Template for content teams in marketing and communications · As of November 2026

Who writes, who reviews, *who approves.*

RACI matrix and approval process for content teams: how to assign responsibilities clearly from briefing to reporting, stage approvals by risk and check AI content against eight criteria, without every coordination taking three weeks.

Roles	Approval levels	Review criteria
RACI	**3**	**8**
responsible, accountable, consulted, informed	from routine to sensitive, each with its own review chain and deadline	for AI-supported content in the groups facts, brand and legal

What this template contains

01	02	03	04	05
RACI matrix	**Approval levels**	**Review criteria**	**Review record**	**Blank templates**
13 process steps, 7 roles, completed example	Who reviews what, within which deadline	Eight yes/no questions for AI content	Feedback that does not go round in circles	To print out or transfer

Typical starting point

- Drafts sit in inboxes for days
- Every review round brings new, contradictory requests
- Nobody knows who decides in the end
- AI drafts are reviewed sometimes strictly, sometimes not at all
- The legal department sees everything or nothing
- Errors are only noticed after publication

Matching resource: the free template **AI policy for marketing** defines which AI tools and data are permitted. This template defines how content is reviewed and approved in everyday work. You will find both at dennis-gumprich.de/en/resources.

Contents

Clear roles, *short paths.*

Chapters 1 and 2 clarify terms and roles. Chapters 3 to 6 are the actual templates, chapter 7 shows the introduction.

01 RACI explained briefly: four letters, five rules — Understand — p. 3

02 The roles in the content team — Understand — p. 4

03 RACI matrix for the content process, completed — Template — p. 5

04 Three approval levels by risk — Template — p. 6

05 Eight review criteria for AI-supported content — Template — p. 7

06 Review record, deadlines and escalation — Template — p. 8

07 AI in the approval process: what it may pre-check — Implement — p. 9

08 Introduction in four weeks and self-check — Implement — p. 10

09 Blank templates to print out — Templates — p. 11

Quick start: if you only have an hour, adopt the matrix on page 5, delete roles you do not have and define the three approval levels from page 6. That already solves the most common bottlenecks.

Chapter 01

RACI explained briefly: *four letters, five rules.*

A RACI matrix assigns to each task who does it, who is accountable for the result, who is consulted beforehand and who is informed afterwards. This makes visible where responsibilities are missing or duplicated.

R Responsible · carries out
Does the task. There can be several people; there must be at least one.

A Accountable · answerable
Bears responsibility for the result and decides in the end. Exactly one person per task.

C Consulted · consulted
Is asked for expert advice before the decision. Contributes, but does not decide.

I Informed · informed
Learns of the result as soon as it is final. No right of objection, no review round.

The five rules that make a matrix robust

01 **Exactly one A per row.** Two accountable people means none in practice.

02 **At least one R per row.** Otherwise there is a task nobody does. If the accountable person does it themselves, their column shows A and R.

03 **Assign C sparingly.** Every C is an additional coordination step. Ask yourselves whether I is enough.

04 **A and R may be the same person.** For routine tasks, that is even the norm.

05 **Check the columns:** if a role has an A everywhere, it is the bottleneck. If it has no R anywhere, it is missing in everyday work.

Why a poor matrix fails

PATTERN	EFFECT	REMEDY
Many C in approval	Long loops, contradictory feedback	C only for subject-matter review, the rest to I
A with management	Everything waits for one person	Delegate A per approval level
Roles missing instead of people	The process stops during holidays	Name a deputy per role

Chapter 02

The roles *in the content team.*

A role is not a position. In small teams, one person takes on several roles; in large teams, several people share one. What matters is that every role is named, with a deputy.

