DOCUMENT 92 · APPLICATION CASES

Application cases

Eight fictitious companies go through the corporate cycle and the lifecycle of their use cases

Fernando García Varela Version 0.1 (working draft) 16-09-2026 Draft for review

8	21	7	5
fictitious cases	use cases taken through their gates	well-founded stops	recorded retirements

IN THIS DOCUMENT

01 Purpose and scope

02 Summary of the cases

03 Case 1 · Energy group E (fictitious)

04 Case 2 · Logistics operator L (fictitious)

05 Case 3 · Hospital group H (fictitious)

06 Case 4 · Retail group R (fictitious)

07 Case 5 · Regional administration P (fictitious)

08 Case 6 · Agri-food cooperative A (fictitious)

09 Case 7 · Regional hotel group T (fictitious)

10 Case 8 · Industrial manufacturer M (fictitious)

11 Cross-cutting lessons and use in workshops

12 Associated tools and templates

13 Related documents

14 Version control

Legal notice and disclaimer. SEVEN-G is a reference methodological framework provided "as is" and for information purposes only. It does not constitute legal, regulatory, financial or professional advice, nor does it guarantee compliance with any law or standard. References to general regulation (such as the EU AI Act, the GDPR, DORA or NIS2), to technical standards and to regulation specific to each sector or jurisdiction may be incomplete, may not apply to a particular case or may become out of date as a result of regulatory changes, interpretations or supervisory positions after their consultation date. **Each organisation that uses SEVEN-G is solely responsible for identifying the regulation that applies to it, verifying that it is current and certifying its own regulatory compliance**, with the appropriate qualified advice. This methodology is a generic, free aid shared with the community so that nobody has to start from scratch; each person or organisation can and should adapt it to its own use. It must not be inferred that its legally sensitive parts have been reviewed by legal counsel: those reviews, for each company or sector, are the ultimate responsibility of the company, consultant or organisation that uses it. Although every effort is made to keep it up to date, some regulation may have changed without being reflected here. To the fullest extent permitted by law, the author accepts no responsibility whatsoever for the effects of its application in any organisation or for its full applicability. The methodology does not grant certification of any kind. The author accepts no liability for any use made of this content or for any decisions taken on the basis of it. The data, figures, companies and cases in the examples are fictitious or illustrative.

> **NOTICE: ALL THE CONTENT OF THIS DOCUMENT IS FICTITIOUS.** The companies, their bodies, people, systems, use cases, decisions, dates and figures are **invented** to illustrate how SEVEN-G is applied. They do not describe any real organisation, do not come from client engagements and **are not market references, benchmarks or expected results**. The cases are consistent with the sectors of the board dashboard demonstrations (energy, logistics, healthcare, retail, public sector, agri-food, hospitality and industry), but do not reproduce their data. Any resemblance to a real organisation is coincidental.

THE ESSENTIALS Reference

Fictitious application cases, from large and medium-sized companies, with Lite and Enterprise use cases. They are read as examples; they create no rules.

Obligation matrix and layered reading (document 94)

01

Purpose and scope

This document uses eight fictitious cases to show how the components of SEVEN-G are applied in practice: maturity diagnosis, transformation index, board decisions, the progression of use cases through their *gates*, value measurement with formulas and statuses, stops and retirements.

It is used to:

- Train boards, AI Committees and AI Offices.
- Explain the framework with complete examples whose calculations can be verified.
- Prepare workshops (section 11).

Conventions used in the cases:

- **Fictitious period:** 2027–2028. Quarters are shown as Q1 27, Q2 27…
- **Codes:** each company has its own numbering (IA-AAAA-NNN, DEC-AAAA-NNN, REC-AAAA-NNN, INC-AAAA-NNN, NC-AAAA-NNN); codes are not related across cases.

- **Maturity:** overall level = average of the seven dimensions rounded down and capped at the lower of D1 or D6 plus one (common specification §5.2), with equal weights.
- **Transformation index:** eight signals scored from 0 to 3; the thresholds in document 12 are pending calibration, so the scores are illustrative.
- **Value:** annual net value = efficiencies + return − recurring cost; released capacity that has not materialised is reported separately and is not added.

02

Summary of the cases

Case	Fictitious company	Initial overall maturity	Initial profile	Use cases in the case	Notable *gate* outcomes
1	Energy group E	2	Tactical efficiency	3	Scale · Stop at G3 (Transform) · Retire
2	Logistics operator L	2	Efficiency at scale	3	Scale · Stop at G5 (Transform) · Iterate at G3
3	Hospital group H	2	Declared but unevidenced transformation	3	Iterate at G7 · Retire due to bias · Stop at G3 due to regulation
4	Retail group R	3	Transformation under way	3	Scale (Transform) · Stop at G3 due to data · Retire
5	Regional administration P	1	Scattered exploration	3	Retire after critical nonconformity · Proceed · Stop at G3
6	Agri-food cooperative A	1	Operational and logistics efficiency	2	Proceed · Stop at G5 due to insufficient data
7	Regional hotel group T	2	Experience and operations improvement	2	Proceed · Iterate at G3
8	Industrial manufacturer M	3	Service improvement and prevention	2	Scale · Stop at G5 due to compliance risk

03

Case 1 · Energy group E (fictitious)

3.1 Initial situation

Fictitious group with electricity distribution, renewable generation, a retail supplier and field services. It has used AI for years in grid operations, with strong technical teams. Every year the board receives a list of projects with "value generated" of €9.8M that nobody has validated. When the inventory is carried out, 19 AI systems come to light, seven more than technology had registered, two of them embedded in supplier software.

