CASE STUDY

ARISE Framework™

Three Months. Nine Sectors. One Governance Architecture.

Published: April 2026
Observation Period: January – April 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Three Months of Adoption Data and What It Reveals About Where Governance Is Heading

Within two months of availability, the *ARISE Framework™* attracted practitioners from nine industry sectors and six global regions. That pace of adoption is not incidental. It reflects a convergence already underway in AI governance: organizations across industries, regulatory jurisdictions, and governance maturity levels are reaching the same conclusion simultaneously. Sector-specific compliance frameworks tell organizations what must be governed. They do not specify how to govern AI systems that generate risk every hour of every day.

The trend line in enterprise AI governance is moving toward unification. The EU AI Act, ISO 42001, NIST AI RMF, and a growing body of sector-specific mandates share a common operational gap: they establish obligations at the policy level but leave the assurance mechanisms largely unspecified. Organizations that have tried to close that gap with separate, framework-specific programs are discovering that the overhead is not sustainable. A financial institution cannot operate one governance program for Basel III model risk, a second for EU AI Act conformance, and a third for internal audit requirements. The pressure toward a common assurance language is structural, not aspirational.

The *ARISE Framework™*, developed by Assessed Intelligence, was built for exactly this environment. Its 7-domain architecture, GOVERN, MANAGE, IDENTIFY, PROTECT, DETECT, RESPOND, and VALIDATE, functions as a unifying assurance layer that maps to the operational requirements embedded within multiple regulatory frameworks without duplicating their compliance obligations. The two-month adoption pattern analyzed in this case study reflects practitioners who recognized that architecture and began deploying it; across consulting practices that serve dozens of client organizations, financial institutions operating under multi-jurisdictional regulation, regulatory authorities evaluating reference architectures for standards they will impose, and academic institutions training the next generation of practitioners.

What the data shows is not simply that the *ARISE Framework™* has been adopted across sectors. It shows that the demand for unified AI governance is sector-agnostic, geographically distributed, and accelerating faster than the regulatory mandates that typically drive framework adoption. Consulting and Financial Services account for the largest cohorts at 29% and 13% of named-sector practitioners respectively, but the breadth across Healthcare, Energy, Education, Critical Infrastructure, and emerging sectors like Real Estate and Utilities confirms that no industry is outside the trajectory.

THE CENTRAL FINDING

Regulatory Fragmentation Is Not a Barrier. It Is the Argument for a Common Assurance Language.

Organizations across sectors face the same underlying challenge: AI systems that generate risk continuously cannot be governed by frameworks designed for periodic review. Annual audit cycles are insufficient for systems that generate risk continuously; a misconfigured agent permission can persist for months before detection under traditional review models.

Regulatory fragmentation compounds this problem. A healthcare organization subject to HIPAA, the EU AI Act (where applicable), and emerging clinical AI guidance cannot adopt three separate governance programs without significant operational overhead. A financial institution managing model risk under Basel III while preparing for EU AI Act compliance needs a common assurance layer that maps to both without duplicating either.

The ARISE Framework™ provides that layer. Its 7 domains are not compliance categories derived from any single regulation; they are operational assurance functions that map to the requirements embedded within multiple frameworks

simultaneously. DETECT and VALIDATE satisfy the conformance monitoring obligations in the EU AI Act. PROTECT and RESPOND address the data protection and incident response requirements in HIPAA. IDENTIFY and GOVERN correspond to the model inventory and accountability requirements in both NIST AI RMF and ISO 42001.

The practitioner adoption data analyzed in this case study validates this architecture in practice. Nine sectors. Six global regions. Multiple regulatory jurisdictions. One governance language.

CROSS-INDUSTRY ADOPTION

Nine Sectors. One Governance Architecture.

Consulting, SaaS, and Financial Services represent the three largest named-sector cohorts, together accounting for over 67% of practitioners with identified sector affiliations. The following profiles examine all nine sectors represented in the practitioner base. Each sector faces distinct regulatory obligations; each finds operational relevance in the ARISE Framework™ architecture for the same underlying reason: AI systems generate risk continuously, and existing compliance frameworks do not specify how to govern that risk at the operational level.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY **29% OF SECTOR ADOPTION**

Software & Technology

Information Technology is the largest named-sector cohort at 29%, spanning software development, payments infrastructure, and academic technology programs. Interswitch, a leading African payments technology company, exemplifies the organization that must govern AI systems embedded in live financial infrastructure rather than in isolated test environments. University-affiliated technology practitioners, reflect early-career and research community adoption; a signal that ARISE literacy is entering the practitioner pipeline at the pre-professional stage.

