

Security and AI training

Where the organisation stands, what has changed, and what to do next.

Executive summary

generated from this period's data

Training readiness stands at 91 out of 100 — a strong position. Across the workforce, 92% of mapped control requirements are currently met, which puts the organisation in the 100th percentile of the comparison group against a median of 71.

The exposed surface has narrowed over the period. Retention-adjusted risk has fallen from 31 to 9, a reduction of 71%, and the phishing-risk score has come down from 24 to 7 over six weeks — 71% lower. Retention, the measure that decides whether training survives the week it was done, sits at 89.

Across the requirements, PCI DSS is the strongest at 97% and CRA the thinnest at 88% — that is where an auditor will look first.

Everyone on the roster has started and nobody is lagging. The gain now comes from depth rather than reach — the competencies scoring lowest below are where the next assignment belongs.

RECOMMENDED NEXT, IN PRIORITY ORDER:

- 1. Where the old advice runs out (Attack Surface) — assign to Operations first, currently at 86.
- 2. How the con starts (Follow the Money) — assign to Engineering first, currently at 90.
- 3. What actually counts as data (Need to Know) — assign to Operations first, currently at 87.

Written automatically from the training record. The six-week series before today's figure is back-cast from the current score; a live deployment stores a weekly snapshot instead.

Summary for management

Week 39 · 21–27 Sep 2026, generated 29 Sep 2026, 04:14 · compiled from the figures

Situation: 36 people take part, and almost everyone is well through the library. This week 83% of the staff answered questions, and the share of right answers rose to 91%.

Risks: three people are still behind the rest. The management body has done its own path; one member is on the home straight.

Actions: remind the people who are behind, and keep the daily quiz going so what was learnt stays learnt.

Started

✓ 100% On track

Correct answers, 30 days

✓ 91% On track

Correct in review, 30 days

✓ 89% On track

Inactive, 30 days

✓ 3% On track

Compiled by fixed rules from this organisation's aggregated figures, without AI.

Key figures

TRAINING READINESS 91 of 100 ✓ On track	AUDIT READINESS 92% ✓ On track	RETENTION-ADJUSTED RISK 9 ✓ On track lower is better	PEER PERCENTILE 100th ≈ 71
ACTIVE THIS WEEK 33 of 36 seats	AVERAGE QUIZ SCORE 90% ✓ On track	CURRICULUM COMPLETED 94% ✓ On track	RETENTION 89 ✓ On track
NOT STARTED 0 people ✓ On track	BEHIND SCHEDULE 0 people ✓ On track	LEARNERS ON SEATS 36/36	NEW LESSONS, 90 DAYS 14 lessons

How the numbers moved

SIX WEEKS, ONE POINT PER WEEK.



Compliance

Requirement	Staff Current	Controls Mapped	Lessons	Status
Cyber Resilience Act (CRA) Most missing: Annex I, Part II (Vulnerability handling), 75% up to date.	88%	4	10	✓ On track
NIS2 Directive Most missing: Art. 21(2)(e) (Acquisition, development and vulnerability handling), 83% up to date; 2 other clauses are not yet at a good level.	90%	13	92	✓ On track
EU AI Act All 4 clauses are at a good level.	90%	4	94	✓ On track
GDPR All 5 clauses are at a good level.	93%	5	57	✓ On track
SOC 2 All 3 clauses are at a good level.	92%	3	86	✓ On track
ISO 27001 All 7 clauses are at a good level.	93%	7	131	✓ On track
Cyber insurance All 2 clauses are at a good level.	95%	2	32	✓ On track
PCI DSS All 2 clauses are at a good level.	97%	2	3	✓ On track

Management body

BY NAME

Under Article 20 of the NIS2 Directive, the management body of an essential or important entity approves the cybersecurity risk-management measures and oversees their implementation, and its members are required to follow training so that they can identify risks and assess risk-management practices. Member states transpose this into their national NIS2 laws. Article 4 of the AI Act, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2026/1744, requires providers and deployers of AI systems to take measures that support the development of AI literacy among their staff and others dealing with the operation and use of AI systems on their behalf. No set level is required.