3.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q1 27)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	2	Data committee with minutes, without a mandate over AI or an approved thesis.
Value and portfolio (D2)	2	List of projects with value declared by the business areas; no prioritisation or retirement criteria.
Data and knowledge (D3)	3	Grid and customer data owners appointed; catalogue with lineage in the main domains.
Technology and operations (D4)	3	Common model platform with degradation monitoring in most use cases in production.
People and adoption (D5)	2	Occasional training; no adoption plans.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	2	Strong cybersecurity in the control network, but no complete AI inventory or regulatory classification.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	1	Declared value with no baseline or attribution method.

Overall level: average 15 ÷ 7 = 2.14 → 2; cap: minimum of D1 and D6 (2) + 1 = 3. **Overall level 2.**

Transformation index: investment mix 1 · value mix 1 · materialisation 1 · depth of change 1 · operating model 0 · AI-enabled revenue 0 · progression to production 1 · board decision 0. **Profile: Tactical efficiency.**

3.3 Board decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-002	Full board (C2, Q2 27)	AI thesis: Optimise in 04 Operations; Augment in 01 Customer; explore Transform in 02 Product and service with a stage limit. Risk appetite: systems with autonomous action (A3) over grid operations or the market are not accepted without the express approval of the board. Investment threshold for Enterprise intensity: €300,000.
REC-2027-001	Board committee	Have management control validate the value of the five use cases with the highest declared value before the end of the financial year.
DEC-2027-004	Full board (Q2 27)	Authorise stage 1 of IA-2027-007 with a limit of €250,000.
DEC-2027-009	Full board (Q3 27)	Take note of the stop of IA-2027-007 at G3.

3.4 Use cases

IA-2027-003 · Transformer failure prediction. Optimise · Enterprise (critical function) · Autonomy A1: the system recommends which transformers to replace and planning decides.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Authorisation (G0)	Q1 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Fit with the thesis; roles without incompatibilities.
Opportunity (G1)	Q1 27	Proceed	Sponsor, informing the committee	Unplanned failures are the largest avoidable maintenance cost.
Hypothesis (G2)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Baseline measured: 118 unplanned failures a year in the pilot zone; comparable control zone.
Feasibility (G3)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Sufficient telemetry data; Medium residual risk.
Design (G4)	Q3 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Rollback plan: return to the age-based replacement schedule.
Go-live (G5)	Q4 27	Proceed with conditions	AI Committee after multi-level sign-off	Condition: measure for twelve months against the control zone (deadline Q4 28; owner: management control).

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Continuity review (R6)	Quarterly 2028	Proceed	AI Committee	Stable; no incidents.
Scale or retire (G7)	Q4 28	**Scale**	AI Committee	Savings materialised and validated; new phase 0 for the remaining zones.

Value after twelve months in production:

Component	Formula	Amount	Status
Efficiencies	36 failures avoided (74 actual versus 110 expected according to the control zone) × €31,000 difference between an unplanned failure and a scheduled replacement	€1,116,000	Validated by management control
Recurring cost	Licences, compute and operations staff	€210,000	Validated
Annual net value	1,116,000 − 210,000	**€906,000**	Validated
Scaling	Expected additional net value €1,300,000 ÷ additional investment €650,000	**€2.0 per euro**	Estimated

IA-2027-007 · Autonomous battery management with bids in the electricity market. Transform (new flexibility service) · Enterprise · Planned autonomy A3.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G1	Q1 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Opportunity aligned with sphere 02.
Hypothesis (G2)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee and **full board** (DEC-2027-004)	Stage 1 with a limit of €250,000; stop criterion: Critical residual risk not acceptable within the appetite.
Feasibility (G3)	Q3 27	**Stop**	AI Committee	Orders executed in the market cannot be reversed. Residual risk with controls: likelihood 4 × impact 4 = 16, **Critical**, outside the approved appetite. Coded reason: *Unacceptable risk*.

Investment consumed: €85,000 of the €250,000 for the stage. The idea of optimising battery charging was registered as a separate use case, IA-2027-014, at the Optimise level and with autonomy A1 (the system recommends and the operator decides), with a different value hypothesis and a different sponsor.

IA-2027-001 · Conversational assistant for outages (version 1). System in production before the framework was adopted; regularised with a review equivalent to G7 (01 §14).

Data point	Value
Conversations resolved without referral to a person	18 %
Value declared by the area	€240,000 of "calls avoided", with no baseline (declared)
Management control estimate based on a sample	9,500 calls avoided × €4.20 per call = €39,900 (estimated)
Recurring cost	€95,000 (validated)
Annual net value with the estimate	39,900 − 95,000 = **−€55,100**

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Scale or retire (G7)	Q2 27	**Retire**	AI Committee	Coded reason: *Cost exceeds value*. Replacement: recognition of the supply point number in the telephone channel (not AI). Conversations retained in accordance with the retention policy and then deleted. Notice on the website for thirty days.

3.5 Annual review (C5, Q4 28)

D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Average	Cap	Overall
3	3	3	3	2	3	3	20 ÷ 7 = 2.86 → 2	3 + 1 = 4	**2**

D1, D2 and D6 rise by one level and D7 by two, but the overall level does not change because of the rounding-down rule: D5 remains at 2. The profile moves to **Efficiency at scale**: validated value in the main use cases and materialised savings.

3.6 Lessons

1. **Stopping a Transform bet at G3 is an outcome of the method.** €85,000 was consumed and committing the rest was avoided; the viable part continued as another use case.
2. **Regularising legacy systems reveals negative values.** The outage assistant only seemed profitable because its value was declared.
3. **The overall level is read together with the dimensions.** An overall level that does not move can hide real progress and a lagging dimension.

04

Case 2 · Logistics operator L (fictitious)

4.1 Initial situation

Fictitious operator with road transport, warehouses, last-mile delivery and customs. It has a deeply rooted efficiency culture: routes, warehouses and fleet maintenance are measured rigorously. The board wants to know whether AI can open a growth line, not just reduce costs.