ROLE	TASK IN THE PROCESS	TYPICALLY FILLED BY
Content lead	Responsible for topic plan, priorities and quality, decides in conflicts	Head of marketing or communications
Editorial team	Creates briefings and content, also with AI, checks style and facts	Editors, content managers
Subject-matter expertise	Supplies knowledge, checks technical accuracy	Product management, engineering, business units
Brand responsibility	Checks brand voice and visual guidelines	Brand management, often the content lead
Legal and compliance	Checks advertising claims, personal data and mandatory information	Legal department, data protection, external law firm
Channel responsibility	Adapts content, plans and publishes, evaluates	Social media, website, newsletter
AI responsibility	Maintains knowledge base, prompts and AI review steps	Content operations, often the editorial team

How to recognize that a role is missing

No content lead

Priorities are renegotiated in every round.

No AI responsibility

Everyone prompts differently, quality fluctuates.

No channel responsibility

Content is finished but does not appear or appears incorrectly formatted.

Example: three people, seven roles

PERSON	TAKES ON THE ROLES
Head of marketing	Content lead, brand responsibility
Content manager	Editorial team, AI responsibility
Online marketing	Channel responsibility
External or in-house	Subject-matter expertise from business units, legal via legal department or law firm

Further reading: which four roles a content team needs at minimum and how they can be distributed across a few people is described in the article “Who does what in the content team” on dennis-gumprich.de.

Chapter 03

RACI matrix *for the content process.*

Completed example for a specialist article with derivatives for social media and newsletter. Adapt rows and columns to your process.

PROCESS STEP	LEAD	EDITORIAL	EXPERT	BRAND	LEGAL	CHANNEL	AI RESP.
Select and prioritize the topic	A	R	C			I	
Create the briefing	I	A R	C			C	
Research and sources		A	R				
Draft, also with AI		A R					C
Fact-checking		A	R				
Brand voice review		R		A			C
Legal review (level 3)	I	C			A R		
SEO and GEO optimization		A				C	R
Final approval	A	R	I			I	
Publication		I				A R	
Derivatives for channels		C				A	R
Reporting	I	I				A R	
Check for updates		A R	C			I	

Working model from consulting practice. Empty fields mean: not involved.

What the example shows

- Management is only needed for prioritization and final approval, not for every intermediate step.
- The legal department only reviews level 3 content. No other content reaches it.
- The editorial team remains responsible for AI drafts. The AI role advises and maintains the tools.

How to adapt the matrix

- **Rows according to your process:** if you have a step such as translation or image rights, add it as a separate row.
- **One version per content type:** press releases and social media posts need different matrices; three are usually enough.
- **Columns with names:** enter the person and their deputy for each role, otherwise the matrix stays abstract.

Chapter 04

Three approval levels *by risk.*

Not every piece of content needs the same review chain. Staging approvals by risk saves time on routine work and adds care where it matters.

Level 1
Routine

Content derived from already approved texts or containing no new statements.

Examples: social media posts from an approved article, event notices,

date announcements

Review: editorial team using a checklist
Deadline: same day

Level 2
Standard

New content with subject-matter statements, but without special legal risks.

Examples: specialist articles, newsletters, landing pages, customer stories with approval

Review: subject-matter expertise and brand responsibility, approval by content lead
Deadline: three working days

Level 3
Sensitive

Content with legal, financial or reputational risks.

Examples: press releases, business figures, environmental and health claims, comparisons with competitors, crisis communication

Review: additionally legal and compliance, if necessary Management
Deadline: five working days

How to classify a piece of content

QUESTION	IF YES
Does the content contain claims about the environment, climate, health or safety?	Level 3
Are company figures, prices or comparisons with competitors mentioned?	Level 3
Are people or customers named or shown?	at least level 2, with documented consent
Does the content contain new subject-matter statements?	Level 2
Is the content derived from an already approved text?	Level 1

Deadlines and examples as a working model. Adapt them to your organization.

Since 27 September 2026: stricter rules apply to environmental claims under the EmpCo directive. General claims such as “sustainable” or “climate-neutral” without proof are not permitted. Such content always belongs in level 3.

