TEMPLATE P10 · FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT

Feasibility assessment

Brings together the technical, data, economic, organisational, regulatory and risk evidence needed to decide at G3 whether the use case proceeds or stops.

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

IN THIS DOCUMENT

01 Instructions for use

02 Identification

03 Summary and recommendation

04 Technical feasibility

05 Data feasibility

06 Economic feasibility

07 Organisational and adoption feasibility

08 Regulatory and risk feasibility

09 Check by ambition level at G3

10 Proposed conditions

11 Quality criteria

12 Approval and verification

13 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regulation specific to each sector or jurisdiction may be incomplete, may not apply to a particular case or may become out of date as a result of regulatory changes, interpretations or supervisory positions after their consultation date.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	In phase 3 (Feasibility and risk), before G3, which is the main stop gate in the lifecycle.
Who completes it	The AI Product Owner (economic and organisational feasibility) and the AI Technical Owner (technical and data feasibility). The risk owner provides the summary of P11, P12, P13 and P14.

Aspect	Guidance
Who verifies it	Lite: AI Risk Owner. Enterprise: AI Auditor. If the risk owner has prepared parts of this document, in Lite the AI Office or the AI Auditor verifies it.
Who decides	Lite: sponsor with risk clearance. Enterprise: AI Committee.
Gate at which it is reviewed	Feasibility. (G3)
Tool	It has no tool of its own; costs can be calculated with T13 and value with T11.
Lite versus Enterprise	Lite may omit the fields and blocks marked **(Enterprise)**.

Completion rules:

- Feasibility is **demonstrated with real data**, not with assumptions (01 §6.5).
- Practices prohibited by regulation **do not get past this phase under any circumstances**.
- No Critical residual risk without the approval provided for in P12 may pass G3.
- Costs are **complete**: build, recurring and adoption.

02

Identification

Field	Content	Guidance
Use case code		IA-AAAA-NNN.
Use case name		
Confirmed ambition level		Optimise · Augment · Transform.
Intensity		Lite · Enterprise (reviewed at G3 with P04).
Document version		
Date		DD-MM-AAAA.
Authors		Names and roles by block.

03

Summary and recommendation

Field	Content	Guidance
Technical conclusion		Feasible · Feasible with conditions · Not feasible.
Data conclusion		Feasible · Feasible with conditions · Not feasible.
Economic conclusion		Feasible · Feasible with conditions · Not feasible.
Organisational conclusion		Feasible · Feasible with conditions · Not feasible.
Regulatory and risk conclusion		Feasible · Feasible with conditions · Not feasible.
Recommendation to the decision-making body		Proceed · Proceed with conditions · Iterate · Pivot · Stop.
Main reason		Two or three sentences.

04

Technical feasibility

Field	Content	Guidance
Technical approach assessed		Type of solution, models, build or buy.
Tests carried out		Proof of concept or experiment, with dates and real data used.
Integration		Systems with which it must be integrated and complexity identified.
Scalability and performance		Expected volumes and test results.
Maturity of the technology and the supplier		Stability, support, roadmap.
Internal capabilities		Available knowledge and gaps.
Preliminary reversibility		How it could be stopped or reverted to the previous process.

Requirement	Required threshold	Result obtained	Met
			Yes · No · Partial
(illustrative example) **Correct answers on order status (reviewed sample)**	≥ 95%	96.8% over 1,000 test conversations	Yes
(illustrative example) **Response time**	≤ 5 s in 95%	3.2 s	Yes
(illustrative example) **Resistance to prompt injection**	0 leaks of other customers' data	2 leaks in 300 test attacks	No

05

Data feasibility

Source	Availability	Quality	Legal basis and purpose	Biases or limitations	Action required	Result
	Available · Partial · Not available	Completeness, accuracy, timeliness				Feasible · With conditions · Not feasible
(illustrative example) **Order logistics system**	Available via API	99% of orders with status updated in less than 1 h	Performance of the contract with the customer	Does not reflect issues with external carriers	Integrate carrier notifications	With conditions

06

Economic feasibility

6.1 Full costs

Category	One-off investment (€)	Annual recurring cost (€)	Assumptions
Licences			
Model consumption			

