Same CCC. Different executive problem.

Public and private AI share the same first-release headline band. The common language is useful precisely because it exposes how different the route forward can be.

CCC	CCC	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
private sector	public sector	visible accountability	portfolio complexity

What the shared band says

CCC places both sectors in an executive decision zone. It does not say the two sectors have identical governance. It says both should ask whether evidence and oversight are keeping pace with exposure before options narrow.

Public-sector pressure

For specified high-risk public and public-service deployments, the EU AI Act requires a fundamental-rights impact assessment covering affected groups, risks, human oversight and mitigation. The UK ATRS makes ownership and public algorithmic transparency an operating requirement across in-scope central government.

Private-sector pressure

Private portfolios often scale through third-party models, embedded services, regional variants and fast product cycles. The assurance problem is maintaining one line of sight across the portfolio as suppliers, versions, markets and business uses change.

The executive distinction

A public body may need stronger ownership, contestability and public evidence. A private group may need portfolio census, supplier traceability, version linkage and cross-border mapping. The band is common; the path to stronger decision freedom is contextual.

Official context: **EU AI Act consolidated text** | **UK ATRS** | **EBA** | **OECD AI Principles**

Technical note: RATE AI ratings are independent risk-intelligence positions, not legal opinions or certificates of regulatory compliance. Detailed scoring and evidence rules are published separately in the Public White Paper v1.1.