Chapter 05

Eight review criteria *for AI-supported content.*

Each criterion has exactly one owner and a yes/no result. This makes reviews fast, traceable and independent of whether a person or an AI wrote the draft.

GROUP	CRITERION	REVIEW QUESTION	OWNER
Facts	Substantiated figures	Is there a reliable source behind every figure?	Editorial team
Facts	Own claims	Are all statements about our company correct?	Business unit
Facts	Currency	Do time-related statements carry a date?	Editorial team
Brand	Tone	Consistently suited to the format, without switching?	Editorial team
Brand	Exclusion list	Does the text contain prohibited phrasing?	Editorial team
Brand	Distinctiveness	Could a competitor publish this text just as it is?	Editorial team
Legal	Advertising claims	Are claims about effects and comparisons permissible?	Legal department
Legal	Personal data	Have the people and customers mentioned given their approval?	Legal department

How to apply the criteria per level

Level 1

Currency, form of address and tone, exclusion list. The other criteria were checked in the original text.

Level 2

All criteria from facts and brand. Legal only if one of the questions on page 6 applies.

Level 3

All eight criteria, legal and compliance with documented review.

Why yes/no instead of grades: a rating from one to five invites discussion. A yes/no question forces a decision and shows immediately what needs to be done. A no means: back to the responsible person, with the specific passage and a suggestion.

Chapter 06

Review record, deadlines *and escalation.*

Approvals rarely take long because of the review itself, but because of unclear feedback and missing deadlines. A uniform record prevents comments from going round in circles.

What good feedback looks like

PASSAGE	CRITERION	PROBLEM	SUGGESTION	MUST / SHOULD
Paragraph 2	Substantiated figures	“40 percent less energy” without a source	Link the measurement report or “up to” with conditions	Must
Headline	Tone	Too informal for format	“How you save energy”	Must
Ending	Distinctiveness	General statement, interchangeable	Add your own customer example	Should

Invented example. “Must” blocks approval, “should” is a recommendation.

Deadlines and escalation

01 **Set a deadline per level** and make it visible in the calendar or tool, not just in the email.

02 **Reminder the day before** the deadline, automatically if your tool can do it.

03 **After the deadline:** follow up with the role's deputy. For levels 1 and 2, you can agree that no response counts as approval.

04 **In conflicts between reviewers,** the person with the A in the matrix decides, not the loudest voice.

05 **Document every approval:** who, when, which version. That protects you when questions come up later.

Three rules for feedback

- **One round, all reviewers:** feedback collected in one version, not one after another by email.
- **Only within your own criterion:** whoever checks facts does not rewrite the style.
- **Taste is not a must:** wording preferences without reference to a criterion are optional notes.

Important: tacit consent is not suitable for level 3. Legal reviews always require explicit approval.

Chapter 07

AI in the approval process: *what it may pre-check.*

AI can prepare and speed up reviews. Responsibility for approval stays with people. This separation belongs explicitly in your matrix.

REVIEW STEP	WHAT AI CAN PRE-CHECK	WHAT STAYS WITH PEOPLE
Brand voice	Flag deviations in form of address, tone and exclusion list	Deciding whether a deviation is intended
Facts	List figures and claims without sources	Checking sources and own claims
Distinctiveness	Find interchangeable passages and empty phrases	Adding your own evidence and examples
Legal	Flag critical terms such as environmental or health promises	Legal assessment and approval
Channel version	Check lengths, formats and mandatory information per channel	Choice and timing of publication

Example: pre-check prompt before the human review

```
Check the following draft against our eight review criteria. State
“met” or “not met” for each criterion. For “not met”, name the exact
passage and a suggestion.
Do not assess the legal situation, only flag passages that should be legally reviewed. Brand voice and
exclusion list: [from the knowledge base]
Draft: [insert text]
```

Three rules for the AI pre-check

- **The same criteria:** the AI checks against your eight criteria, not against its own standards.
- **Flag instead of decide:** the AI delivers notes with location; approval stays with the A in the matrix.
- **Maintain the context:** keep the exclusion list and brand voice up to date in the knowledge base, otherwise the AI checks against outdated rules.

