CONVERGENT VALUE PARTNERS™
PEOPLE | IDEAS | IMPACT
Converging Today. Greater Value Tomorrow.

ISSIFU AI VALUE ASSESSMENT MATRIX

I-AVAM™ 2.0

A gated, stage-sensitive framework for AI investment and scale decisions

Developed by **Issifu Awudu**, Founder, Convergent Value Partners™

THE DECISION PROBLEM

AI investment decisions rarely fail for lack of ideas. They fail when attractive possibilities move forward before leaders know whether the problem matters, whether the solution can be delivered and sustained, whether the evidence is strong enough for the commitment requested, and whether the intended use can be trusted.

WHAT I-AVAM™ 2.0 DOES

I-AVAM™ 2.0 gives executives a structured way to decide whether an AI initiative should move from discovery to experiment, pilot, controlled deployment or scale.

It does not replace legal review, model validation, cybersecurity, responsible-AI governance or financial appraisal. It brings their outputs into one investment-stage conversation, ending in an auditable recommendation, risk statement and remediation plan.

FOUR SEPARATIONS THAT MAKE AI DECISIONS CLEARER

Comparison is not permission
A score ranks eligible initiatives. Mandatory gates decide whether an initiative may progress at all, so strong commercial estimates cannot mask regulatory, harm, data-rights, ownership, evidence or assurance weaknesses.

Evidence is judged against the stage
Discovery does not need the evidence that scale needs. Every stage needs evidence appropriate to the commitment being requested.

Initiative readiness is not portfolio funding
An initiative can be ready yet still be deferred because people, platforms, budget or dependencies are committed elsewhere. That is an allocation choice, not a readiness failure.

Expected value is not realized value
Forecast credibility is assessed before deployment. Attributable benefits are measured after it, and the comparison improves future forecasts.

STATUS I-AVAM™ 2.0 is a conceptual decision architecture. It is a transparent aid to multidisciplinary judgment, and its weights, thresholds and predictive performance are being calibrated through a defined research programme.

CORE CONSTRUCTS

Four questions every AI investment must answer

Each indicator has one primary home, so the same weakness is not counted twice under different labels.

S Strategic Attractiveness

Is the opportunity worth pursuing?

Strategic alignment, problem significance, expected benefit, adoption value, time to value and affordability. Records the value proposition, kept separate from the strength of evidence behind it.

R Delivery Readiness

Can the initiative be delivered and sustained?

Data, technical and process readiness, execution capability, accountable ownership and change readiness for this specific initiative.

E Evidence Confidence

Is the information adequate for this stage?

Problem evidence, feasibility tests, prototype or pilot results, support for benefit estimates, transparent assumptions, replication and independent challenge.

T Trustworthiness

Are risk and control conditions acceptable?

Reliability, safety, fairness, privacy, security, transparency, human oversight, accountability, monitoring and incident response, based on documented assurance evidence.

DECISION ARCHITECTURE

Nine layers, nine distinct decisions

Each layer answers a different question, so concerns are never collapsed into a single number.

#	LAYER	DECISION QUESTION	OUTPUT
0	**Regulatory & harm screen**	Is the intended use permissible, and what assurance is required?	Risk classification and specialist-review needs
1	**Strategic Attractiveness**	Is the opportunity worth pursuing?	Strategic and economic rationale
2	**Delivery Readiness**	Can it be implemented and sustained?	Initiative-level execution capability
3	**Evidence Confidence**	Is the information sufficient for the current stage?	Stage-relative evidence ratio
4	**Trustworthiness**	Are risks and controls acceptable in context?	Assurance and residual-risk profile
5	**Mandatory gates**	Do non-negotiable progression conditions pass?	Pass, conditional pass, hold or stop
6	**Scale Decision Score**	How does a gate-qualified initiative compare?	Transparent comparison score
7	**Portfolio selection**	Should we fund or sequence it now?	Funding, sequencing or deferral
8	**Post-deployment review**	Did it create attributable value within control expectations?	Benefit, adoption and incident learning

MANDATORY PROGRESSION GATES

Six conditions a high score cannot override

GATE	PROGRESSION CONDITION
Regulatory permissibility	The intended use is lawful and all applicable classification obligations are identified.
Critical harm	No unmitigable material harm condition prevents progression.
Data rights	Lawful access, permitted use, provenance and retention arrangements are in place.
Accountable ownership	Named business, technical, risk and benefit owners accept their responsibilities.
Stage evidence minimum	Required evidence for the current stage is available and reviewable.
Trust minimum	Assurance controls meet the minimum requirement for the intended use and stage.

