TEMPLATE P07 · SPHERE AND AMBITION CLASSIFICATION

Sphere and ambition classification

Classifies the use case into an impact sphere and an ambition level using five verifiable questions, and compares the proposed, confirmed and actual classification.

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

IN THIS DOCUMENT

01 Instructions for use

02 Identification

03 Impact sphere

04 The five questions

05 Decision rule

06 Classification result

07 Discrepancy analysis in phase 7 (Enterprise)

08 Classification change log

09 Quality criteria

10 Approval and verification

11 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regulation specific to each sector or jurisdiction may be incomplete, may not apply to a particular case or may become out of date as a result of regulatory changes, interpretations or supervisory positions after their consultation date.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.

01

Instructions for use

Aspect	Guidance
When it is used	Three times on the same document: in phase 1 the **Proposed** column is completed; in phase 2, the **Confirmed** column; in phase 7, the **Actual** column, with operational evidence (00 §5.2).
Who completes it	The AI Product Owner. In phase 7, with the data from P28 (value realisation tracking).
Who verifies it	Lite: AI Office. Enterprise: AI Auditor.
Who decides	The body for the corresponding *gate*. If the result is Transform, confirmation at G2 and scaling at G7 require approval by the board or its board committee (01 §7.5).

Aspect	Guidance
Gate at which it is reviewed	G1 (proposed), G2 (confirmed) and G7 (actual).
Tool	T05 · Ambition classifier (module of T01).
Lite versus Enterprise	The five questions and the decision rule are mandatory in both intensities. Lite may omit the blocks marked **(Enterprise)**.

Completion rules:

- Ambition is not determined by the technology, but by **what changes in the business and where the value appears** (00 §5.1).
- If questions 1 to 4 are negative, the use case is **Optimise**, regardless of how it has been presented (00 §5.2).
- The answers in the Actual column are based on operational evidence, not on intentions.

02

Identification

Field	Content	Guidance
Use case code		IA-AAAA-NNN.
Use case name		
Document version		
Date of the last column completed		DD-MM-AAAA.
Author		Name and role.
Applicable intensity		Lite · Enterprise. Transform implies Enterprise (P04, criterion 7).

03

Impact sphere

Field	Proposed (phase 1)	Confirmed (phase 2)	Actual (phase 7)	Guidance
Primary sphere				01 Customer · 02 Product and service · 03 People · 04 Operations · 05 Data · 06 Knowledge · 07 Decision · 08 Regulation, ethics and accountability · 09 AI governance
Secondary sphere				Same list or "none".
Justification				Where the main effect appears.

Spheres 08 and 09 are not assessed on the three ambition levels (00 §4.1). If the primary sphere is one of them, complete this table instead of sections 4 to 6:

Sphere	Level	Justification
08 Regulation, ethics and accountability	Compliance · Anticipation · Ethical leadership	
09 AI governance	Structure · Balance between speed and control · Supplier ecosystem	

04

The five questions

Reference: 00 §5.2. Answer "Yes" or "No" in each column.

#	Question	If the answer is yes, it points to…	Proposed (phase 1)	Confirmed (phase 2)	Actual (phase 7)
1	Does it change the value proposition received by the customer or end user?	Transform			
2	Is the process redesigned end to end, and not just a task within the process?	Augment or Transform			
3	Do roles, organisational structure or who makes which decisions change?	Augment or Transform			

#	Question	If the answer is yes, it points to…	Proposed (phase 1)	Confirmed (phase 2)	Actual (phase 7)
4	Does it generate revenue, services or markets that did not exist before?	Transform			
5	Could it be retired without affecting the business model, simply returning to the previous cost?	Optimise			

Justification and evidence

#	Proposed (phase 1)	Confirmed (phase 2)	Actual (phase 7)
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Guidance on evidence: in phase 1 reasoning is sufficient; in phase 2, the value hypothesis (P08) must be consistent with the answers; in phase 7 data is used: composition of validated value (efficiencies versus return), redesigned processes, approved role changes and attributable revenue.