Category	One-off investment (€)	Annual recurring cost (€)	Assumptions
Compute and infrastructure			
Data			
Build staff			
Operations staff			
Suppliers and services			
Control and compliance			
Adoption and training			
Total			

6.2 Economic result

Item	Value	Guidance
Expected annual efficiencies (€)		From P08, updated with what has been learned in phase 3.
Expected annual return (€)		From P08.
Annual recurring cost (€)		From 6.1.
Expected annual net value (€)		Efficiencies + return − recurring cost.
Additional investment required (€)		From 6.1.
Additional net value per euro		Expected additional annual net value ÷ additional investment required.
Horizon set in C2		Is the expected net value consistent with the horizon? Yes · No.
Scenarios (Enterprise)		Annual net value in prudent, central and favourable scenarios, with the assumptions that change.
Status of the amounts		In this phase, normally *estimated*.

07

Organisational and adoption feasibility

Field	Content	Guidance
Users and change in their work		Which tasks change, how many people and to what extent.
Effect on roles and jobs		Role changes, capacity reassignment, training needs.
Readiness for adoption		Evidence: user tests, resistance detected.
Capacity to operate		Who will operate the system and whether they have the capacity.
Labour relations (Enterprise)		Information or consultation obligations and status.
Preliminary adoption plan		Reference to P20, which is completed in phase 4.

08

Regulatory and risk feasibility

Field	Content	Guidance
Regulatory classification		Taxonomy in 03 §3.3, with reference to P11 and to the legal validation.
Prohibited practice		Yes · No. If "Yes", the recommendation is **Stop**.
Impact assessments		Data protection impact assessment and fundamental rights impact assessment: carried out, not required or pending.
High and Critical residual risks		Number and reference to P12; acceptance approval where applicable.
Mitigation and contingency plan		Reference to P13.
Suppliers		Requirement level and conclusion of P14.
Fit with the C2 risk appetite		Yes · No, with justification.

09

Check by ambition level at G3

Reference: 01 §7.6.

Level	What must be demonstrated	Result	Met
Optimise	Positive expected annual net value within the horizon set in C2.		Yes · No · Not applicable
Augment	Feasibility of adoption and of the role change, in addition to the expected net value.		
Transform	Feasibility of the first stage; stop criteria per stage; documented option value.		

10

Proposed conditions

No.	Condition	Deadline	Owner	*Gate* at which it is verified
1				
***(illustrative example)*1**	Fix the prompt injection vulnerability and repeat the test with 0 leaks.	Before G4	Technical owner	G4

"Proceed with conditions" is not permitted for critical security, legal compliance or human oversight controls (01 §7.3). In the example, the condition affects a critical security control: the correct recommendation would be **Iterate** until it is fixed.

11

Quality criteria

The formal G3 criteria are in document 21 (see criteria G3.xx).

#	Check	Status
1	Technical feasibility is based on tests with real data.	Met · Not met · Not applicable · Pending
2	Each data source has its availability, quality and legal basis assessed.	
3	Costs cover the nine categories and distinguish investment from recurring cost.	
4	Annual net value and additional net value per euro are calculated with status.	
5	The impact on people is assessed.	
6	P11, P12, P13 and, if there are suppliers, P14 exist.	
7	There are no prohibited practices or Critical risks without the required approval.	
8	The G3 criteria for the ambition level are applied.	
9	The proposed conditions do not affect critical controls.	

12

Approval and verification

Function	Role in SEVEN-G	Name and position	Date	Signature or reference
Prepares (economic and organisational)	AI Product Owner			
Prepares (technical and data)	AI Technical Owner			
Issues risk clearance	AI Risk Owner			
Verifies	Risk owner (Lite) · AI Auditor (Enterprise)			
Decides	Sponsor with risk clearance (Lite) · AI Committee (Enterprise)			

Segregation of duties: nobody verifies a block they have prepared. Risk clearance and verification are separate acts and must be recorded separately.

13

Version control

Completed document

Version	Date	Author	Changes

Template

Version	Date	Changes
0.1	16-09-2026	First version. Structure aligned with 01 §6.5 and §7.6 and with the cost categories in the common specification §5.7.