4.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q1 27)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	3	Digital operations committee with a mandate and minutes; approved portfolio.
Value and portfolio (D2)	3	Use cases prioritised with value and cost; retirement criteria documented.
Data and knowledge (D3)	2	Good telemetry data; scattered commercial data.
Technology and operations (D4)	3	Monitoring and rollback plans in the planning systems.
People and adoption (D5)	2	Training for planners; no position on the effect on drivers.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	2	Complete inventory; regulatory classification pending for systems that affect employees.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	3	Pilots with control depots; validation by management control.

Overall level: average 18 ÷ 7 = 2.57 → 2; cap: minimum of D1 and D6 (2) + 1 = 3. **Overall level 2.** D6 constrains the result.

Transformation index: 1 · 1 · 2 · 2 · 1 · 0 · 1 · 1. **Profile: Efficiency at scale.**

4.3 Board decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-011	Full board (C2, Q2 27)	Thesis: Optimise in 04 Operations; Transform in 02 Product and service with a transport capacity booking service. Appetite: agents with supervised action (A2) with a financial limit per transaction approved by the committee; no A3 in transactions involving third-party money.
REC-2027-012	Full board	Present the company's position on the use of telemetry to evaluate drivers before extending any system that does so.
DEC-2027-015	Full board (Q2 27)	Authorise stage 1 of IA-2027-015 with a limit of €180,000 and stop criteria.
DEC-2028-003	Full board (Q1 28)	Take note of the stop of IA-2027-015; do not relax the stop criteria.

4.4 Use cases

IA-2027-012 · Last-mile route optimisation. Optimise · Lite · Autonomy A1.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2 (grouped)	Q1 27	Proceed	Sponsor	Baseline of kilometres and hours in two pilot depots and two control depots.
Feasibility (G3)	Q1 27	Proceed	Sponsor with risk clearance	Low residual risk.
G4–G5 (grouped)	Q3 27	Proceed	Sponsor with risk clearance	Pilot exceeds the threshold; rollback to the manual plan tested.
Continuity review (R6)	Q1 28	Proceed	Sponsor	Stable.
Scale or retire (G7)	Q3 28	**Scale**	Sponsor	New phase 0 for six more depots.

Value after twelve months:

Component	Formula	Amount	Status
Efficiencies (kilometres)	610,000 km avoided × €0.62 per km	€378,200	Validated
Efficiencies (materialised hours)	6,200 fewer hours of overtime and subcontracting × €24 per hour	€148,800	Declared by operations; validation planned
Released capacity not materialised	17,500 h released − 6,200 h materialised	11,300 h	Reported separately; **not added**
Recurring cost	Licences, compute and support	€120,000	Validated
Annual net value	378,200 + 148,800 − 120,000	**€407,000**	Validated proportion: 378,200 ÷ 527,000 = 71.8 %
Scaling	Expected additional net value €1,100,000 ÷ additional investment €280,000	**€3.9 per euro**	Estimated

IA-2027-015 · Load booking agent on freight exchanges. Transform (new on-demand capacity service for customers) · Enterprise · Autonomy A2 with a limit of €2,500 per load; above that, a person decides.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G1	Q1 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Fit with the thesis.
Hypothesis (G2)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee and **full board** (DEC-2027-015)	Learning milestone: 400 loads. Stop criteria: improvement in margin per load of less than 1.0 point against the control group, or more than 2 % of loads with errors in the terms.
Feasibility (G3)	Q2 27	Proceed with conditions	AI Committee	Non-critical condition: agreements signed with two freight exchanges before G5.
Design (G4)	Q3 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Limit per load, action log and kill switch designed.
Go-live (G5)	Q1 28	**Stop**	AI Committee	Pilot with random assignment: 520 loads with the agent and 510 in the control group. Margin improvement: 0.6 points (below 1.0). Errors: 0.8 %. Coded reason: *Hypothesis refuted.*

Return measured in the pilot: 520 loads × €1,900 average revenue × 0.6 % = €5,928 (validated). Investment consumed: €165,000. The team asked for one more iteration with a threshold of 0.5 points; the committee escalated it to the full board because stop criteria can only be relaxed by the body that authorised the use case (01 §7.4, rule 6), and the full board decided not to relax them (DEC-2028-003).

IA-2027-018 · Assessment of risky driving using telemetry. Augment · Enterprise (decisions about people) · Autonomy A1: recommends training, no sanctions.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Baseline: 212 own-damage accidents a year in the pilot fleet.
Feasibility (G3)	Q3 27	**Iterate**	AI Committee	The regulatory classification with legal judgement (possibly high-risk because it evaluates workers), the data protection impact assessment and information to workers' representatives were missing. Proceeding with conditions on legal compliance is not permitted.
G3 (2nd)	Q4 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Assessments complete; position approved in response to REC-2027-012.
Design (G4)	Q1 28	Proceed	AI Committee	No automatic sanctions; the traffic manager decides.
Go-live (G5)	Q2 28	Proceed	AI Committee after multi-level sign-off	Pilot with a result within the threshold.

Value declared at six months, annualised: 29 fewer accidents × €3,400 average repair cost = €98,600 (declared by fleet); recurring cost €80,000 (validated); net value €18,600 (declared). Validation planned at twelve months.

4.5 Lessons

1. **Stop criteria set in advance protect the board from its own enthusiasm.** The growth bet was stopped at €165,000 with documented learning.
2. **An efficient company does not need to look transformative.** Efficiency at scale is a good profile; transformation is attempted knowingly and within limits.
3. **Iterating at G3 is faster than correcting in production.** One quarter of iteration avoided launching an employee assessment system without its assessments.