PASS | CONDITIONAL PASS | REMEDIATION HOLD | STOP

A Conditional Pass requires named actions, owners, deadlines, accepted residual risk and a reassessment point. Passing every gate establishes eligibility for the next decision; it does not commit investment.

STAGE-SENSITIVE EVIDENCE

The right evidence for the commitment requested

STAGE	EXPECTED EVIDENCE	DECISION SUPPORTED
Discovery	Problem definition, stakeholder need, strategic relevance, initial risk classification	Fund investigation
Experiment	Prototype results, data and technical feasibility, initial assurance review	Fund a controlled pilot
Pilot	Operational results, user response, benefit indicators, control testing	Authorize controlled deployment
Controlled deployment	Repeated performance, integration evidence, operating ownership, monitoring design	Consider broader scale
Scale	Stable outcomes, approved controls, support model, validated benefit case	Authorize wider rollout
Post-deployment	Attributable benefits, adoption, incidents, drift, operational sustainability	Continue, expand, modify or retire

THE EXECUTIVE CANVAS

One page from analysis to governance action

The canvas turns the assessment into a decision record that is visible, explainable and actionable. It adds no new score. It shows:

- The four-construct profile and gate outcome
- Strongest and weakest dimensions and the primary gap
- A primary risk statement and stage-progression recommendation
- Remediation commitments with owners and deadlines

RESPONSIBLE USE

Open about what is still being tested

- Ratings remain partly subjective; independent challenge is built in.
- Equal weights and thresholds are starting assumptions for calibration.
- Profiles and gates must stay visible beside any composite score.
- It supports, and never replaces, legal, technical, financial and executive judgment.

RESEARCH AND VALIDATION

How I-AVAM™ 2.0 is being tested

The framework is evaluated as a decision system, not by its internal arithmetic alone: do assessors interpret it consistently, does it find material weaknesses earlier, do recommendations hold under reasonable changes, and does it improve decisions over simpler methods?

VALIDATION AREA	APPROACH
Content validity	A multidisciplinary expert panel reviews construct relevance, indicator ownership, completeness and rubric clarity.
Inter-rater reliability	Independent assessors score the same cases and agreement is measured.
Retrospective testing	Completed initiatives are scored blind, then compared with deployment, adoption, incidents and realized benefits.
Baseline comparison	Compared with value-effort scoring, simple weighted scoring, checklist gating and unstructured expert judgment.
Sensitivity analysis	Weights, thresholds, rating shifts and missing-evidence states are varied to find unstable decisions.
Prospective pilot	Used in live governance while decision time, reversals, early stops, forecast error and outcomes are tracked.
Recalibration	Weights, thresholds and rubrics are revised through transparent version control as evidence accumulates.

OPERATING THE FRAMEWORK

Nine steps from decision to learning

01 Define the decision
Initiative, intended use, stage, commitment and decision authority.

02 Screen the use
Regulatory class, critical harms, data rights, specialist reviews.

03 Assemble evidence
Stage-appropriate business, technical, operational and assurance evidence.

04 Score independently
Owner proposes ratings; an independent challenger reviews them.

05 Apply gates
Record the outcome for every mandatory condition.

06 Compare eligible initiatives
SDS, dimension results, sensitivity and convergence.

07 Select at portfolio level
Affordability, resources, dependencies, sequencing, opportunity cost.

08 Record and reassess
Decision, actions, owners, dates, residual risk, next review.

09 Review realized outcomes
Benefits, adoption, incidents, drift and sustainability.

MINIMUM DECISION RECORD

What every I-AVAM™ decision leaves behind

Initiative, intended purpose, affected stakeholders and current lifecycle stage	Regulatory and harm classification, legal basis and required specialist reviews	Construct ratings, rubric levels, evidence references, reviewer rationale and date
Mandatory-gate outcomes, blocking conditions and residual risk	Current and proposed next stage, decision authority and recommendation	Remediation actions, accountable owners, deadlines and reassessment point
Cost, enterprise resource demand, dependencies, sequencing and portfolio rationale	Expected benefit, baseline, measurement window, attribution method and benefit owner	Post-deployment benefits, adoption, incidents, drift and lessons learned

Is your next AI commitment ready for the decision you are about to make?

Convergent Value Partners™ applies I-AVAM™ with your leadership team to reach a clear, defensible recommendation. Request an I-AVAM™ Assessment through our website.

- → I-AVAM™ Executive Assessment
- → AI Portfolio Value Review
- → AI Pilot-to-Scale Diagnostic
- → AI Investment Governance Design
- → Executive AI Decision Workshop