

AI ValueForge - Transformation & Value Realisation Assessment

Fictional organisation: Orion Group (fictional) | Date: 22 October 2026

Important: this report is based entirely on fictional scenarios, respondents and outcomes. It illustrates a possible reporting structure; no actual client engagement, independent audit, verification or validated results are claimed.

1. Executive summary

Illustrative context. The fictional Orion Group is exploring AI across three departments. Initiatives exist, but accountability for value and baseline measurements remain unclear. All observations below are hypothetical illustrations, not findings from interviews or systems analysis.

Dimension	Illustrative observation	Evidence status
VALUE	AI initiatives have been identified, but net business value has not been established.	ES1 - asserted
WORK	Workflows have only been redesigned to a limited extent.	Unknown
EXECUTION	Pilots exist; the transition to supported operational use is unclear.	ES1 - asserted
TRUST	Some governance is documented; its application has not been assessed.	ES2 - defined
EVIDENCE & SCALE	The scenario lacks a measurement plan and stop/scale decision gates.	Unknown

2. Decision question and scope

How can Orion Group establish which AI opportunities create actual business value and which organisational changes are needed to realise that value safely and demonstrably? Scope: three fictional use cases, without access to real systems or personal data.

3. Key assumptions and counter-evidence

- Assumption: AI reduces administrative processing time. Counter-evidence may include extra correction and supervision effort.
- Assumption: teams are willing to change how they work. Alternative: adoption remains sporadic without adequate enablement.
- Assumption: new AI is necessary. Explicitly compare it with non-AI process improvements and existing software.

4. Priorities: three actionable steps at most

Priority	Action	Accountability / evidence
P1	Define a measurable outcome and baseline for each use case.	Business owner; reproducible KPI definition
P2	Design one human-plus-AI workflow, including decision rights and exception handling.	Process owner; approved work blueprint



Priority	Action	Accountability / evidence
P3	Run a small comparison: human-only vs human+AI vs process improvement without AI.	Pilot lead; quality, lead time, total costs

5. Measurement plan and evidence gates

All items below are illustrative measurement dimensions, not measured benefits. Decisions should be made only after testing with representative real-world process data.

KPI	Baseline	Pilot comparison	Assessment
Case handling time	Actual baseline required	Human, human+AI, non-AI	Median and variation
Quality / errors	Consistent assessment rubric	Blinded quality review	Error rate and severity
Actual costs	Hours, licensing, operations, review	Total cost per completed case	Net rather than gross gains
Adoption	Current behaviour and usage	Use in day-to-day operations	Measure, do not assume

6. Decision gates

- GO: a better outcome with adequate quality, compliance, adoption and net value.
- ADAPT: promising, but workflow, training or controls need improvement.
- STOP / NO AI: risk, costs or limited added value do not justify continuing.
- SCALE: only with evidence of outcomes and clear operational accountability.

7. Evidence limitations and confidentiality

This demonstration contains no actual interviews, validated scores, verified ROI, customer endorsement or independent audit. It is a commercial illustration of the AI ValueForge output structure and is separate from formal pilot validation in the canonical ModelForge register.

8. Next steps

A real engagement starts with a clear decision question, agreed scope, confidentiality arrangements and an explicit evidence strategy. Findings may lead to targeted organisational change, a pilot, reuse of existing capabilities or a decision not to use AI.