consulting Group



2. Resumo Executivo

A governança de inteligência artificial é cada vez mais expressa por meio de políticas, comitês, princípios, inventários e classificações de risco. Essas estruturas são importantes. Mas quando uma instituição pública efetivamente adquire e implementa um sistema de IA, a governança eventualmente precisa se tornar algo muito menos abstrato. Precisa se tornar um registro.

Someone has to describe what the system is allowed to do. Someone has to decide what evidence is sufficient to support the vendor's claims. Someone has to identify the people who may be harmed when the system fails. Someone has to determine which failures require human intervention, which changes require reevaluation, and which conditions require the system to be suspended. If those decisions are not documented before deployment, an AI governance policy does not cure the omission. The procurement file is where institutional principles become operational commitments.

RESUMO RÁPIDO

Para sistemas de IA que afetam pessoas com deficiência, o processo de compras deve conter evidências suficientes para responder a uma pergunta básica depois que algo dá errado: por que a instituição acreditava razoavelmente que este sistema era apropriado para este uso, com esta população, nestas condições? Se a resposta não puder ser reconstruída a partir do registro, o sistema de governança estava incompleto antes mesmo de o sistema entrar em operação.

3. A Governança Eventualmente Precisa Alcançar a Transação

Uma contingência só é uma salvaguarda se a pessoa que dela precisa puder realmente utilizá-la.

Heather Grizzle



Organizations are building increasingly sophisticated AI governance structures. They establish responsible AI principles, create review committees, maintain inventories, and classify systems according to risk. They adopt policies requiring fairness, transparency, accountability, privacy, accessibility, and human oversight. Then procurement begins. A vendor responds to a solicitation. Product demonstrations are scheduled. Accessibility documentation is collected. Security questionnaires are completed. Legal terms are negotiated. Business owners describe the efficiencies they expect. The technology clears the institution's established gates and enters service.

A existência desses portões pode gerar considerável confiança institucional, mas confiança não é o mesmo que uma decisão defensável. A questão crítica de governança não é apenas se o sistema passou pelo processo exigido. É se o registro resultante contém as evidências necessárias para justificar a implementação específica que foi aprovada.

That distinction becomes especially important when AI mediates access for disabled people. A system may summarize information, communicate with patients, evaluate applicants, translate language, generate instructional material, prioritize cases, assist employees, authenticate users, answer questions, or, increasingly, act on behalf of an institution. In each case, accessibility is not simply a characteristic of the interface. It is part of the decision architecture. A disabled person may encounter a system differently from the population on which it was primarily designed, tested, or validated, and an accessibility failure may alter the information that person receives, the choices available to them, their ability to respond, or the institution's interpretation of their behavior. The procurement record therefore needs to establish more than whether accessibility was considered. It needs to establish what was considered, what was tested, what remains unknown, and what the institution decided to do about the uncertainty.

— O PROCESSO DE COMPRAS COMO INSTRUMENTO DE RESPONSABILIZAÇÃO —

4. O Processo de Compras como Instrumento de Responsabilização

Procurement files are often understood primarily as administrative records. For AI, they should increasingly be understood as governance instruments. A mature AI procurement record should allow an independent reviewer to reconstruct the institution's reasoning without



relying on the institutional memory of the people who participated in the purchase. That means the record should answer several questions:

1. O que exatamente o sistema foi comprado para fazer?
2. O que ele foi explicitamente proibido de fazer?
3. Quais populações se esperava que o encontrassem?
4. Que evidências sustentaram as alegações utilizadas na aprovação, e quem produziu essas evidências?
5. Quais limitações eram conhecidas, e quais limitações permaneciam desconhecidas?
6. O que acontecia quando o sistema estava incerto ou errado?
7. Quem detinha autoridade para anulá-lo?
8. Como uma pessoa afetada poderia contestar sua saída?
9. O que levaria a instituição a reconsiderar a implementação?
10. Quem tinha autoridade para interrompê-lo?

Essas não são perguntas para a investigação de incidentes após uma falha. São perguntas de compras.

