

Client-code AI permission review

Software agencies, counsel and engineering leads

[Read the complete guide on aona.ai](#)

Use client source code with AI only within the permission granted by the governing contracts and the client's authorised decisions. An NDA alone does not identify every permitted recipient, service or use. Review the specific terms, data path and decision authority; where permission is unclear, prepare an independently written synthetic example instead of disclosing the client material.

Record the proposed material, recipients, purpose and authorised client decision, with a clean synthetic alternative.

A worked fictional permission decision plus an independently written toy example. No actual client consent or legal conclusion is supplied.

Your review

Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Organisation or team: _____

☐ **Identify the governing client terms**

Have the responsible owner resolve permission and confidentiality questions for the actual contract.

☐ **Record the authorised decision**

Do not treat a generic template or colleague's assurance as a contract amendment.

☐ **Use an independent synthetic reproduction where possible**

Removing names from the original code may not remove its confidential substance.

Checked items record your review, not a compliance approval or an installed-product test result.

Notes and next actions

Decision and scope: _____

Evidence to collect: _____

Owner and next review date: _____

Review matrix

Fictional case	Scope or decision	Meaning
Requested material	A function from SYNTHETIC_CLIENT_PORTAL	Original client code remains withheld
Proposed recipient	SYNTHETIC_AI_SERVICE and model provider	Actual recipients would need review

Fictional case	Scope or decision	Meaning
Authority	Fictional client contract owner	Project request alone is insufficient in this exercise
Illustrative outcome	Use the independent toy example only	No real client consent is supplied

Questions for the disclosure decision

- **Material:** What client information would leave?

Include derived and automatic context

- **Recipient and purpose:** Which service/account and task are proposed?

Follow the relevant data path

- **Authority:** Who can decide under the client's process?

This worksheet does not grant permission

Client-code permission review

This pack is a review aid, not an NDA, legal opinion, consent or contract amendment. It sends no message and makes no API call. Do not put actual client source code or credentials into the training files.

Use the "Proposed client-code disclosure" section with the responsible legal/commercial owner and the client's authorised process. Record exact scope and evidence in your approved system. The toy function and cases were written independently for this guide and contain no client information. They illustrate a clean reproduction, not a guarantee that modified client code is free of restrictions.

Proposed client-code disclosure

Client/reference: _____

Governing agreement and relevant review owner: _____

Material proposed, including derived/automatic context: _____

Service, account and additional recipients: _____

Purpose and expected benefit: _____

Provider handling evidence for the client to consider: _____

Who is authorised to decide under the client process: _____

Decision/evidence reference: NOT OBTAINED

Limits and recheck triggers: _____

This file grants no permission and does not amend an agreement.

Synthetic cases

Notice: INDEPENDENT SYNTHETIC EXAMPLES ONLY

Cases

Record 1

Input

Quantity: 2

Expected return: 2

Record 2

Input

{}

Expected exception: ValueError

Expected message: quantity is required

Client material used: false

Provider calls performed: false

Clean reproduction review

General programming question: _____

Independently written example: _____

Invented names/values and minimal structure: _____

Client-specific algorithm, comments or business rules excluded: _____

Does any derived information still require permission? _____

Reviewer and decision: NOT YET REVIEWED

A renamed copy is not automatically an independent example.

Worked fictional client-permission decision

SYNTHETIC SCENARIO. This is not consent, legal advice or a contract amendment.

Request: a software agency wants an AI explanation of a quantity-check failure in SYNTHETIC_CLIENT_PORTAL.

Material proposed: the original fictional client function and nearby context. No actual client function is included in this pack.

Recipient path: SYNTHETIC_AI_SERVICE in SYNTHETIC_WORKSPACE, then a fictional model provider. These are labels, not real services.

Authority in this exercise: only the fictional client contract owner may decide disclosure scope; the project manager cannot extend it.

Decision: original client code is not authorised for this use. Use only clean-example.py, independently written for the guide, with synthetic-cases.json.

Limits: no client names, algorithms, comments, surrounding files or production values may be added under this illustrative decision.

Recheck: any change to material, purpose, account or recipients requires a new authorised review.

Outcome: a useful general programming question can proceed with the independent synthetic example while the client-code request stays unresolved.

Practice files

The complete download pack includes these original working files. Keep their original formats when running or inspecting the examples.

- [Clean example \(clean-example.py\)](#)

Sources and scope

Sources checked 2026-09-21. Review the current requirements and your actual agreement before using this workbook for a real decision. Aona does not interpret an NDA, authorise client disclosure or guarantee compliance with a contract. No technical control supplies missing permission.

[USPTO: Guidance on use of AI-based tools](#). Nonbinding, USPTO-specific guidance discussing confidential client information shared with third-party AI; not a general interpretation of software NDAs.

Additional source and scope notes

The “Worked fictional client-permission decision” section is a completed teaching example: the fictional authority withholds original client code and allows only the independent toy reproduction within its stated example scope. It is separate from the blank actual-client review and grants no real permission.