05

Case 3 · Hospital group H (fictitious)

5.1 Initial situation

Fictitious private hospital group with a referral hospital, a network of clinics and a laboratory. Its external communications speak of a "hospital transformed by AI". It has a very strong patient safety and compliance culture, but hardly measures value at all.

5.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q1 27)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	3	Clinical AI committee with physicians and ethics representation; approved mandate.
Value and portfolio (D2)	2	Portfolio with no value in money and no retirement criteria.
Data and knowledge (D3)	3	Clinical data governance with owners and access controls.
Technology and operations (D4)	3	Monitoring and rollback in clinical systems.
People and adoption (D5)	3	Adoption plans with clinical training.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	4	Complete inventory, classification with legal judgement, impact assessments and drills.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	1	Clinical and economic benefits declared, with no baseline or control group.

Overall level: average 19 ÷ 7 = 2.71 → 2; cap: minimum of D1 and D6 (3) + 1 = 4. **Overall level 2.**

Transformation index: investment mix 1 · value mix **no data** (scores 0 and is shown as no data) · materialisation 0 · depth of change 1 · operating model 1 · AI-enabled revenue 0 · progression to production 1 · board decision 0. **Profile: Declared but unevidenced transformation.**

5.3 Board decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-021	Full board (C2, Q2 27)	Thesis: Augment in 03 People and in 01 Customer (patient). No Transform bets in clinical diagnosis are approved until D7 reaches level 3. External communications are aligned with what has been evidenced.
REC-2027-020	Board committee	Measure the value of automatic clinical documentation with a control group and validate the reassigned hours.
REC-2027-022	Board committee	Weekly sampling of generated notes, reviewed by a second physician, with the correction rate reported to the committee.
DEC-2027-025	Full board (Q3 27)	Authorise stage 1 of IA-2027-026 with a limit of €150,000, as a bounded exception to the thesis because it is not clinical diagnosis.

5.4 Use cases

IA-2027-021 · Automatic clinical documentation during consultations. Augment · Enterprise (health data) · Autonomy A0: the system drafts the note; the physician reviews and signs it. Regulatory classification carried out with legal judgement.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q1 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Baseline: 7.5 minutes of documentation per consultation.
Feasibility (G3)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Impact assessments complete; Medium residual risk.
Design (G4)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Mandatory physician signature; kill switch that reverts to manual drafting.
Go-live (G5)	Q3 27	Proceed with conditions	AI Committee after multi-level sign-off	Non-critical condition: capacity reassignment plan approved by medical management within 90 days.
Continuity review (R6)	Q4 27	Proceed	AI Committee	INC-2027-006 (S3): a draft attributed a medication to another patient; detected during review before signature. Action: verification of the patient's identity when recording starts.
Scale or retire (G7)	Q3 28	**Iterate**	AI Committee	No scaling without validated return: back to phase 5 to measure with a control group in four clinics.

Value after twelve months:

Component	Formula	Amount	Status
Released capacity	3.4 minutes × 310,000 consultations = 17,567 h × €52	€913,484	**Not added**
Efficiencies	2,100 h of documentation overtime eliminated × €52	€109,200	Validated
Return	6,400 h reassigned × 4 consultations per hour × €22 contribution margin	€563,200	Declared by medical management; it remains to be demonstrated that the consultations are additional
Capacity not materialised	17,567 − 2,100 − 6,400	9,067 h	Reported separately
Recurring cost	Licences, model consumption, support and review	€480,000	Validated
Annual net value	109,200 + 563,200 − 480,000	**€192,400**	Validated proportion: 109,200 ÷ 672,400 = 16.2 %
Net value with validated amounts only	109,200 − 480,000	**− €370,800**	Validated

IA-2027-002 · Readmission risk prediction (version 1). System predating the adoption of the framework · Enterprise · Autonomy A1.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Continuity review (R6)	Q2 27	Brings G7 forward	AI Committee	First bias test: sensitivity of 0.71 overall, but 0.52 in patients over 80, the group with the most readmissions.
Scale or retire (G7)	Q2 27	**Retire**	AI Committee	Coded reason: *Unacceptable risk*. Temporary replacement: telephone follow-up based on nursing judgement. Model archived with no possibility of reuse. Communication to the clinical units. New use case IA-2027-024 in phase 2 with the age bias test as a G5 criterion.

The value attributed to the system (€1.4M of readmissions avoided) never had a control group and was recorded as declared.

IA-2027-026 · Symptom guidance for patients before their appointment. Transform (new digital patient service) · Enterprise · Direct exposure.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G1	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Patient demand identified.
Hypothesis (G2)	Q3 27	Proceed	AI Committee and **full board** (DEC-2027-025)	Stage 1 with a limit of €150,000.
Feasibility (G3)	Q4 27	**Stop**	AI Committee	Legal counsel concluded that the service could be considered a medical device, with a conformity assessment incompatible with the stage's time limit and budget limit; in addition, High residual risk to patient safety due to incorrect referrals. Coded reason: *Regulation*.

Investment consumed: €40,000.

5.5 Lessons

1. **Excellent compliance is no substitute for measurement.** D6 at level 4 and D7 at level 1 give an overall level of 2 and a profile the board did not expect.
2. **Released capacity is not value.** With validated amounts only, automatic documentation has a negative net value; the reassignment of hours is what determines whether it deserves to be scaled.
3. **The continuity review must be able to retire.** The readmission model had been in use for years and only a bias test called it into question.
4. **G3 is the main stop gate.** The regulatory question was resolved before building.

06

Case 4 · Retail group R (fictitious)

6.1 Initial situation

Fictitious food retail group with supermarkets, an online store and its own logistics. It has had formal AI governance for two years. The board wants to check whether its bet on a new service is working and where to invest the next euro.

