TEMPLATE P37 · C5 ANNUAL REVIEW

C5 annual review

Assesses the corporate cycle that is ending: whether the thesis has been fulfilled, how maturity and the index have evolved, what the funnel shows, what has been learned, which thresholds are recalibrated, how the bodies have performed and what is proposed for the next C2.

Fernando García Varela Version 0.2 (working draft) 01-10-2026 Draft for review

IN THIS DOCUMENT

01 Instructions for use

02 Identification

03 Summary for the board

04 Fulfilment of the thesis

05 Evolution of maturity

06 Evolution of the transformation index

07 Funnel metrics and cohorts

08 Portfolio value and cost

09 Consolidated lessons learned

10 Recalibration of thresholds and time limits

11 Self-assessment of the governance bodies

12 Adjustments proposed for the next C2

13 Quality criteria

14 Approval and verification

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regulation specific to each sector or jurisdiction may be incomplete, may not apply to a particular case or may become out of date as a result of regulatory changes, interpretations or supervisory positions after their consultation date.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

> **Why it matters.** Without an evidence-based annual review, the thesis is renewed out of inertia, the initial thresholds are never tested against the company's own data and the same mistakes are repeated in new use cases. C5 is the moment when the board checks whether what was decided in C2 has been achieved and adjusts direction with what has been learned. It is the evidence for the level 5 questions of dimension D1 in document 11 (D1.11 and D1.12) and for the improvement cycle that a management system requires.

01

Instructions for use

Aspect	Guidance
When it is used	Once a year, when closing the corporate cycle; the first between months 13 and 18 of the implementation (90 §6.1). It precedes the C2 of the following cycle.
Who completes it	The AI Office with internal audit (01 §5.1); management control provides value and cost; the AI Committee and the AI Office complete their self-assessment (section 11).
Who verifies it	Internal audit or the AI Auditor, who also checks that the recalibration of thresholds is not proposed to improve the year's result (12 §8, step 4).
Who decides or approves	The board (01 §5.1). Maturity, the index and the proposed adjustments are taken to the board's annual session (30 §3.1).
Corporate cycle stage	C5 · Review. Inputs: current P35, P36, the quarterly C4 packs and the value reviews of the use cases. Output: proposal for the next C2 (new version of P35).
Tools	T15 (maturity), T14 (index), T01 (funnel metrics and cohorts), T12 and T13 (value and cost), T17 (dashboard), T18 (recommendations and decisions), T22 (retirements and lessons).
Reference documents	01 §5.1; 11 §7.1 and D1; 12 §7 and §8; 13 §13; 03 §3.5 and §3.6; 14 §10.8; 43 §8.3; 30 §12.
Lite versus Enterprise	Both scopes use all sections. Blocks marked **(Enterprise)** may be omitted in a Lite scope. In Lite, the stages may be compressed (90 §6.1).

Completion rules:

- Maturity is assessed with **the same questionnaire version** as in the previous assessment, or with a correspondence table (11 §6).
- The index is calculated with the thresholds in force; if new thresholds are approved, the previous period is recalculated and both results are published (12 §8).
- Amounts carry a status: validated, declared or estimated. "No data" is shown as such.
- Lessons are consolidated by coded reason, not by use case.

02

Identification

Field	Content	Guidance
Document code		
Company or group		In the examples, always fictitious.
Cycle reviewed		Period and cut-off date.
C2 decision in force		Version of P35 and DEC-AAAA-NNN.
Threshold version used		Threshold version register in P35, section 14.
Implementation scope		Lite · Enterprise, and whether it should be reviewed (90 §2.2).
Prepared by		AI Office with internal audit.
Review version and date		
Date of the board session		Reference to the minutes or DEC-AAAA-NNN.

03

Summary for the board

One page maximum, using the response format in documents 60 and 61 ("Yes" · "Yes, with one condition" · "Not yet, because ... is missing" · "No, because...").

Question	Answer	Evidence
Has the AI thesis been fulfilled?		Section 4.

Question	Answer	Evidence
Has the capacity to govern AI improved?		Section 5.
Is the company transforming or only becoming more efficient?		Section 6.
Does the portfolio work as a funnel?		Section 7.
What is proposed to change for the next cycle?		Section 12.

04

Fulfilment of the thesis

4.1 Monitoring targets

Those set in section 12 of P35 (the "How we will know it is working" item of the thesis).