Good to know: AI detectors that are supposed to recognize whether a text comes from an AI do not deliver reliable results. For approval, the origin of a text does not matter anyway, but whether it is correct, fits the brand and is permissible.

Chapter 08

Introduction in four weeks *and self-check.*

Week 1
Current state
Trace ten pieces of content from recent months: who was involved, where did it get stuck?

Week 2
Matrix and levels
Fill in the matrix, define levels, agree with all roles

Week 3
Pilot
All new content via the new process, keep a record

Week 4
Evaluate
Compare lead times, sharpen the matrix, make it binding

How to measure success

- **Lead time** from finished draft to approval, separated by level
- **Number of review rounds** per piece of content, target: two at most
- **Errors after publication** that require a correction or withdrawal

Self-check: how clear is your approval process?

	STATEMENT
☐	There is exactly one accountable person for each process step.
☐	Every role has a named deputy.
☐	Content is classified into approval levels by risk.
☐	There is a binding deadline for each level.
☐	AI drafts are checked against the same criteria as all other content.
☐	Feedback names the passage, criterion and suggestion.
☐	Approvals are documented with person, date and version.

Tip for getting started: start with level 1. When routine content is approved on the same day, the team feels the benefit immediately, and acceptance of the stricter levels grows.

Evaluation: up to three ticks: start with the matrix and the levels. Four to five ticks: deadlines and the record bring the biggest gain. Six to seven ticks: your process holds; now automating individual steps pays off.

Template A

Your RACI matrix

Exactly one A and at least one R per row. Assign C sparingly.

PROCESS STEP
Select the topic
Create the briefing
Research and sources
Draft, also with AI
Fact-checking
Brand voice review
Legal review
SEO and GEO optimization
Final approval
Publication
Derivatives for channels
Reporting
Check for updates

Enter roles in the header row, for example lead, editorial, expert, brand, legal, channel, AI responsibility.

Deputies

ROLE	PERSON	DEPUTY

Template B

Review record

Content and version		Approval level	1 · 2 · 3
Reviewed by		Date	

CRITERION	YES	NO	PASSAGE AND SUGGESTION
Substantiated figures	☐	☐	
Own claims	☐	☐	
Currency	☐	☐	
Tone	☐	☐	
Exclusion list	☐	☐	
Distinctiveness	☐	☐	
Advertising claims	☐	☐	
Personal data	☐	☐	

Feedback

PASSAGE	CRITERION	PROBLEM	SUGGESTION	MUST / SHOULD

Approved by	Date

Next steps

From paper *into the process.*

A matrix only works when it is visible where content is created: in your editorial tool, with status, responsibilities and deadlines per piece of content.

01 **This week:** fill in the matrix and agree it with all roles in a 30-minute meeting.

02 **Next week:** define approval levels and deadlines and communicate them to the team.

03 **In four weeks:** compare lead times and decide which steps you automate.

Free analysis

Where does your content process lose *time today?*

In 30 minutes, we look together at where unnecessary coordination, manual tasks, tool switching or recurring content work cost you time today, and how your approvals can become faster without losing care.

Analyze your content process in 30 minutes

dennis-gumprich.de/en/analysis

Read more on dennis-gumprich.de

- Approval processes: why three weeks is normal and how to halve it
- Checking and recognizing AI texts: the checklist before approval
- Who does what in the content team: the four roles you really need
- Template AI policy for marketing

DG

Dennis Gumprich · Senior Consultant Content Solutions at contentbird GmbH. He supports marketing and communications teams with the question of how AI fits into existing content processes without undermining quality, brand voice and approvals.

Transparency note: Dennis works for contentbird, a provider of AI-supported content software. This template is vendor-neutral and does not replace legal advice. It was created using AI, reviewed for accuracy and is the responsibility of Dennis Gumprich. As of: November 2026.