CONSULTING **25% OF SECTOR ADOPTION**

Advisory & Professional Services

Consulting represents the second largest sector cohort in ARISE Framework™ adoption, accounting for 25% of named-sector practitioners. Their engagement reflects demand for a governance architecture that applies across client industries rather than a framework designed for a single vertical. The ARISE Framework™ provides consultants with a transferable assurance methodology that maps to client-specific regulatory requirements without requiring a custom framework for each engagement. The significant exposure across advisory represents the breadth of consulting firm types engaging with ARISE driven advisory..

FINANCIAL SERVICES **13% OF SECTOR ADOPTION**

Banking, Finance & Accounting

Financial services represents the third-largest named-sector cohort at 13% of practitioners, and carries the most complex regulatory profile in the subscriber base. Institutions represent geographically distinct regulatory environments with a shared need for model transparency and audit-readiness. Financial services practitioners are moving from initial framework assessment into active integration with existing model risk management programs.

EDUCATION

Academic & Educational Institutions

Practitioners from Universities and business schools reflect the sector's dual governance challenge: managing AI tools deployed in educational settings while preparing the next generation of practitioners to govern AI responsibly. Educational institutions must establish AI use policies before adoption decisions are made rather than after deployment has occurred.

COMMUNICATION SERVICES

Telecommunications & Regulatory Bodies

The presence of international regulatory bodies and Communications Authorities shows a significant trend in the initial cohort. Regulatory agency practitioners are not adopting the *ARISE Framework™* for internal compliance; they are evaluating it as reference architecture governance standards for the organizations they regulate. This pattern indicates that the framework is entering regulatory awareness through practitioner channels rather than through formal standards bodies.

HEALTH CARE

Healthcare & Health Informatics

Healthcare practitioners carry the most consequential risk profile in the cohort. AI systems deployed in clinical decision support, diagnostic imaging, and patient data management operate in environments where model failure has direct patient safety implications. Practitioners from Health Informatics represent the clinical informatics and behavioral health segments, each facing distinct but overlapping *ARISE* domain requirements.

ENERGY

Energy & Critical Infrastructure

National power grids operate AI-assisted grid management systems affecting millions of customers. Energy sector practitioners engage with *ARISE* at the intersection of operational technology (OT) governance and AI risk management; a domain overlap that most governance frameworks do not address with sufficient specificity. AI failures in predictive maintenance or load balancing must be identified and contained before physical infrastructure is affected.

MANUFACTURING

Industrial & Manufacturing

Manufacturing sector adoption reflects the integration of AI into production quality control, supply chain optimization, and worker safety monitoring. Practitioners from global manufacturing organizations where AI systems govern physical processes directly show a shifting trend toward unification of governance. Manufacturing organizations must establish comprehensive inventories of AI deployments before governance controls can be applied effectively.

UTILITIES, MATERIALS & REAL ESTATE

Emerging Sector Adoption

Utilities, Materials, Real Estate represent sectors that have historically operated outside primary AI governance discourse but have started to show the desire to adopt and apply structured assurance frameworks to their AI deployments. Their early adoption of the *ARISE Framework* indicates that practitioner-level governance awareness is advancing faster than the regulatory mandates that typically drive it.

ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Patterns That Distinguish Application from Awareness

Sector distribution, engagement depth, and the presence of regulatory authority practitioners indicate that a meaningful portion of the *ARISE* practitioner initial cohort has moved beyond initial research into active framework integration. The following patterns characterize that shift.

Sustained Multi-Session Engagement

A significant share of practitioners returned for multiple sessions, indicating active framework application rather than one-time awareness scanning. The highest engagement concentration is in the consulting sector, consistent with practitioners who reference the framework repeatedly during active client engagements rather than in a single research pass.

Regulatory Authority Participation

Government regulatory bodies have begun to engage distinctly with *ARISE*. When regulatory practitioners engage with a governance framework at this level of depth, they are leveraging and establishing suitability as a reference architecture for the standards they will impose on entities. This continued engagement suggests that the *ARISE Framework™* is beginning to enter regulatory awareness through practitioner channels rather than through formal standards bodies, which typically represents an earlier and more durable form of institutional adoption.

