TEMPLATE P66 · BUILD ANNEXES WITH SPAD

Build annexes with SPAD

Records the artefacts of AI-assisted building —plan review, implementation rules, test strategy, reviews, fixes, breaches and versions— and links them to the SEVEN-G evidence they feed.

Fernando García Varela Version 0.1 (working draft) 19-09-2026 Draft for review

IN THIS DOCUMENT

01 Instructions for use

02 Identification

03 Contexts and exceptions

04 Plan review (annex to P15)

05 Implementation rules (annex to P15)

06 Test strategy (annex to P22)

07 Test, code and security reviews

08 Fix log (P21)

09 Breach log (Enterprise) (P21)

10 Human review, traceability, dependencies and licences

11 Version management (P21, P19)

12 Correspondence with P15, P21 and P22

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regulation specific to each sector or jurisdiction may be incomplete, may not apply to a particular case or may become out of date as a result of regulatory changes, interpretations or supervisory positions after their consultation date.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.** When design, code and tests are generated with AI, quality depends on the process having been followed: plan reviewed before building, explicit rules, tests defined before implementing, review by a different AI and recorded human validation. The SPAD artefacts demonstrate this, but they are not SEVEN-G evidence until a person references them with a date, version and verification (53 §2.2). Without this annex, the G4 and G5 verifier only sees the result, not whether it was reached by following the process, and code generated without a plan or self-approved by an AI can reach production without anyone noticing.

01

Instructions for use

Aspect	Guidance
When it is used	In phases 4 and 5 when the solution is built with SPAD or another AI-assisted engineering method; in phase 6 for urgent fixes and changes generated with AI. Sections 3 to 6 before G4; sections 7 to 11 before G5.
Who completes it	The orchestrator of the work topic, under the responsibility of the AI Technical Owner (53 §5.1).
Who verifies it	AI Office in Lite; AI Auditor in Enterprise. The auditor may consult the outputs of the AI Reviewer, but does not base the verification on them alone (53 §5.3).
Who decides or approves	Every acceptance of an artefact is recorded by an identified person. The *gate* is decided by the body in 01 §7.5.
Stage, *gate* or moment	G4 (plan, rules and test strategy), G5 (reviews, fixes, versions) and R6 (subsequent changes and urgent fixes, 53 §8).
Tool	T01 (link from the work topic to the use case), T02 (build tools inventoried), T06, T08, T09 and T10.
Reference document	Document 53 (§3.1, §4, §5, §6, §7 and §8). SPAD is an independent methodology referenced from SEVEN-G, not part of it (53 §2.1).
Lite versus Enterprise	Lite may omit the fields marked **(Enterprise)** and group the plan, its review, the rules and the test strategy into one artefact, and the implementation, the tests and their review into another (53 §4.3).

Completion rules:

- **SPAD verdicts are not *gate* decisions.** GO does not mean Proceed; NO-GO prevents the *gate* from being requested (53 §4.4).
- **No AI approves.** An approval without an identified person is null and void.
- **The same AI configuration does not generate and review the same artefact in the same phase.** In Enterprise, the AI Reviewer should use a different model, provider or configuration.
- Each artefact is cited by identifier, version and date; the full content remains in the work topic repository.
- If SPAD is not used, this template works in the same way with the equivalent artefacts of the chosen method, which must meet the requirements of 53 §7.

02

Identification

Field	Content	Guidance
Use case code		IA-AAAA-NNN (T01).
Work topic (*TOPIC*)		Includes or references the use case code.
Type of flow		Main · Legacy code · Security · Debugging · Urgent fix.
Method		Full SPAD · Reduced SPAD (Lite) · Other documented method.
AI build tools		Name, provider, version; approved by the company (P14) and inventoried in T02.
Autonomy level of the build agents		A0–A3 (document 35). If they act on production or personal data at A2 or A3, the use case is Enterprise.
Orchestrator and human reviewer		Designated in P03.
Intensity		Lite · Enterprise.
Document version, author and date		DD-MM-AAAA.

03

Contexts and exceptions

Field	Content	Guidance
Global context		Derived from documents 31 and 35 and from the company's technical standards; version.
Project context		Derived from P02, P11, P15, P17 and P18; version.

No.	Exception to the global context	Justification	Risk in P12	AI Risk Owner clearance if it affects a critical control	Approved in the plan review
EX-01					Yes · No

04

Plan review (annex to P15)

Field	Content	Guidance
Plan reviewed: identifier and version		Logical architecture, components, data flows, decisions and risks. No code.
Planner AI (model and configuration)		
AI Reviewer (model, provider and configuration)		Different from the planner.
Main findings		Coupling, cohesion, scalability, concurrency, security and observability.
Technical verdict		GO · GO with changes · NO-GO.
Human validation		Name, date and result.
Decisions transferred to P15 and flows to P16		Design decisions are recorded in P15, not only in conversations with the tool (53 §7.2).
New technical risks		Number in P12.