1. USO PRETENDIDO E USO PROIBIDO

5. 1. Uso Pretendido e Uso Proibido

O primeiro requisito é enganosamente simples: definir o que a instituição está comprando. Sistemas de IA são frequentemente adquiridos por meio de descrições amplas de capacidade. Um sistema pode ser descrito como assistente, tradutor, ferramenta de acessibilidade, sistema de apoio à decisão, chatbot, agente, ferramenta de triagem ou plataforma de produtividade. Esses rótulos são especificações de governança inadequadas. O registro de compras deve identificar a função institucional real.

Uma ferramenta de comunicação usada para ajudar alguém a navegar em um site apresenta um risco diferente da mesma tecnologia usada durante uma triagem médica. Um sistema automatizado de transcrição usado para gerar atas de reunião apresenta um risco diferente de um usado para criar o registro oficial de um processo disciplinar. Um sistema de reconhecimento de língua de sinais usado experimentalmente por um indivíduo não é equivalente a um



que uma instituição apresenta como substituto de outro meio de acesso à comunicação. A mesma tecnologia pode, portanto, transitar entre categorias de risco sem qualquer mudança em seu modelo subjacente, porque o contexto de implementação mudou.

DEFINA O LIMITE ANTES QUE A CONVENIÊNCIA O APAGUE

O registro de compras deve declarar tanto o uso pretendido quanto o uso proibido. Sem o segundo, as organizações criam uma expansão previsível de escopo: uma ferramenta aprovada para uma finalidade limitada torna-se disponível, os funcionários descobrem aplicações adicionais, e o uso institucional gradualmente ultrapassa as evidências sobre as quais a aprovação original se baseava.

2. ANÁLISE DA POPULAÇÃO AFETADA

6. 2. Análise da População Afetada

A aquisição tradicional de tecnologia pergunta quem usará o sistema. A governança de IA também deve perguntar quem será afetado por ele, e essas populações não são necessariamente as mesmas. Um funcionário pode operar um sistema de IA enquanto um paciente, estudante, candidato, residente, cliente ou beneficiário de assistência experimenta suas consequências. Pessoas com deficiência podem ser especialmente difíceis de identificar por meio da análise convencional de usuários, porque a deficiência frequentemente altera o caminho por meio de um sistema, em vez da categoria nominal de usuário.

The procurement record should therefore identify foreseeable accessibility interactions. Does the system process speech? Does it generate or interpret language? Does it depend on vision, hearing, dexterity, cognition, timing, biometric characteristics, or a particular mode of communication? Does it infer intent or competence from behavior that disability may affect? Does an inaccessible output alter a person's ability to participate in a subsequent decision? These questions convert accessibility from a compliance artifact into a system-risk inquiry.

3. O REGISTRO DAS ALEGAÇÕES DO FORNECEDOR



7. 3. O Registro das Alegações do Fornecedor

Every consequential vendor claim relied upon during procurement should have an evidentiary status. Not every claim requires independent testing, but institutions should distinguish among at least three categories. A capability is claimed when the vendor states that it exists. It is demonstrated when evidence shows that it has been observed under specified conditions. It is established for deployment when evidence reasonably supports reliance on it in the institution's intended context. Those categories are not interchangeable.

Uma demonstração pode estabelecer que um sistema é capaz de produzir uma saída. Não estabelece necessariamente com que confiabilidade ele produz essa saída em diferentes populações, ambientes ou casos de uso relevantes. Da mesma forma, a documentação pode estabelecer o que um fornecedor representa sobre seu sistema. Não pode estabelecer independentemente que a representação está correta. O processo de compras deve preservar essa distinção. Caso contrário, afirmações gradualmente se tornam constatações simplesmente por terem sido repetidas em documentos suficientes.

Estabelecida para implementação

A vendor claim status meaning evidence reasonably supports reliance on the capability in the institution's actual, intended context, not merely that the capability has been observed under demonstration conditions.

