



OBJECTIVE

Put the ACF® framework into practice to **analyze a corporate scenario**, identify risks, define the appropriate **autonomy level**, and design the necessary **safeguards**. This case is completed as a team, card by card.



HOW TO USE THIS CASE STUDY?

1 Read the scenario and context below.

2 Complete each section using the ACF tools.

3 Present your decisions and justify your choices.

1



THE SCENARIO

An **e-commerce** company specializing in sporting goods wishes to deploy an **autonomous dynamic pricing agent** across its online catalog.

The agent must adjust prices in real time to maximize margin and conversion, drawing on internal and external data.

The goal is to improve commercial responsiveness while maintaining competitiveness and customer satisfaction.

2



CONTEXT & STAKES — ELEMENTS PROVIDED

WHAT THE AGENT DOES

- Adjusts product prices in real time.
- Draws on internal data (stocks, sales, costs) and external data (competition, seasonality, demand).
- Can act on the entire online catalog.
- Can create promotions and discounts.

MAIN STAKES

- Optimization of revenue and margin.
- Responsiveness to market and competition.
- Reputational and regulatory non-compliance risks.
- Protection of decisional sovereignty.



LEVELAdvanced educational

DURATION2-3 h

FORMATWorkshop · 4-6 pers.

TRACKToolkit

3

🎯 AGENT OBJECTIVES

What are the main objectives the agent must achieve? Rank them by priority (from most to least important).

| PRIORITY | OBJECTIVE | SUCCESS INDICATOR | WEIGHT % |
|----------|-----------|-------------------|----------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| Total | | | 100 % |

EXAMPLES OF RELEVANT OBJECTIVES (non-exhaustive — tick / complete)

- ☐ Maximize gross margin
- ☐ Increase conversion rate
- ☐ Optimize inventory turnover
- ☐ Reduce stock-outs
- ☐ Adapt prices to competition
- ☐ _____

4

🗺️ DECISION MAPPING

List the decisions the agent will have to make and map them (draws on **ACF-01** and **ACF-02**).

| NO. | DESCRIPTION — WHAT DOES THE AGENT DECIDE? | CRITICALITY LOW / MOD. / HIGH | DELEGABLE? YES / NO / UNDER COND. | ASSOCIATED ACF TOOL(S) |
|-----|---|----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |

🕒 REMINDER

- ✓ A decision is only delegable if it is **reversible**, **measurable and aligned** with the company's strategy.



5 RECOMMENDED MATURITY LEVEL

PAGE 3/6

Which ACF maturity level best suits this scenario? Tick your choice (ACF-04 scale — one value per agent).

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| N0 Classical automation <input type="checkbox"/> | N1 Assisted agents <input type="checkbox"/> | N2 Governed agents <input type="checkbox"/> | N3 Supervised autonomy <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|--|

JUSTIFICATION

Maturity describes the agent's overall framework. Autonomy is then tuned **decision by decision** (suggestive → autonomous, ACF-01 / ACF-02).

6 SAFEGUARDS & CONSTRAINTS

CONSTRAINTS TO IMPOSE ON THE AGENT

- ☐ Financial thresholds
- ☐ Discount ceilings
- ☐ Excluded product categories
- ☐ Fair competition rules
- ☐ Regulatory constraints
- ☐ _____

CONTROL MECHANISMS

- ☐ Prior human validation
- ☐ Post-hoc human validation
- ☐ Continuous supervision
- ☐ Alerts & escalation
- ☐ Kill switch available (ACF-06)
- ☐ _____

7 NON-DELEGABLE ZONES

Which decisions or actions must remain **strictly human**?



8 INDICATORS & SUPERVISION

KEY KPIS TO TRACK

MONITORING FREQUENCY

- ☐ Real time
- ☐ Daily
- ☐ Weekly
- ☐ Monthly

9 MAIN RISKS & MITIGATIONS

For the full probability × severity assessment, see ACF-11.

| IDENTIFIED RISK | LEVEL 1 → 5 | POTENTIAL IMPACT | MITIGATION MEASURES | OWNER |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------|-------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

1 Very low 2 Low 3 Moderate 4 High 5 Very high



LEVEL

DURATION

FORMAT

TRACK

Advanced educational

2-3 h

Workshop · 4-6 pers.

Toolkit

10

PROGRESSIVE INTEGRATION PLAN

PAGE 5/6

| PHASE | DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS | TRANSITION CRITERIA |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 · Test in controlled environment | | |
| 2 · Limited rollout (restricted scope) | | |
| 3 · Progressive extension | | |
| 4 · Full deployment | | |
| 5 · Continuous improvement | | |

KEY WATCH POINTS

REQUIRED RESOURCES

11

SYNTHESIS & PRESENTATION

SUMMARY OF YOUR PROPOSAL

EXPECTED BENEFITS

REMAINING WATCH POINTS

VALUE FOR THE COMPANY (short & long term)



12 SELF-ASSESSMENT & LESSONS LEARNED

PAGE 6/6

Evaluate your case study on a scale of 1 (weak) to 5 (excellent).

Understanding of the scenario

Clarity of the integration plan

Alignment with the ACF framework

Relevance of indicators

Quality of defined safeguards

Decisional sovereignty achieved

WHAT YOU LEARNED

POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS

3 CONCRETE NEXT ACTIONS

1

2

3

13 FINAL DELIVERABLE — TICK WHAT IS COMPLETED

☐ Scenario analysis — stakes & constraints☐ Indicators & supervision — KPIs + frequency☐ Decision mapping — ranked decisions☐ Integration plan — 5 phases☐ Maturity level — justified☐ Synthesis & presentation — summary + benefits☐ Safeguards & constraints — human + technical

FINAL ADVICE

- ✓ Successful implementation rests on the balance between **agent autonomy** and **company sovereignty**. Document, measure, control, adjust.

Tools mobilized: ACF-01/02 (mapping & criticality), ACF-04 (maturity), ACF-05 (supervision), ACF-06 (kill switch), ACF-11 (risks), ACF-12 (mandate). Full evaluation rubric: ACF-14.