

AssetsCompliance v1.0 — Foundation

Release Documentation

HISTORICAL Foundation release

The original release that connected obligations, ownership, evidence, controls, actions, reporting, integrations, and compliance intelligence into one demo control view.

Version 1.0

Documentation generated 2026-08-27

OFFICIAL DEMO VIDEO

AssetsCompliance Application v1.0 | Demo Walkthrough

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tm7NsUZ68VU>

Contents

1. Version overview
2. Release purpose
3. Problem addressed
4. Demo narrative
5. Verified capabilities
6. End-to-end practitioner journey
7. Connected control model
8. Obligations, controls, ownership, evidence, actions, and reporting
9. Role of compliance intelligence
10. What v1.0 established
11. Review-stage boundaries and limitations
12. Relationship to v1.1
13. Official v1.0 demo video
14. Continue to v1.1

1. Version overview

AssetsCompliance v1.0 was the foundation demo release of the practitioner application (`ac-en`). It replaced an earlier, separately discarded product scaffold with a coherent connected-control demo: obligations, ownership, evidence, controls, actions, reporting, integrations, and a first compliance-intelligence layer, brought together in one workspace.

v1.0's code boundary is marked explicitly in the `ac-en` repository history by a `chore: checkpoint v1.0 end` commit, immediately followed by a `chore: checkpoint v1.1 start` commit. Everything before that boundary (starting from `feat(ac-en): replace legacy app with demo foundation`) is v1.0; everything after it is v1.1.

2. Release purpose

v1.0 existed to demonstrate that a single connected control view — rather than a set of disconnected registers and spreadsheets — could represent an organisation's compliance obligations, ownership, evidence, and reporting credibly enough for a senior practitioner to review.

3. Problem addressed

Fragmented organisations can usually point to individual controls, but struggle to demonstrate how obligations, ownership, evidence, actions, and reporting connect. v1.0 addressed this by modelling those elements as one traceable structure instead of separate, disconnected records.

4. Demo narrative

The v1.0 demo opened on a dashboard summarising a headline control position, a connected review chain, and current exposure. From there, a reviewer could follow an obligation into its controls, ownership, and evidence, inspect an interactive Control Picture for that obligation or control, review Senior Oversight Reporting aimed at an executive audience, and check integration lineage and a connector universe showing source health and freshness.

5. Verified capabilities

Confirmed by the `ac-en v1.0-era` commit history (`feat(ac-en): add connected compliance workflow`, `feat(ac-en): add interactive control picture`, `feat(ac-en): add senior oversight reporting`, `feat(ac-en): add integration lineage and connector universe`, `feat: build connected obligations controls ownership and evidence`, `feat: build actions intelligence reporting and integrations`, and related commits):

- Connected obligations, controls, ownership, evidence, actions, reporting, integrations, and compliance intelligence in one workspace
- A dashboard summarising control position, review chain, and exposure
- An interactive Control Picture for a single obligation or control
- Senior Oversight Reporting for an executive audience
- Integration lineage and a connector universe (source health, freshness, source-to-record relationships)
- A first compliance-intelligence layer surfacing findings from the connected model
- Four separately named practitioner review journeys (`review-v1` schema), each with its own multi-step structure and structured feedback capture
- Demo account, application-wide notification, and Stripe-backed instant-unlock/checkout infrastructure for reviewer access

6. End-to-end practitioner journey

v1.0 did not use a single unified journey. Its practitioner review environment (`review-v1` schema) offered four separately named review journeys, each aimed at a different reviewer role and each with its own steps:

1. **Senior Oversight Review** (board, committee, or senior reviewer): Dashboard overview; Senior Oversight Summary; Priority oversight matters; Executive usefulness.
2. **Control Workflow Review** (compliance practitioner or control owner): Obligation to control chain; Ownership and actions; Control picture detail; Scenario preview; Exposure and reportability.
3. **Evidence and Reporting Review** (assurance, audit, or evidence owner): Evidence records; Evidence gaps; Report limitations; Oversight and audit preparation.
4. **Integration and Lineage Review** (compliance operations, technology risk, or data owner): Integrations overview; Source health and freshness; Connector Universe; Integration impact preview.

7. Connected control model

v1.0 modelled obligations, controls, ownership, evidence, actions, and reporting as one connected structure rather than separate lists, so a reviewer could move between any of these record types along real relationships instead of re-deriving the connection manually.

8. Obligations, controls, ownership, evidence, actions, and reporting

Each of these record types existed as first-class, connected data in v1.0: obligations carried applicable controls; controls carried ownership and evidence; evidence supported control operation; actions tracked follow-up work; and reporting (Senior Oversight Reporting) aggregated the resulting position for an executive audience.

9. Role of compliance intelligence

Compliance intelligence in v1.0 sat downstream of the connected obligations, controls, evidence, and actions model. It surfaced findings and priority matters derived from that data and fed them into Senior Oversight Reporting, rather than standing as an independently reasoned decision layer.

10. What v1.0 established

v1.0 established two lasting foundations that v1.1 built directly on:

- The connected data model — obligations, controls, ownership, evidence, actions, reporting, and integrations as one traceable structure.
- A practitioner review discipline for validating that model, expressed as the four named `review-v1` journeys.

It also established the surrounding reviewer-access infrastructure (demo accounts, notifications, Stripe-backed instant unlocks and checkout) that later releases continued to use.

11. Review-stage boundaries and limitations

- v1.0 was a demo/review-stage release for practitioner validation. It was not a certified production application, not legal advice, and not a compliance certification.
- It required no live client data and used representative demo data throughout.
- Control was presented through a single generic control view, not through independently reasoned Organisation, Practitioner, and Regulator positions.
- Every workspace started from a fixed, already-populated demo dataset, rather than an empty workspace that the practitioner populates by mounting data.

12. Relationship to v1.1

v1.1 kept v1.0's connected data model but rebuilt the review experience around three independent Control Positions and a workspace that starts empty until the practitioner mounts data into it. v1.1's Control Position model, data-mounting behaviour, Data Readiness, Workspace Health, and evidence-quality judgements did not exist in v1.0 — see [the v1.1 release documentation](#) for what changed.

13. Official v1.0 demo video

AssetsCompliance Application v1.0 | Demo Walkthrough <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tm7NsUZ68VU>

14. Continue to v1.1

v1.1 is the current demo release. See [v1.1.md](#) for what it retained, changed, and extended from v1.0.