University and Research Institution Adoption

Practitioners from multiple global universities and Health Informatics represent academic community engagement signals that *ARISE*-based governance literacy is entering use in research and curriculum pipelines. *ARISE* has already been implemented to curriculum across multiple academic institutions. Practitioner-facing frameworks that gain early academic adoption tend to become reference points in course design and research methodology; the health informatics representation is particularly notable given that clinical AI governance is a rapidly growing academic discipline.

Consulting and Financial Services as Lead Sectors

SaaS, Consulting, and Financial Services are the dominant named-sector cohorts, at 29%, 25%, and 13%, of the named-sector practitioner base respectively. These sectors function as governance multipliers. A consulting practitioner who adopts the *ARISE Framework* applies it across multiple client organizations. A financial services practitioner who integrates it into model risk management extends its reach into the institutions that framework governs. The density in these two sectors indicates that *ARISE* adoption is propagating through advisory and institutional networks rather than through top-down organizational mandates.

HARMONIZING GOVERNANCE

One Architecture. Multiple Regulatory Languages.

The core value of the *ARISE Framework* is not that it replaces existing regulatory obligations; it is that it provides the continuous assurance structure that unifies existing frameworks and fills the gaps where other frameworks lack coverage. Organizations subject to the EU AI Act must demonstrate ongoing conformance monitoring. ISO 42001 requires operational

controls at the system level. NIST AI RMF provides functional categories but does not prescribe the assurance mechanisms that fill them.

The *ARISE Framework's* 7 domains map to the operational requirements embedded within each of these frameworks without duplicating their compliance obligations. A financial institution applying ARISE-based continuous assurance satisfies the detection and response requirements implicit in both its AI governance obligations and its existing model risk management program, because the framework is designed to function at the operational level that compliance standards specify in principle but leave unresolved in practice.

The cross-sector adoption observed in this case study reflects practitioners who have identified this gap and are deploying the *ARISE Framework* to close it. Currently mappings exist for 14 frameworks, 6 Criteria, and 8 regulations and these continue to grow monthly. This mapping is not exhaustive. Sector-specific mandates, including NERC CIP for energy, DORA for financial services in the EU, and emerging healthcare AI frameworks, contain additional operational requirements that the ARISE Framework™ addresses but have not been fully mapped to yet.

GLOBAL REACH

Adoption Without Geographic Constraint

Verified practitioner organizations span the United States, the United Kingdom, Nigeria, Kenya, Ethiopia, Algeria, Ghana, Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Germany, the Netherlands, Chile, Argentina, and Nepal. This distribution confirms that *ARISE Framework* adoption is not concentrated in a single regulatory jurisdiction or governance maturity level.

The practical implication is that the framework is being applied across environments governed by the EU AI Act, emerging African AI policy frameworks, APAC data governance regimes, and US sector-specific regulations simultaneously. This multilateral field validation is not available to frameworks designed for a single jurisdiction or regulatory audience.

The geographic spread also reflects divergent governance maturity stages. Organizations in established regulatory environments, such as EU member state practitioners preparing for AI Act obligations, engage with *ARISE* domains that address conformance monitoring and audit readiness. Organizations in markets where AI regulation is nascent, such as several African and South Asian practitioners in this cohort, engage with ARISE's GOVERN and IDENTIFY domains as foundational architecture rather than as compliance requirements. The framework accommodates both use cases without requiring separate configurations.

CONCLUSION

The Evidence for a Common Governance Language

The ARISE Framework™ adoption data analyzed in this case study does not describe a niche compliance tool. It describes a governance architecture with demonstrated utility across nine industry sectors, six global regions, and practitioners operating under some of the most divergent regulatory environments in the world. Harmonizing governance under one language.

Three patterns in the data are particularly instructive. First, regulatory authority practitioners are evaluating the framework as a reference architecture for standards they will impose on others; that signal precedes formal regulatory adoption and is more consequential than general practitioner interest. Second, Consulting sector density, the largest named cohort at 29% of named-sector practitioners, indicates that the framework is propagating through advisory networks rather than through single-organization adoption; each consulting practitioner represents multiple client governance engagements. Third,

academic institution engagement signals that *ARISE* literacy is entering the practitioner pipeline before regulatory pressure requires it.

The governance gap that the *ARISE Framework* addresses is not theoretical. AI systems generate risk continuously. Compliance frameworks specify what must be governed but not how to govern it continuously. The 7-domain architecture, GOVERN, MANAGE, IDENTIFY, PROTECT, DETECT, RESPOND, and VALIDATE, provides the operational assurance layer that closes that gap across regulatory environments, not instead of them.