6.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q1 27)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	3	Approved AI thesis; AI Committee with recorded decisions.
Value and portfolio (D2)	3	Portfolio prioritised by additional net value per euro.
Data and knowledge (D3)	3	Sales and customer data governed; procurement data incomplete.
Technology and operations (D4)	3	Monitoring, rollback and incident management.
People and adoption (D5)	3	Adoption plans in stores and head offices.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	3	Inventory, classification and assessments up to date.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	3	Control groups in the main use cases.

Overall level: average 21 ÷ 7 = 3; cap: 3 + 1 = 4. **Overall level 3.**

Transformation index: 2 · 2 · 2 · 2 · 2 · 2 · 2 · 3. **Profile: Transformation under way.**

6.3 Board decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-031	Full board (C2)	Thesis: Transform in 02 Product and service (recurring subscription basket); Optimise in 04 Operations (replenishment and shrinkage); Augment in 03 People. Appetite: prices with minimums by category and human review of changes greater than 10 %.
DEC-2027-032	Full board (Q1 27)	Authorise stage 1 of IA-2027-031 with a limit of €600,000.
REC-2027-035	Board committee	Create a data use case to structure the terms of supplier agreements before proposing new procurement agents.
DEC-2028-030	Full board (Q4 28)	Scale IA-2027-031 to all regions and extend fresh produce demand forecasting, in that order of execution.

6.4 Use cases

IA-2027-031 · Personalised recurring subscription basket. Transform · Enterprise · Autonomy A1: the system proposes the basket and the customer confirms it.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Hypothesis (G2)	Q1 27	Proceed	AI Committee and **full board** (DEC-2027-032)	Milestones: 10,000 active subscribers at nine months; incremental margin ≥ €4 per order against the control group. Stop: fewer than 5,000 subscribers or margin below €2.
Feasibility (G3)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Medium residual risk (data protection and personalisation).
Design (G4)	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Control group of 5 % of customers designed.
Go-live (G5)	Q4 27	Proceed	AI Committee after multi-level sign-off	Market evidence: 12,300 active subscribers at nine months.
Continuity review (R6)	Quarterly 2028	Proceed	AI Committee	No relevant incidents.
Scale or retire (G7)	Q4 28	**Scale**	AI Committee and **full board** (DEC-2028-030)	Return measured and validated.

Value in 2028:

Component	Formula	Amount	Status
Return	18,400 average active subscribers × 11.2 orders a year × €6.10 incremental margin per order, net of cannibalisation against the control group	€1,257,088	Validated
Recurring cost	Platform, consumption, operations and customer service staff	€390,000	Validated
Annual net value	1,257,088 − 390,000	**€867,088**	Validated
Scaling	Expected additional net value €1,500,000 ÷ additional investment €1,200,000	**€1.25 per euro**	Estimated

The extension of fresh produce demand forecasting (IA-2027-036) offered €3.1 per euro (estimated). The board approved both and decided to execute the fresh produce use case first: additional net value

per euro sets the order of execution, and the recurring basket was kept because of its role in the thesis. The decision and its reason were recorded.

IA-2027-034 · Supplier renegotiation agent. Augment · Enterprise · Planned autonomy A2: it would record terms in the procurement system.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q2 27	Proceed	AI Committee	Hypothesis of improved terms with a baseline from the latest negotiations.
Feasibility (G3)	Q3 27	**Stop**	AI Committee	Only 22 % of agreements from the last three years have structured terms; the agent would negotiate with an incomplete history. High residual risk of agreements outside the procurement policy. Coded reason: *Insufficient data*.

Investment consumed: €60,000. In response to REC-2027-035, IA-2027-039 was registered, at the Optimise level in sphere 05, to structure the terms of the agreements.

IA-2027-029 · Dynamic pricing of fresh produce close to expiry (version 1). System predating adoption · Optimise · Enterprise in the regularisation: it changes selling prices without individual review (autonomy A2).

Data point	Value
Shrinkage avoided declared by the area	€420,000 (declared)
Shrinkage avoided measured with control stores	€60,000 (validated)
Recurring cost	€230,000 (validated)
Validated annual net value	60,000 − 230,000 = **−€170,000**
Customer complaints about price changes during shopping	1,150 in the year

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Continuity review (R6)	Q1 27	Brings G7 forward	AI Committee	Negative net value and reputational effect.
Scale or retire (G7)	Q2 27	**Retire**	AI Committee	Coded reason: *Cost exceeds value*. Replacement: fixed markdown rules by expiry date (not AI). Electronic shelf labels reused. In-store notice.

6.5 Lessons

1. **Transforming with milestones and a control group produces a defensible return.** Scaling was approved on validated amounts, not on promises.
2. **Additional net value per euro sets the order, but does not replace the thesis.** The board decided knowingly and recorded the reason.
3. **Aggregates hide negatives.** Dynamic pricing seemed profitable within the portfolio total.
4. **An agent without data is a risk, not an opportunity.** The stop gave rise to a data use case.

07

Case 5 · Regional administration P (fictitious)

7.1 Initial situation

Fictitious regional administration with citizen services, taxation, urban planning and social services. In this case, the role of the board is taken on by its **collegiate governing body**, and that of the AI Committee by a digital transformation commission with an extended mandate. The initial inventory finds eleven AI-enabled tools; four had been contracted by different departments without the knowledge of the technology area, including a conversational assistant on the website.

7.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q2 27, first month of the 90-day implementation)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	1	Isolated use cases by department; no body with a mandate over AI.
Value and portfolio (D2)	1	No portfolio.
Data and knowledge (D3)	2	Data owners in taxation and the municipal register of residents.
Technology and operations (D4)	2	Stable operation of in-house systems; supplier tools without control.
People and adoption (D5)	1	No AI training.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	1	No prior inventory or classification.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	0	No value measured.