05

Implementation rules (annex to P15)

Field	Content	Guidance
Identifier and version		SPAD code guide.
Project structure and conventions		
Contracts between components		
Strict rules and prohibited anti-patterns		
Critical components that require a second human review (Enterprise)		Authentication, authorisation, personal data, payments, human oversight, agent limits, decisions about people (53 §7.1).

06

Test strategy (annex to P22)

It must exist before G4 in Enterprise.

Field	Content	Guidance
Identifier and version		
Critical cases and minimum coverage		
Test layers		Unit, integration, end-to-end, performance.
AI-specific tests		Performance, bias, robustness and security; prompt injection in generative AI and agents (53 §7.3).
Test data		Synthetic or anonymised; if personal, the measures in P11 and P16.

07

Test, code and security reviews

Review	Artefact reviewed and version	AI Reviewer (model)	Findings critical · high · medium · low	Verdict	Human validation (name and date)	Template that records the result
Test review						P22
Code review						P21
Security review						P18 and P22
***(illustrative example)* Code review**	Limit calculation module v0.4	Model different from the builder	0 · 1 · 3 · 2	GO with changes	AI Technical Owner, 12-02-2027	P21

Critical and high security findings block G5 unless the risk is formally accepted (53 §7.4).

08

Fix log (P21)

No.	Finding or problem	Minimal change	Justification	Expected impact	Fixer AI	Reviewed by (person and date)
C-01						

09

Breach log **(Enterprise)** (P21)

SPAD considers it optional; SEVEN-G recommends it in Enterprise (53 §6).

No.	Date	Phase	Type of breach	Tool or model	Action	Nonconformity (NC-AAAA-NNN) where applicable
I-01			Phase violation · Artefact missing or altered · Decision outside the plan · Implementation without plan or review · AI self-approval		Discard and repeat · Return to the plan · Update P15–P18	

If code without a plan or review reaches production, it is a major nonconformity (critical if it affects a critical control). A self-approval used to advance a *gate* is a major nonconformity. Repeated patterns feed the lessons in P30 and, if they reveal an unsuitable tool, P14.

10

Human review, traceability, dependencies and licences

Check (53 §7)	Evidence	Status
Every AI-generated artefact has a recorded human review before the main branch.		Met · Not met · Not applicable · Pending
It is possible to identify which parts were generated with AI, with which tool and in which work topic.		
The key prompts and outputs of plan and review are retained (Enterprise).		
Static analysis, secret detection and dependency analysis run before G5.		
Dependencies proposed by the AI verified (existence, provenance, maintenance, vulnerabilities).		
Software bill of materials (Enterprise).		
Licences of dependencies and third-party fragments checked; match filters activated (Enterprise).		
No personal data, secrets or credentials in tools not approved for that level.		

11

Version management (P21, P19)

Version	Date	Changes	Breaking changes and migration	Rollback plan (P19)	Change record in P27 (from production)

12

Correspondence with P15, P21 and P22

Artefact in this annex	SEVEN-G template	Where it is referenced	*Gate*
Plan review (section 4)	P15	Annex; decisions in section 7 of P15	G4
Implementation rules (section 5)	P15	Annex	G4
Test strategy (section 6)	P22	Annex, as the planning of the tests whose results are recorded in section 3 of P22	G4
Test review (section 7)	P22	Test results	G5
Code review and fixes (sections 7 and 8)	P21	Scope delivered and limitations	G5
Security review (section 7)	P18 and P22	Security results	G5
Breach log (section 9)	P21	Annex **(Enterprise)**	G5
Versions (section 11)	P21, P19 and P27	Delivery summary and rollback	G5 and R6

13

Quality criteria

Formal criteria in document 21 (G4.01, G4.12, G5.01, G5.02, G5.04 and R6.07); checks in 53 §8.

#	Check	Status
1	Build tools approved and inventoried, and the autonomy of their agents classified.	Met · Not met · Not applicable · Pending
2	Plan reviewed by a different AI and validated by a person before implementing.	
3	Implementation rules and test strategy exist before G4 (Enterprise).	
4	Exceptions to the global context recorded as risks.	
5	Test, code and security reviews with human validation; no open critical or high findings at G5.	
6	Fixes and breaches recorded; no approval without an identified person.	
7	Each version linked to a tested rollback plan.	
8	Subsequent changes and urgent fixes meet the same requirements and are recorded in P27.	

14

Approval and verification

Function	SEVEN-G role	Name and position	Date	Signature or reference
Orchestrates and records	Orchestrator (designated in P03)			
Validates the AI outputs	AI Technical Owner			
Reviews security	Information security			
Verifies	AI Office (Lite) · AI Auditor (Enterprise)			
Decides the *gate*	Body in 01 §7.5 (recorded in P29)			

Segregation of duties: the AI Reviewer is a tool of the team that builds and is not the AI Auditor; whoever orchestrated a critical component is not the only person who approves its incorporation; the verifier is not part of the team.

15

Version control

Completed document

Version	Date	Author	Changes

Template

Version	Date	Changes
0.1	19-09-2026	First version. Covers the build artefacts in 53 §4.1 and §6 (plan review, implementation rules, test strategy, reviews, fixes, breaches and versions), the requirements in 53 §7 and their correspondence with P15, P21 and P22.