Indicator	Value at the start of the cycle	Target	Current value	Met (Yes · Partly · No)	Main cause
Transformation index profile					
Overall maturity level and priority dimensions					
Proportion of validated value					
Annual net value of the portfolio					

4.2 Ambition per sphere

Sphere	Target ambition (C2)	Level achieved	Level in the portfolio	Main indicator (target → current)	Heat map markers (Gap · Outside the thesis · No evidence)
01 · Customer					
02 · Product and service					
03 · People					

Sphere	Target ambition (C2)	Level achieved	Level in the portfolio	Main indicator (target → current)	Heat map markers (Gap · Outside the thesis · No evidence)
04 · Operations					
05 · Data					
06 · Knowledge					
07 · Decision					
08 and 09 (grade by dimension)			—		

4.3 Tolerance metrics

Category	Metric	Quarters in amber	Quarters in red	Escalation carried out (13 §5.5)	Was the limit set correctly?

05

Evolution of maturity

Verified assessment with the same questionnaire version (11 §7.1).

Dimension	Previous level	Current level	C2 target	Achieved?	Improvement plan actions closed ÷ planned
Strategy and governance (D1)					
Value and portfolio (D2)					
Data and knowledge (D3)					
Technology and operations (D4)					
People and adoption (D5)					
Risk, security and compliance (D6)					

Dimension	Previous level	Current level	C2 target	Achieved?	Improvement plan actions closed ÷ planned
Measurement and evidence (D7)					
Overall level					

Field	Content	Guidance
Assessment type		Verified assessment; independent at least every two years in an Enterprise scope (11 §4.1).
(§14) questions answered "Yes"		Out of 10. Status of the declaration of application (01 §14).
Cost of governance by intensity (IND-COS-12 to 14)		Median hours and cost over investment by intensity against the C2 target (13 §6) and referenced evidence. If an intensity exceeds its target, the Express threshold, the reduced list (21 §2.5) or the evidence equivalences (21 §4.3) are reviewed; targets are recalibrated with the measured data.

06

Evolution of the transformation index

Formal C5 calculation (12 §7), presented with the elements in 12 §10.

Signal or condition	Previous calculation	Current calculation	Trend
B1 · B2 · B3			
Signals 1 to 8 (one row per signal)			
Coverage			
Evidenced profile			
Assigned profile			
Complementary alerts			

Field	Content	Guidance
Signals with no data in two consecutive annual calculations		This is a finding in itself (12 §6, rule 5).
What would change the profile		Two or three conditions with owner and deadline.

07

Funnel metrics and cohorts

7.1 Cycle metrics

Definitions in 03 §3.5. Median and 80th percentile where appropriate.

Metric	Previous cycle	Current cycle	Reading
Time in phase (by phase)			
***Gate* decision time against the reference time limit**			
Time to production (registration → G3 → G5)			
Conversion per *gate*			
Iterations per *gate*			
Stalled use cases			
Expired conditions			
Stop and retirement reasons (distribution)			
Ambition mix by phase			
Weighted value (only with sufficient history)			

7.2 Cohorts by quarter of registration

Cohort	Registered	Passed G2	Passed G3	Reached G5	Stopped or retired	Median days to production	On hold or stalled
***(illustrative example)* Q1 2027**	9	6	4	3	3	210	1

08

Portfolio value and cost

Item	Previous cycle	Current cycle	Status	Source
Realised efficiencies			Validated · Declared · Estimated	T12
Return				T12
Recurring cost				T13
Annual net value				
Proportion of validated value				
Released capacity materialised or reassigned				T12, T20

09

Consolidated lessons learned

Sources: lessons notes from each retirement and from each stop at G3 or later (14 §10.8) and reports from the 6- and 12-month reviews (43 §8.3). The AI Office consolidates them **by coded reason**.

Coded reason (03 §3.3)	No. of use cases	Codes IA-AAAA-NNN	Early signal that foreshadowed it and when it was noticed	Total investment and cost against realised value	Proposed change (entry criteria, templates or thresholds)	Decision
Hypothesis refuted						
Cost exceeds value						
No adoption						
Insufficient data						
***(illustrative example)* No adoption**	2	IA-2027-011, IA-2027-015	Active users below 50 % at the 6-month review	€0.62M against €0.05M declared	Require an adoption plan approved before G4 also in Optimise use cases that change tasks	Pending committee decision

All reasons with at least one case are included.

10

Recalibration of thresholds and time limits

Procedure in 12 §8 and 13 §13. Approved changes are entered in the threshold version register in P35 (section 14).

