

EU AI ACT AUDIT REPORT · DRAFT

Larkmoor

How Larkmoor meets Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 for the AI systems it uses, checked one requirement at a time.

1 of 18

checks met with proof

3

partly met

14

not met, with a plan

1. Summary

Larkmoor uses one AI system. One, Kestrel Applicant Ranking, is high-risk. 1 of 18 checks are met with proof. Not met yet: staff who use AI know enough about it (Art. 4), technical documentation (Art. 11), automatic record-keeping (Art. 12) and writes instructions for its users (Art. 13), and 10 more. Each has a fix in section 4.

2. Scope

AI system	What it does	Our role	Risk class
Kestrel Applicant Ranking	Ranks written job applications.	Provider and user	High-risk, point 4(a) of Annex III

3. How we checked

Each requirement was checked against Larkmoor's own records in Complipath: 0 documents, 3 written statements from named staff, and the AI register. Every check in this report points to its proof in the appendix. A statement is shown as a statement, never as a document. Where no proof exists, the check is marked not met.

4. Findings and plan

Risk	Requirement	Finding and fix	Owner	Due
High	Art. 11	Technical documentation: nothing on file for Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 12	Automatic record-keeping: nothing on file for Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 13	Writes instructions for its users: nothing on file for Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 13	The provider's instructions for use for Kestrel Applicant Ranking are missing. Fix: ask the vendor for them.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 14	Built for human oversight: nothing on file for Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 15	Accuracy, robustness, security: nothing on file for Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 17	A quality management system: nothing on file for Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 26(1)	No record that Kestrel Applicant Ranking is used as the provider's instructions say. Fix: upload the instructions and say who checks them.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 26(2)	No named, trained person oversees Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: answer 3 questions on oversight.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 26(4)	No written check that the data put into Kestrel Applicant Ranking fits the purpose. Fix: answer 2 questions or upload the check.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 26(6)	No proof that Kestrel Applicant Ranking's logs are kept for at least 6 months. Fix: routine from template.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 26(7)	Staff haven't been told that Kestrel Applicant Ranking is used on them. Fix: send the ready notice.	Not assigned	—
High	Art. 49	Registered in the EU database: nothing on file for Kestrel Applicant Ranking. Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
Medium	Art. 4	Nobody's AI training is on record yet. Fix: send the AI basics to everyone who uses AI.	Not assigned	—
Medium	Art. 9	A risk management system — only partly proven (Kestrel Applicant Ranking). Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
Medium	Art. 10	Data and data governance — only partly proven (Kestrel Applicant Ranking). Fix: upload the document that shows it.	Not assigned	—
Medium	Art. 26(5)	Watched in use; incidents reported — only partly proven (Kestrel Applicant Ranking). Fix: routine from template.	Not assigned	—

5. All checks

Requirement	What it asks	Kestrel Appl.
Art. 4	Staff who use AI know enough about it	Not met
Art. 5	No prohibited AI practice	Met
Art. 9	A risk management system	Partly
Art. 10	Data and data governance	Partly

Art. 11	Technical documentation	Not met
Art. 12	Automatic record-keeping	Not met
Art. 13	Writes instructions for its users	Not met
Art. 14	Built for human oversight	Not met
Art. 15	Accuracy, robustness, security	Not met
Art. 17	A quality management system	Not met
Art. 49	Registered in the EU database	Not met
Art. 26(1)	Used the way the provider's instructions say	Not met
Art. 26(2)	A trained person oversees it	Not met
Art. 26(4)	Input data fits the purpose	Not met
Art. 26(5)	Watched in use; incidents reported	Partly
Art. 26(6)	Logs kept at least 6 months	Not met
Art. 26(7)	Workers told before it is used on them	Not met
Art. 13	Provider's instructions for use on file	Not met

6. Confirmed by

Not signed yet

A draft: it changes as the register changes.

Check this copy

f7fe f4f4 50b0 63a6

If one word changes, this fingerprint changes. Ask Larkmoor for the shared link to compare.

Appendix · the proof behind every check

Art. 26(5) · Kestrel Applicant Ranking · Stated · Sofia Lindqvist, 8 Oct 2026

Asked: Who is told first when an AI system fails?

Sofia Lindqvist

Art. 26(5) · Kestrel Applicant Ranking · Stated · Sofia Lindqvist, 8 Oct 2026

Asked: How fast can you stop or roll back the system?

Same working day

Art. 26(5) · Kestrel Applicant Ranking · Stated · Sofia Lindqvist, 8 Oct 2026

Asked: When are affected customers told?

No later than 72 hours