CRITICALITY MATRIX

Which decisions can be delegated to an agent?

LEVEL	Foundation
DURATION	1h45 - 3h30
USE	Framing / Workshop
PATHWAY	Step 3 / 6

OBJECTIVE

Objectively determine, for each type of decision, **how far to delegate it to an agent** : replacing intuition with a reproducible, traceable, and enforceable score, shared across business, technical, and governance teams.

1 THE CRITICALITY FORMULA

The criticality of an agentic decision is calculated along **three axes**, each rated from **1 to 10**. The product is divided by 10 to obtain a readable and comparable score.

$$\text{Score} = (\text{Impact} \times \text{Frequency} \times \text{Irreversibility}) \div 10$$

Each axis is rated from 1 (negligible) to 10 (maximal) · resulting score from 1 to 100.

2 THE THREE EVALUATION AXES

IMPACT

1 → 10

Severity of consequences if the decision is wrong. **1** = benign (rephrasing an email). **10** = critical (health, safety, finances, reputation).

FREQUENCY

1 → 10

Recurrence of the decision in operations. **1** = exceptional. **10** = continuous (thousands of times per day).

IRREVERSIBILITY

1 → 10

Difficulty of reversing the decision. **1** = cancellable in a single step. **10** = definitive, no possible return.

3 READING THE SCORE · THE THREE THRESHOLDS

< 15

AGENTIFIABLE

Delegation possible, light supervision. Autonomy set decision by decision (ACF-02).

15 – 25

GOVERNED AGENT

Bounded autonomy: strict policy, traceability, human control.

> 25

HUMAN REQUIRED

The final decision remains human. The agent prepares and proposes · it does not decide.

To combine with: once the zone is determined, set the **delegated autonomy** of each decision (suggestive → autonomous) in the Decision Map **ACF-02**, then record it in the Decision Policy (layer 2) via **ACF-05**.

© 2026 Vincent Dorange · acfstandard.com/licence

CRITICALITY MATRIX

Which decisions can be delegated to an agent?

LEVEL	Foundation
DURATION	1h45 - 3h30
USE	Framing / Workshop
PATHWAY	Step 3 / 6

4 TWO WORKED EXAMPLES

Customer service agent · replying to order tracking questions

4 IMPACT × 9 FREQUENCY × 2 IRREV. ÷ 10 = **7.2** → AGENTIFIABLE

Finance agent · autonomous validation of supplier payments

9 IMPACT × 6 FREQUENCY × 8 IRREV. ÷ 10 = **43.2** → HUMAN REQUIRED

5 YOUR GRID TO COMPLETE

List your candidate decisions, rate each axis from 1 to 10, calculate the score, read the zone. Keep in the governance file as an enforceable record.

DECISION / USE CASE	IMPACT	FREQ.	IRREV.	SCORE	ZONE / VERDICT

6 BEST PRACTICES & POINTS OF VIGILANCE

✓ BEST PRACTICES

- ✓ Rate with multiple stakeholders (business + technical + governance) to neutralize biases
- ✓ Reassess the score with every major evolution of the agent or context
- ✓ Document the "why" of each rating, not just the number
- ✓ When in doubt between two zones, always select the more cautious one

! POINTS OF VIGILANCE

- ! Under-rating irreversibility "because we have a backup": reputational damage cannot be undone
- ! Confusing low frequency with low risk: a rare case can be catastrophic
- ! Freezing the matrix once and for all · it is a living document
- ! Delegating a red zone "as a pilot" without a real human checkpoint

© 2026 Vincent Dorange · acfstandard.com/licence