4. GARANTIA INDEPENDENTE

8. 4. Garantia Independente

Vendor evidence has a legitimate role in procurement. Vendors know their systems better than purchasers do and should be expected to disclose testing, architecture, limitations, known failure conditions, and relevant performance evidence. But the commercial relationship matters. The party seeking the contract should not be the only party determining whether the evidence is sufficient to award it.

Independent assurance does not mean recreating the vendor's engineering program. It means testing the claims that matter to the purchasing decision under conditions capable of dispro-



ving them. For accessibility-related AI, this may require evaluation involving people with the relevant disability and, where linguistic access is involved, qualified members of the language community. The objective is not ceremonial participation. It is evidentiary authority. The people capable of identifying a consequential failure must have a mechanism for causing that failure to affect the procurement decision. Otherwise, participation exists without governance.

5. FAILURE AND FALLBACK ARCHITECTURE

9. 5. Failure and Fallback Architecture

Every AI procurement should contain a written answer to a single question: what happens when the system does not work? "Human in the loop" is not an adequate answer. The record should identify the human, the trigger, the authority, the response time, and the alternative pathway available to the affected person.

For disabled users, the fallback itself must also be accessible. An AI communication system that fails and directs a Deaf person to make a telephone call has not produced a fallback. An automated digital process that becomes inaccessible and requires a blind user to complete the same inaccessible interface has not transferred the person to human oversight in any meaningful sense.

6. PERFORMANCE BOUNDARIES AND KNOWN UNKNOWN

10. 6. Performance Boundaries and Known Unknowns

Procurement documents tend to record what products can do. Governance records also need to state where confidence ends. AI performance is conditional. It may vary according to language, di-

allect, accent, signing style, lighting, camera position, disability, device, environment, domain terminology, interaction length, demographic characteristics, or countless other variables.

Institutions should require vendors to disclose known performance boundaries and should separately document areas that have not been evaluated.

Uma contingência só é uma salvaguarda se a pessoa que dela precisa puder realmente utilizá-la.

Heather Grizzle



That distinction matters. Not evaluated is not the same finding as failed, but it is also not the same finding as safe. Uncertainty is not a procurement defect if it is recognized and governed. Undocumented uncertainty is.

7. LOGGING, TRACEABILITY, AND RECONSTRUCTION

11. 7. Logging, Traceability, and Reconstruction

When an AI-mediated interaction produces harm, the institution should be able to reconstruct what happened, and that requires decisions about logging before deployment. What system version was operating? What inputs were received? What output was generated? Was the output modified? Did a human review it? What information did that reviewer see? What action followed? Can the institution reproduce the event without retaining data that should never have been retained in the first place?

Traceability and privacy can create legitimate competing requirements. That conflict should be resolved through system design and governance rather than discovered during litigation, an accessibility complaint, or an internal investigation. The procurement file should document the resolution.

8. COMPLAINT, CONTESTABILITY, AND REDRESS

12. 8. Complaint, Contestability, and Redress

A person affected by AI needs more than a mechanism for reporting a technical problem. They may need to contest what the institution did because of the system, and that is a different function. If an AI system mistranslates communication, incorrectly characterizes behavior, produces inaccessible information, generates a false inference, or contributes to an adverse institutional action, the affected person needs a pathway to challenge the resulting decision.

The institution should know before deployment who receives the challenge, who investigates it, what evidence is preserved, whether the contested AI output remains operative during review, what remedies are available, and how quickly the institution must respond.



A FEEDBACK FORM IS NOT A REDRESS MECHANISM

Redress requires an identified recipient, an investigation process, preserved evidence, a decision on whether the contested output stays live during review, defined remedies, and a response deadline.

9. MODEL CHANGE AND REVALIDATION

13. 9. Model Change and Revalidation

AI procurement creates a problem that traditional software contracts were not designed to handle particularly well: the product that was evaluated may not remain the product that is deployed. Models are updated. Guardrails change. Training data changes. Interfaces change. Third-party dependencies change. Vendors replace underlying models. Performance can improve in one domain and degrade in another without the purchasing institution initiating any change itself.