05

Decision rule

Apply the steps in order:

Step	Condition	Result
1	Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 are "No".	**Optimise** (rule in 00 §5.2).
2	Question 1 or 4 is "Yes".	**Transform**.
3	Questions 1 and 4 are "No" and 2 or 3 is "Yes".	**Augment**, unless the redesign or the organisational change alters how the company competes or how it is organised; in that case, **Transform** with express justification.

Step	Condition	Result
4	Consistency check against question 5.	If 5 is "Yes" and the result is Transform, there is an inconsistency: it is justified or reclassified. If 5 is "No" and the result is Optimise, check whether the use case supports a critical function (P04, criterion 6).

Steps 2 to 4 are this template's operational rule for the questions that 00 §5.2 leaves open ("Augment or Transform"). Document 12 may calibrate it.

06

Classification result

Point in time	Level resulting from the rule	Level declared by the team	Do they match?	Confirming body	Date
Proposed (phase 1, G1)	Optimise · Augment · Transform		Yes · No		
Confirmed (phase 2, G2)					
Actual (phase 7, G7)					

If the declared level does not match the level from the rule, the rule prevails unless the competent body takes a reasoned decision, which is recorded in P29.

Who decides according to the level (00 §4.1):

Level	Who should decide	Consequences in SEVEN-G
Optimise	Management of the area, within the portfolio framework.	G2 criteria focused on a baseline for cost, time or errors and savings with a formula.
Augment	Senior management, with visibility for the AI Committee.	Performance and cost metrics, adoption target and people plan.
Transform	Board or senior management, explicitly.	Enterprise intensity; board approval at G2 and G7; learning milestones and investment limit per stage in P08.

(illustrative example) Assistant for responding to order queries. Proposed: questions 1–4 "No", 5 "Yes". Result: **Optimise**. Actual (phase 7): the company redesigns customer service and creates a

conversation supervision role; question 3 changes to "Yes". Actual result: **Augment**. The discrepancy is recorded in section 7.

07

Discrepancy analysis in phase 7 (Enterprise)

Field	Content	Guidance
Confirmed versus actual level		For example: "confirmed Transform, actual Optimise".
Evidence of the actual level		Validated value by type, process and role changes, attributable revenue.
Cause of the discrepancy		Reduced scope, partial adoption, change of strategy, optimistic initial classification.
Effect on the transformation index		Signals affected (00 §5.3), in particular value mix, depth of change, operating model and move to production.
Lesson for the portfolio		What must change in the classification of future use cases.

A use case confirmed as Transform whose actual classification is Optimise contributes to the "Declared but unevidenced transformation" profile and must be reported to the AI Committee.

08

Classification change log

Date	Field	Previous value	New value	Reason	Decision-maker
	Sphere · Ambition				

Each change generates a classification change event in the use case register (03 §3.3) and requires P04 to be reviewed.

09

Quality criteria

The formal criteria are in document 21 (see criteria G1.xx, G2.xx and G7.xx).

#	Check	Status
1	The five questions have an answer and a justification in the column for the point in time.	Met · Not met · Not applicable · Pending
2	The result applies the decision rule, including the question 5 check.	
3	The sphere uses the controlled taxonomy.	
4	Discrepancies between the declared level and the result of the rule are reasoned.	
5	For Transform, board approval at G2 (and at G7 if scaled) is recorded.	
6	The Actual column is based on operational evidence.	
7	Classification changes are recorded and P04 has been reviewed.	

10

Approval and verification

Function	Role in SEVEN-G	Name and position	Date	Signature or reference
Prepares	AI Product Owner			
Verifies	AI Office (Lite) · AI Auditor (Enterprise)			
Decides	*Gate* body (01 §7.5)			
Approves Transform	Board or board committee			

Segregation of duties: the verifier has not answered the questions; the sponsor does not confirm a Transform classification alone.

11

Version control

Completed document

Version	Date	Author	Changes

Template

Version	Date	Changes
0.1	16-09-2026	First version. Applies the five questions in 00 §5.2 with proposed, confirmed and actual columns, and proposes an operational decision rule.