Parameter	Current value	Evidence from own data	Proposal	Justification	Internal audit review (not proposed to improve the year's result)	Board decision
Reference time limits by phase (03 §3.6)						
Transformation index thresholds (12 §4.5)						
Heat map thresholds (10 §8.1)						
Programme traffic light (14 §12.1)						
Maturity weights (11 §2.3)						
Economic thresholds, horizons and bands (13 §5.4, §6, §7 and §8)						

11

Self-assessment of the governance bodies

The AI Committee and the AI Office assess their own effectiveness at least once a year and close the improvement actions (question D1.12 in document 11). The board and the board committee **may** do the same under their own rules.

11.1 Questionnaire

Question	AI Committee	AI Office	Board or board committee (optional)	Evidence
Have the sessions in the calendar in 01 §5.2 been held?				Minutes
Has there been a quorum including the second line for G3, G5, risk acceptances and exceptions (30 §3.3)?		—	—	Minutes

Question	AI Committee	AI Office	Board or board committee (optional)	Evidence
Have *gates* been decided within the reference time limit?			—	T01
Have abstentions and conflicts of interest been recorded, including the members' annual declaration (30 §12)?				T01; declarations
Have matters exceeding the delegation been escalated in time?				Minutes
Have the assigned board recommendations been closed on time (T18)?				T18
Are there expired exceptions that have not been closed (30 §7.4)?				Exceptions register
Has the AI Office verified any *gate* in which it took part?	—		—	T03
Has any use case been stopped or retired with a coded reason during the year?				T01; T22
Overall assessment (Effective · Effective with improvements · Not effective)				

11.2 Improvement plan

No.	Body	Action	Owner	Deadline	Closure criterion	Status (Open · Closed · Expired)
Finding your way around the site (M01)						
What SEVEN-G is and what problem it solves (M02)						

Closure of the previous cycle's plan	Value
Planned actions	
Actions closed with evidence	
Expired actions and reason	

12

Adjustments proposed for the next C2

One row per component in 13 §2. If no change is proposed, "Keep" is stated.

Component	Keep · Modify	Proposal	Reason and evidence (sections of this review)
AI thesis			
Ambition per sphere			
Risk appetite			
Economic impact thresholds			
Enterprise investment threshold and materiality			
Return horizon			
Target portfolio balance			
Reference time limits			
Nonconformity and incident time limits			
Red lines			
Framework budget			
Review and triggers			
Indicator selection (P35, section 13)			Indicators with no data, unused or without a contrasting indicator.
Implementation scope (Enterprise)			90 §2.2.

13

Quality criteria

#	Check	Status
1	The thesis has been reviewed with the evidence on maturity, the index and the portfolio, and the approved changes are applied in the next C2 (question D1.11 in document 11).	Met · Not met · Not applicable · Pending
2	The AI Committee and the AI Office have completed their self-assessment and the previous improvement plan has documented closure (question D1.12).	
3	Maturity has been assessed with the same questionnaire version or with a correspondence table.	
4	The recalibration uses the company's own data, is approved and is not proposed to improve the year's result (question D7.11; 12 §8).	
5	Lessons are consolidated by reason and propose changes to entry criteria, templates or thresholds (question D2.12).	
6	The funnel metrics include the cohort analysis (03 §3.5).	
7	Amounts carry a status and "no data" entries are recorded as such.	
8	Each C2 component has a keep or modify proposal with its reason.	

14

Approval and verification

Function	Role in SEVEN-G	Name and position	Date	Signature or reference
Prepares	AI Office, with internal audit			
Validates value and cost	Management control			
Self-assess	AI Committee · AI Office			
Verifies	Internal audit or AI Auditor			Result: Conformant · Conformant with observations · Nonconformant

Function	Role in SEVEN-G	Name and position	Date	Signature or reference
Approves	Board			Reference to the minutes · DEC-AAAA-NNN

Segregation of duties: no body assesses itself alone; its self-assessment is reviewed by internal audit. Whoever proposes the recalibration of thresholds does not verify it.

15

Version control

Completed document

Version	Date	Author	Changes

Template

Version	Date	Changes
0.1	19-09-2026	First version. Covers the C5 outputs (01 §5.1) and the annual review in 13 §13: fulfilment of the thesis, maturity, index, funnel and cohorts (03 §3.5), consolidated lessons (14 §10.8; 43 §8.3), recalibration (12 §8), self-assessment of the bodies with an improvement plan (11, D1.11 and D1.12) and adjustments for the next C2.
0.2	01-10-2026	C5 review of the cost of governance by intensity against the proportionality targets (41 IND-COS-12 to 14).