Overall level: average 8 ÷ 7 = 1.14 → 1; cap: minimum of D1 and D6 (1) + 1 = 2. **Overall level 1.**

Transformation index: investment mix **no data** · value mix **no data** · materialisation 0 · depth of change 1 · operating model 0 · AI-enabled revenue 0 (signal to be adapted for the public sector in document 12) · progression to production 0 · governing body decision 0. **Profile: Scattered exploration.**

7.3 Governing body decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-041	Governing body (third month, Q3 27)	Thesis: Optimise in 04 Operations (case processing). Systems that influence decisions about people are not deployed until D6 reaches level 3, except with an impact assessment and an understandable individual statement of reasons. Digital transformation commission with the functions of an AI Committee.
REC-2028-004	Governing body	Include in the tender specifications for AI-enabled systems the supplier's obligation to allow results to be explained to each affected person and to facilitate bias testing.

7.4 Use cases

IA-2027-040 · Website conversational assistant (version 0). Contracted by a department and in production without a *gate*.

Timing	Event	Decides
Q2 27	**NC-2027-001, critical**: system in production without an approved *gate* and without a notice that users are talking to an AI. Containment within 48 hours: visible notice and restriction to general information without personal data.	Digital transformation commission; board committee informed
Q2 27	Sample of 400 conversations: 9 % of answers incorrect about procedural time limits. Contract without clauses on the use of data by the supplier.	AI Office
Q3 27 · G7	**Retire.** Coded reason: *Unacceptable risk*. Replacement: reviewed frequently asked questions. Conversations deleted in accordance with the retention policy. Recurring cost avoided: €70,000 a year. New use case IA-2027-047 in phase 1, through the full cycle.	Digital transformation commission

IA-2027-041 · Classification and routing of documents submitted to the registry. Optimise · Lite · Autonomy A1: it proposes the competent department and registry staff confirm it; low-confidence documents are reviewed one by one.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2 (grouped)	Q3 27	Proceed	Sponsor	Baseline: external classification service and 1.7 minutes of internal review per document.
Feasibility (G3)	Q3 27	Proceed	Sponsor with risk clearance	Medium residual risk: an error delays a procedure with statutory time limits; low-confidence control.
G4–G5 (grouped)	Q4 27	Proceed	Sponsor with risk clearance	Pilot with accuracy within the threshold; rollback to manual routing tested.
Continuity review (R6)	Q2 28	Proceed	Sponsor	Stable.

Value after twelve months:

Component	Formula	Amount	Status
Efficiencies	External classification contract not renewed	€145,000	Validated by the internal comptroller
Released capacity	210,000 documents × 1.7 minutes = 5,950 h	—	Separate; **not added**
Reassigned capacity	4,000 h expressly assigned to processing licence applications	—	Separate; effect on time limits not quantified in money
Capacity not materialised	5,950 − 4,000	1,950 h	Separate
Service improvement	Average time to reach the competent department: from 3.1 to 0.4 days	Not quantified	It is stated that it could not be translated into money (rule 7)
Recurring cost	Licence and support	€60,000	Validated
Annual net value	145,000 − 60,000	**€85,000**	Validated

IA-2027-043 · Matching of jobseekers and job offers. Augment · Enterprise (decisions about people) · Classified as high-risk with legal judgement in this fictitious case.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q4 27	Proceed	Digital transformation commission	Hypothesis: more people placed per employment adviser.
Feasibility (G3)	Q1 28	**Stop**	Digital transformation commission	The supplier's product did not allow each person to be told why an offer was or was not proposed to them, nor access to the data to test for bias. Residual risk: likelihood 4 × impact 5 (people and rights) = 20, **Critical**. Coded reason: *Unacceptable risk*.

Investment consumed: €30,000. The stop gave rise to REC-2028-004 on tender specifications.

7.5 Lessons

1. **The inventory is the first control.** Without it, the website assistant would have remained in production without a notice or an assessment.
2. **Starting with case processing is a legitimate decision.** With an overall level of 1, the prudent thesis was to optimise internal processes before making decisions about people.
3. **Not everything translates into money, but it is stated.** The improvement in time limits is real and is reported as not quantified, without inventing an amount.
4. **A stop can change the way procurement is done.** The lesson from one supplier became a requirement for all of them.

08

Case 6 · Agri-food cooperative A (fictitious)

8.1 Initial situation

Fictitious regional cooperative with 260 employees, 11 receiving centres, its own logistics and 3 fruit and vegetable production lines. It has a very strong operations team but little digital specialisation, and management wants to decide whether AI can help reduce shrinkage and improve forecasting without creating complex external dependencies.

8.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q2 27)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	2	Cooperative thesis with no formal mandate over AI.
Value and portfolio (D2)	2	Isolated projects with declared value; no prioritisation criteria.
Data and knowledge (D3)	2	Procurement and sales data in accounting and the ERP, with some dispersion.
Technology and operations (D4)	2	Stable production systems; little data automation.
People and adoption (D5)	2	Warehouse and production staff with a culture of continuous improvement.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	2	Acceptable production security controls; AI inventory still incomplete.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	1	No baselines or formal validation of value.

Overall level: average 13 ÷ 7 = 1.85 → 1; cap: minimum of D1 and D6 (2) + 1 = 3. **Overall level 1.**

Transformation index: investment mix 1 · value mix 0 · materialisation 1 · depth of change 1 · operating model 0 · AI-enabled revenue 0 · progression to production 1 · board decision 0. **Profile: Operational and logistics efficiency.**

8.3 Board decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-051	General assembly (C2)	Thesis: Optimise in 04 Operations and in 05 Data/logistics; AI in procurement decisions or decisions about people is not approved until there is a baseline and controls.
DEC-2027-053	General assembly	Authorise stage 1 of IA-2027-052 with a limit of €90,000.

