Implementing the framework

Where to start from your starting point and what is mandatory.

> *"The starting point decides what is done first, not what is required in the end. The framework is implemented in layers: a core of fourteen rules that is never left out and the rest in proportion to risk."*

WHAT IT IS

Implementing in layers

Implementing SEVEN-G is not reading the whole library. There is a core of fourteen rules that every company meets: a complete inventory, a record of each use case, gates with feasibility decided separately, segregation of duties and a board that approves the direction. The rest is activated by triggers or consulted when needed.

Implication: Does your management know what is mandatory from day one and what only applies when a use case requires it?

Risk: Without layers, the company applies the highest requirement to everything, slows down and pushes use outside the framework.

WHAT IT PROPOSES

A roadmap based on the starting point

Six typical starting points, from the company with no AI to the one with agents that act, order twenty-two milestones in five stages: start, organise, govern, measure and scale. In ninety days there is a diagnosis, a board-approved thesis, a first portfolio, bodies and gates in place. What already runs is regularised with deadlines.

Implication: Has your board set the implementation scope, its owner and the date on which it will approve the AI thesis?

Risk: Copying another company's plan leaves what acts on customers uncontrolled, or loads a company with no cases with committees.

HOW IT IS CHECKED

Milestones with evidence

A milestone is met when its question in the maturity diagnosis is "Yes" in a verified assessment. The declaration of application comes when the fourteen core rules are evidenced, with an audit, within the implemented perimeter. It is a verifiable self-declaration, not a certification.

Implication: How many of the fourteen core rules can your company evidence today with verified evidence?

Risk: Presenting the implementation as a certification creates expectations that the first audit disproves.

FOUR QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD

1. **Where are we starting from and what do we do first?**
   The starting point classified with the roadmap questionnaire, its modifiers and the first milestones, with an owner and a date.
2. **Lite or Enterprise scope, and why?**
   A choice based on written criteria (sector supervision, high risk, agents that act, group, several Transform bets), not on size.
3. **Is all AI in use inventoried?**
   In-house, third-party, corporate use and unauthorised use, with a statement of completeness signed by each area's management.
4. **When will what already runs be regularised?**
   An approved plan: first the systems with Enterprise criteria, within six months; the rest within twelve, with a review equivalent to the scale-or-retire gate.

WHAT FAILS IF IT IS NOT GOVERNED

WHAT FAILS	LEVEL	WHAT TO DO
Implementing with no sponsor in senior management	HIGH	Sign the implementation mandate
Partial inventory that misses unauthorised use	HIGH	Take the census from purchasing, licences and security
Legacy systems with no regularisation deadline	HIGH	Approve regularisation deadlines with the thesis
Enterprise requirements applied to every case	MEDIUM	Determine the intensity of each use case
General AI moratorium during implementation	MEDIUM	Stop only what the diagnosis flags
Maturity diagnosis by self-assessment	MEDIUM	Verify the diagnosis with sampling
Parallel governance that duplicates committees	LOW	Extend the mandate of existing bodies

FURTHER READING

Implementation guide
Document 90 · scope, 90-day plan and regularisation

Obligation matrix
Document 94 · core, triggers and layers

Starting points and roadmap
Document 96 · six archetypes and twenty-two milestones

Implementation roadmap
Tool · questionnaire and plan by stage

Fernando García Varela · CC BY 4.0 · Version 0.x, under review

Generic help offered free of charge, with no legal review for any specific case: each organisation adapts it, identifies the regulation that applies to it and is responsible for its own compliance. It is neither advice nor certification. To the maximum extent permitted by law, the author accepts no liability for the effects of its application.