The procurement file therefore needs a change-control rule. The relevant question is not whether the vendor is permitted to update its product. It is which changes invalidate the evidence on which the institution relied. Contracts should identify material changes requiring notice, reevaluation, renewed acceptance testing, or approval before continued use in specified contexts. Otherwise, an institution can perform rigorous assurance at acquisition and still find itself governing a materially different system six months later using evidence produced for the previous one.

10. SUSPENSION AND EXIT AUTHORITY

14. 10. Suspension and Exit Authority

Governance without stop authority is advisory. Someone within the institution must have the authority to restrict, suspend, or terminate an AI deployment when evidence no longer supports its use, and the triggering conditions should not have to be invented during a crisis.

☐ Repeated accessibility failures



- ☐ Undisclosed material model changes
- ☐ Loss of required human oversight
- ☐ Significant divergence from validated performance
- ☐ Unresolved complaints
- ☐ New evidence of population-specific harm
- ☐ Failure to provide contractually required information
- ☐ Expansion beyond the approved use case

The procurement record should identify both the triggers and the decision authority.

It should also address exit. Who owns or receives institutional data when the relationship ends? What records must be retained? What must be deleted? How does the institution restore the previous service pathway? What happens to people who have become dependent on the AI-mediated process? Exit planning is not merely vendor management. It is continuity-of-access planning.

FROM AI POLICY TO INSTITUTIONAL EVIDENCE

15. From AI Policy to Institutional Evidence

The emerging challenge for AI governance is not a shortage of principles. It is translation. Fairness has to become an evaluation criterion. Transparency has to become a disclosure requirement. Human oversight has to become an assigned authority. Accessibility has to become a deployment condition. Accountability has to become a named office and a documented remedy. Monitoring has to become a trigger for action. And responsible AI eventually has to become something a procurement officer can place in a file.

This is particularly important in public institutions because procurement is where abstract institutional commitments encounter money, contracts, vendors, statutory duties, and people who cannot simply choose another government, school, hospital, court, or public service when the technology does not work for them. The procurement file therefore performs a function much larger than recordkeeping. It establishes the institution's theory of acceptable risk.



NCG POLICY POSITION

16. NCG Policy Position

Novara Consulting Group holds that AI systems affecting disabled people should not be approved solely because they have satisfied an organization's general AI governance process. The procurement record should contain sufficient evidence to reconstruct and defend the specific deployment decision.

AT MINIMUM, THE RECORD SHOULD ESTABLISH

- The intended and prohibited uses of the system
- The populations foreseeably affected
- The evidentiary status of consequential vendor claims
- The basis for independent assurance where warranted
- Known failure conditions and untested conditions
- Accessible fallback and human-review pathways
- Logging and traceability requirements
- Complaint, contestability, and redress procedures
- Material-change and revalidation triggers
- Institutional authority to restrict, suspend, or terminate deployment

The standard is not perfect knowledge. No procurement process can eliminate uncertainty. The standard is governed uncertainty: knowing what has been established, what has not, what evidence justified proceeding anyway, and who bears responsibility for the decision.

CLOSING POSITION



17. Closing Position

After an AI failure, institutions often ask whether the vendor should have warned them. Sometimes the answer will be yes. But public accountability requires another question: what evidence did the institution require before it agreed to proceed? That question cannot be outsourced. The vendor can supply evidence. An assessor can evaluate it. A committee can advise. Disabled stakeholders can identify failures that others cannot see. Lawyers can negotiate the allocation of contractual risk. The institution still makes the decision, and its procurement record should prove that it knew what decision it was making.

An AI system is not governed because an organization has an AI policy. It is governed when the institution can show why this system, for this purpose, affecting these people, under these conditions, was permitted to operate.

Heather Grizzle

The procurement file is where that accountability begins.

18. Como citar

Grizzle, H. M. (2026, August 30). O Processo de Compras É o Sistema de Governança. Novara Consulting Group.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23003317>