8.4 Use cases

IA-2027-052 · Demand forecasting by centre and product. Optimise · Lite · Autonomy A1.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q1 27	Proceed	Sponsor	Baseline of sales and returns by centre.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Feasibility (G3)	Q2 27	Proceed	Sponsor with risk clearance	Low residual risk; the decision concerns logistics coordination, not procurement.
Design (G4)	Q2 27	Proceed	General assembly	Rollback to manual planning tested.
Go-live (G5)	Q4 27	**Stop**	General assembly	External suppliers were found to have several different ordering patterns and the historical series was incomplete; accuracy fell below the threshold in two centres. Coded reason: *Insufficient data*.

Estimated value before the pilot closed: €124,000 of savings in lost margin and shrinkage avoided; forecast recurring cost €55,000. The use case was archived and the cooperative devoted the following quarter to a procurement and logistics data project to standardise the flows.

IA-2027-055 · Quality and batch traceability assistant. Augment · Lite · Autonomy A0.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G1	Q3 27	Proceed	General assembly	Quality staff have to look up 18,000 batches a year in several formats.
G2–G3	Q4 27	Proceed	General assembly	Human review control and tests on batch matches.
G4–G5	Q1 28	Proceed	General assembly	Response time is reduced and traceability improves; rollback is simple.

8.5 Lessons

1. **Mid-sized companies often have good operational data, but not always consistent data.** Accuracy did not fail for technical reasons but because of data quality.
2. **A data project can be the most valuable use case.** The cooperative learnt that forecasting requires putting data in order before automating.
3. **Useful AI for a cooperative does not have to be large-scale.** A clear problem, a baseline and a quick rollback are enough.

09

Case 7 · Regional hotel group T (fictitious)

9.1 Initial situation

Fictitious chain of 7 hotels, 4,000 beds and 600 employees. It has a small digital operations team and management that is very focused on the customer experience. It has no external consultancy or large AI Committee, but it knows that automating bookings and staff allocation has a direct impact on revenue and satisfaction.

9.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q2 27)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	2	Management with experience objectives, but no formal AI thesis.
Value and portfolio (D2)	2	Some isolated marketing pilots; no portfolio or closure criteria.
Data and knowledge (D3)	2	Fairly good booking and occupancy history; fragmented customer data.
Technology and operations (D4)	2	CRM and PMS with partial integration.
People and adoption (D5)	3	Front desk and management team with a positive attitude.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	2	Incomplete inventory of generative tools; third-party contracts reviewed.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	1	Some occupancy indicators, but no validation of incremental value.

Overall level: average 14 ÷ 7 = 2.0. **Overall level 2.**

Transformation index: investment mix 0 · value mix 0 · materialisation 1 · depth of change 1 · operating model 1 · AI-enabled revenue 0 · progression to production 1 · board decision 0. **Profile: Experience and operations improvement.**

9.3 Board decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-061	Management board	Thesis: Optimise in 04 Operations and 03 People; Augment in 01 Customer. Decisions on prices or refunds are not automated without human review.

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-062	Management board	Authorise stage 1 of IA-2027-060 with a limit of €65,000.

9.4 Use cases

IA-2027-060 · Room pricing and availability optimisation. Optimise · Lite · Autonomy A1.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q1 27	Proceed	Management	The Black Friday campaign and high-demand dates had already been measured.
Feasibility (G3)	Q2 27	**Iterate**	Management board	A clear classification of customer data was missing and a human review criterion was needed for rate changes.
G3 (2nd)	Q3 27	Proceed	Management board	Data and usage policies clarified.
G4–G5	Q4 27	Proceed	Management	The margin increase was above the threshold in one pilot hotel.

Value declared after six months: €212,000 of revenue increase from occupancy and hourly margin; recurring cost €92,000; estimated net value €120,000. The board did not authorise G7 until the effect had been validated with a control group.

IA-2027-063 · Assistant for customer service and incident management. Augment · Lite · Autonomy A0.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G1	Q3 27	Proceed	Management	Reduction in response time and in repeat calls.
G2–G3	Q4 27	Proceed	Management	Incidents with human review and transparency of the answer.

9.5 Lessons

1. **The customer experience can be a sensible first use case for mid-sized companies.** It does not require a huge structure or an external consultancy.
2. **Iterating at G3 is a sign of maturity, not of failure.** The use case was strengthened with a human review criterion and data classification.

3. **A hotel does not need to "transform" to get started.** Optimising and augmenting already have measurable value.

10

Case 8 · Industrial manufacturer M (fictitious)

10.1 Initial situation

Fictitious manufacturer of metal components for the automotive and agricultural machinery industries, with 420 employees and two production plants. It has a capable technical team, management that is strongly focused on quality and a strong tension between customer service and the operational workload of maintenance and planning.

10.2 Diagnosis (C1, Q2 27)

Dimension	Level	Main evidence
Strategy and governance (D1)	3	There is a continuous improvement agenda and an operations committee with owners.
Value and portfolio (D2)	3	Clear priorities by business line.
Data and knowledge (D3)	3	Sensors and traceability in production with a well-organised ERP.
Technology and operations (D4)	3	Predictive maintenance and monitoring already in place.
People and adoption (D5)	2	Some teams with a good foundation; others showing resistance to change.
Risk, security and compliance (D6)	2	Supplier identification and control, without a complete AI inventory.
Measurement and evidence (D7)	3	Baseline and comparison groups in maintenance and service.

