# Organisation and people

*How is an AI-first company organised and how does it attract and keep technical talent?*

> *"AI does not, in general, need a department of its own: it needs every function to have a named owner, the builder not to control itself and every agent to have a person who answers for it."*

WHAT IT IS

## Six functions, three separations

Someone must perform six functions: direction, demand and sponsorship, coordination and method, building and operation, control and independent verification. They can fall on a few people, but with three separations that are not negotiable. Coordination, control and verification are the ones usually left without an owner.

**Implication:** Does each of the six functions have a named person in your company?

**Risk:** If governance sits inside the area that builds, that area is judge and party and its evidence does not hold up.

WHAT IT PROPOSES

## AI by default, people where it matters

In an AI-first company every process is designed on the assumption that AI does the work or proposes the decision, and people set the goal, decide on the exceptions and answer for the outcome. SEVEN-G proposes getting there in phases: end-to-end value chains on a shared AI and data factory, with a temporary office that closes.

**Implication:** Which process in your company has an end-to-end owner today, with a budget and an outcome target?

**Risk:** If the temporary office never closes, a head of AI has been created through the back door.

HOW IT IS CHECKED

## People who can say no

Every system has supervisors with a name, training and real authority to disagree; without authority there is no human oversight. AI literacy is mandatory. Adoption is measured by use in the process, not by licences. And technical talent is kept with a technical career, projects that reach production and visible work.

**Implication:** Can the supervisor of each AI system reject what it proposes without asking anyone's permission?

**Risk:** A supervisor who always accepts what the system proposes does not supervise: they sign.

## FOUR QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD

1. **Do we really need a head of AI?**
   In general, no: the chief executive answers to the board, and value, capacity and control are split between chain owners, the factory and the second line.
2. **Does every agent have a person who answers for it?**
   There is an inventory of agents with a human owner, limits and a decommissioning date, just as any person with system access is managed.
3. **What do we do with the capacity AI releases?**
   Each use case decides where the released hours go. Without a decision, the capacity does not count; after 90 days, an alert is raised.
4. **Why are our technical profiles leaving?**
   There is a technical career parallel to the management one, projects reach production and the work is visible, even as open source.

## WHAT FAILS IF IT IS NOT GOVERNED

| WHAT FAILS | LEVEL | WHAT TO DO |
|---|---|---|
| Control and verification functions with no owner | HIGH | Assign the six functions to named people |
| Supervisors without real authority to disagree | HIGH | Give each supervisor written authority |
| Agents in production with no human owner | HIGH | Inventory agents with their owner and their limits |
| Staff using AI without the required literacy | MEDIUM | Set minimum training per profile before access |
| Assigned licences that nobody uses in the process | MEDIUM | Measure real use in the process, not licences |
| Technical talent leaving with no career or projects | MEDIUM | Open a technical career parallel to management |

## FURTHER READING

**How a company organises itself for AI**
Document 54 · functions, patterns and the AI-first company

**Adoption and change**
Document 23 · availability is not adoption

**People and organisation**
Document 50 · roles, literacy and technical talent

**McKinsey: «The agentic organization»**
McKinsey & Company · 26-09-2025



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.*