MEMBER	NIS2 ART. 20	AI ACT ART. 4	MANAGEMENT PATH	EVIDENCE
Aino Esimerkki	✓ 25/25 up to date	✓ 11/11 up to date	40/40	11/09/2026 – 29/09/2026
Eero Esimerkki	✓ 25/25 up to date	✓ 11/11 up to date	40/40	11/09/2026 – 29/09/2026
Iris Esimerkki	✓ 25/25 up to date	✓ 11/11 up to date	36/40	13/09/2026 – 29/09/2026
Mikko Esimerkki	✓ 25/25 up to date	✓ 11/11 up to date	40/40	11/09/2026 – 29/09/2026
Sofia Esimerkki	✓ 25/25 up to date	✓ 11/11 up to date	40/40	11/09/2026 – 29/09/2026

Neither the Directive nor, for example, Finland's Act sets a form, length or certificate for management's training or familiarity. Dated completions are evidence that supports showing it to a supervisory authority or an auditor; on their own they do not show that the requirement is met.

Requirements by department

SHARE OF EACH DEPARTMENT'S PEOPLE UP TO DATE

DEPARTMENT	SOC 2	ISO 27001	GDPR	EU AI Act	PCI DSS	NIS2	Insurance	CRA
Leadership 5	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 95	✓ 100	⦿ 75
Engineering 9	✓ 89	✓ 89	✓ 93	✓ 89	✓ 95	✓ 87	✓ 95	⦿ 84
Finance 4	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 85	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 94	✓ 100	✓ 94
Operations 4	⦿ 75	⦿ 79	⦿ 80	⦿ 81	✓ 100	⦿ 83	✓ 88	✓ 94
People 2	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 100	⦿ 75	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 100
Sales 6	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 100	✓ 92	✓ 100	✓ 99	✓ 100	✓ 96
Support 6	⦿ 83	✓ 85	✓ 93	⦿ 79	✓ 100	⦿ 83	⦿ 83	✓ 87

Competency by department

COMPLETION WEIGHTED 60%, RETENTION 40%. THE LOW NUMBERS ARE WHERE TO ASSIGN NEXT.

COMPETENCY	Engineering	Finance	Leadership	Operations	People	Sales	Support
● Security awareness	✓ 91	✓ 93	✓ 93	✓ 86	✓ 93	✓ 97	✓ 88
● Fraud resilience	✓ 90	✓ 93	✓ 94	✓ 90	✓ 94	✓ 97	✓ 90
● Data protection	✓ 91	✓ 91	✓ 95	✓ 87	✓ 96	✓ 97	✓ 90
● AI literacy	✓ 91	✓ 93	✓ 94	✓ 87	✓ 95	✓ 96	✓ 89
● Incident response	✓ 91	✓ 95	✓ 96	✓ 88	✓ 94	✓ 97	✓ 90
● Technical depth	✓ 90	✓ 94	✓ 93	✓ 91	✓ 96	✓ 96	✓ 86

Cost and
break-even

NO RETURN IS FORECAST: A RANDOMISED STUDY OF 19,500 EMPLOYEES (UC SAN DIEGO, IEEE S&P 2025) FOUND NO SIGNIFICANT LINK BETWEEN ANNUAL AWARENESS TRAINING AND FALLING FOR PHISHING.

Learners covered	36
Plan price, 12 months, flat	€1,068
Per learner, 12 months	€29.67
Learners' time so far, 270.5 h	€10,279

The plan pays for itself at
€1,068 of losses prevented a year

For example, one €10,000 invoice fraud prevented every 9.4 years. €10,000 is an example, not a statistic. The break-even covers the plan's price; learners' time comes on top, costed at €38 an hour (Eurostat, euro-area labour cost 2025) and 2 minutes a lesson. Prices excl. VAT.

What to do next

Ranked by the size of the gap each one closes.

- 1Where the old advice runs out
assign to Operations · 7 lessons · now at 86
- 2How the con starts
assign to Engineering · 5 lessons · now at 90
- 3What actually counts as data
assign to Operations · 5 lessons · now at 87

Open risk

- Support is the lowest-scoring department at 87
- CRA: 88% of staff up to date

How these numbers are made

- Readiness = completion 35% + quiz quality 25% + retention 40%. Retention carries the most weight because it is the only part that survives the week the training was done.
- Coverage = completed lesson-instances ÷ (roster × lessons mapped to that control). A person counts as current on a control at 80% of its lessons.
- The peer set is every other organisation in the comparison group, scored by the same formula.
- Demo data throughout. Nothing on this page is typed in by hand.