Overall level: average 19 ÷ 7 = 2.71 → 2; cap: minimum of D1 and D6 (2) + 1 = 3. **Overall level 2.**

Transformation index: investment mix 1 · value mix 1 · materialisation 1 · depth of change 2 · operating model 1 · AI-enabled revenue 0 · progression to production 1 · board decision 1. **Profile: Service improvement and prevention.**

10.3 Board decisions

Code	Body	Decision
DEC-2027-071	Management board	Thesis: Optimise in 04 Operations, Augment in 01 Customer and in 09 AI governance; quality and service decisions are not automated without human review.
DEC-2027-072	Management board	Authorise stage 1 of IA-2027-070 with a limit of €180,000.
DEC-2028-010	Management board	Stop IA-2027-074 at G5 due to tax compliance and order management risk.

10.4 Use cases

IA-2027-070 · Predictive maintenance of critical equipment. Optimise · Enterprise · Autonomy A1.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q1 27	Proceed	Management	Machinery control groups and failure dates recorded.
Feasibility (G3)	Q2 27	Proceed	Management	Medium residual risk; review by maintenance.
Design (G4)	Q3 27	Proceed	Management	Rollback through manual shutdown tested.
Go-live (G5)	Q1 28	**Scale**	Management board	Reduction in failures and in response time verified.

Value at twelve months: €280,000 of losses avoided; recurring cost €120,000; validated annual net value €160,000.

IA-2027-074 · Agent for managing customer incidents and orders. Augment · Enterprise · Autonomy A2 with a limit of €2,500 per case.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
G0–G2	Q2 27	Proceed	Management	Hypothesis of reduced response time and improved service.
Feasibility (G3)	Q3 27	Proceed with conditions	Management	Condition: human review and traceability of decisions on contracts and deliveries.
Design (G4)	Q4 27	Proceed	Management	Margin milestone prior to service.

Gate	Timing	Outcome	Decides	Reason
Go-live (G5)	Q2 28	**Stop**	Board	A problem was detected with traceability and with the handling of suppliers, with a risk of non-compliance in the most critical service. Coded reason: *Compliance risk*.

Investment consumed: €145,000. The use case was reformulated as an internal support assistant, not as a decision-making agent.

10.5 Lessons

1. **Industry does not need to be huge to take a risk and service approach.** The case combines production, quality and customer service.
2. **Useful AI in plants usually starts with maintenance and service.** These are domains with clear data and simple rollback.
3. **Once decisions about customers or suppliers are involved, traceability becomes critical.** The case demonstrated this and reinforced the review criterion.

11

Cross-cutting lessons and use in workshops

11.1 Cross-cutting lessons

Lesson	Cases
Well-founded stops avoid investment and generate recorded learning.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
Regularising systems that predate the framework often reveals unfounded declared value or unassessed risks.	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
Released capacity is only value when it materialises or is expressly reassigned.	2, 3, 5, 6, 7
The overall maturity level is capped by the weakest governance or risk dimension and is read together with the dimensions.	1, 2, 3, 6, 8
Transform bets need milestones, a stage limit and stop criteria that can only be relaxed by whoever authorised them.	1, 2, 3, 4, 8
At G3 there is no proceeding with conditions on legal compliance: the use case iterates or stops.	2, 3, 5, 7, 8

Lesson	Cases
In mid-sized companies, the first decision is not usually "transform" but "put data in order and put controls in place".	6, 7, 8

11.2 Questions for working on the cases

Case	Question for discussion
1	What would have happened if the board had accepted the Critical risk of the batteries so as not to miss the opportunity? What should have been recorded in that decision?
2	The load agent team asked for the stop criterion to be lowered to 0.5 points. What arguments would the board have for and against?
3	With a negative validated net value and a positive total net value, would you scale automatic clinical documentation? Under what condition?
4	Is it consistent to fund first the use case with the lower additional net value per euro? How is this explained to the market and to the workforce?
5	How would you adapt the "AI-enabled revenue" signal of the transformation index to a public administration?
6	What change in data governance would be needed before trying forecasting by centre again?
7	What human review threshold is reasonable for a hotel chain without a large AI structure?
8	How would you distinguish a service error from a compliance risk when the system interacts with customers, suppliers and people?

12

Associated tools and templates

Name	Use in the cases
Use case register `(T01)`	Progression through *gates*, statuses and coded reasons.
AI system inventory `(T02)`	Initial findings in cases 1 and 5.
***Gate* manager** `(T03)`	Decisions and conditions.
Ambition classifier `(T05)`	Ambition level of each use case.

Name	Use in the cases
Value realisation tracking (T12)	Value tables with status.
Transformation index calculator (T14)	Profiles of each company.
Maturity diagnosis (T15)	D1–D7 tables.
Board recommendations register (T18)	REC and DEC codes.
Retirement manager (T22)	Retirements in cases 1, 3, 4 and 5.
***Gate* decision record** (P29)	Each row of the *gate* tables.
Scale or retirement decision (P30)	G7 decisions.

13

Related documents

Document	Relationship
00 · What SEVEN-G is and how it helps companies	Measurement rules, ambition levels and profiles.
01 · Foundational methodology	*Gates*, decision rules, intensity and regularisation.
11 · Maturity model	Calculation rule for the overall level.
12 · Transformation index	Signals and thresholds pending calibration.
33 · AI risk methodology	Inherent and residual risk levels.
40 · Value measurement rules	Formulas and statuses.
60 · Board pack	How these cases would be presented to the board.
61 · Board conversation guide	Answer format and selection of cases.
62 · Recommendations and decisions register	REC and DEC codes.
91 · Guide for consultants	Use of fictitious cases in third-party services.

14

Version control

Version	Date	Changes
0.1	16-09-2026	First version. Five fictitious cases (energy, logistics, healthcare, retail and public sector) with maturity diagnosis, transformation index, board decisions, the progression of fifteen use cases through their *gates*, value with formulas and statuses, five stops, four retirements and lessons. Replaces the example cases in the previous material, which contained undemonstrable results.