JASAE
Journal of Applied Science and Advanced Engineering
Vol. 5 No. 1 (2027) ; p. 1 - 9

e-ISSN: 2985-7252
https://jasae.org/

Architectural Synthesis and Cyber-Physical Integration: A Comprehensive Literature Review

Setyawan Widyarto[1,a*], Arief Goeritno[2], Budi Susetyo[2]
[1] Unisel Admission, Partnership & Collaboration Centre, Universiti Selangor Malaysia
[2] Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor, Indonesia
[a] Universitas Budi Luhur, Jakarta, Indonesia
*email: swidyarto@unisel.edu.my

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received: 6 June 2026
Revised: 22 September 2026
Accepted: 27 September 2026

KEYWORDS
agentic AI
digital transformation
technology convergence
organizational readiness
autonomous systems
governance architectures

ABSTRACT– The integration of autonomous, goal-driven AI agents into enterprise digital transformation initiatives necessitates a comprehensive reassessment of organizational readiness that extends beyond conventional technical implementation to encompass strategic alignment, governance architectures, and socio-technical adaptability. This systematic literature review synthesizes extant research published between 2015 and 2026 across five major academic databases (IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, and arXiv) using a rigorous multi-stage screening methodology. We construct a seven-dimensional readiness framework examining: (1) strategic roadmap alignment, (2) technology stack interoperability, (3) autonomous decision-making governance, (4) data accessibility and quality, (5) organizational adaptability and AI literacy, (6) technology convergence velocity, and (7) transformation performance outcomes. Moving beyond descriptive maturity models, this review makes a distinct theoretical contribution by grounding readiness in established frameworks—including the Strategic Alignment Model, Dynamic Capabilities Theory, and multi-layered interoperability ontologies—while resolving conceptual ambiguities between readiness and implementation outcomes. Practical deliverables include an enterprise self-assessment framework, maturity progression matrices, and industry-specific deployment pathways.

© Widyarto et al.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons CC-BY-4.0 License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Agentic AI systems, characterized by autonomous, goal-driven capabilities that enable independent decision-making, adaptive action, and multi-step workflow execution, represent a paradigmatic shift in enterprise digital transformation trajectories rather than an incremental technological evolution [1, 2]. Unlike conventional predictive or generative AI models that operate strictly within bounded, human-initiated prompt-response loops, agentic systems function as proactive entities capable of orchestrating complex enterprise tasks without continuous human intervention. Empirical evidence supporting this paradigmatic shift demonstrates that while first-generation machine learning (M1) optimizes discrete, deterministic processes, production-grade agentic architectures (M2) introduce autonomous economic agency, dynamic tool selection, and cross-functional workflow synthesis. This shift fundamentally alters the nature of enterprise computing from static automation to autonomous delegation.

Architecturally, agentic AI systems are distinguished from conventional AI by several core capabilities beyond simple autonomous decision-making:

1. Dynamic Tool Use and Environment Interaction: The capacity to discover, evaluate, and invoke external APIs, web services, and enterprise software modules dynamically to achieve high-level goals.
2. Episodic and Semantic Dynamic Memory: Long-term memory stores and retrieval-augmented reasoning loops that allow agents to learn from past execution states, maintain contextual continuity, and adapt plans mid-execution.
3. Pre-Action Reasoning and Refinement Loops: Neurocognitive and control-plane architectures (e.g., Pre-Action Governance Reasoning Loops) that evaluate proposed actions against safety, policy, and domain constraints prior to execution.
4. Multi-Agent Orchestration: The capacity for heterogeneous autonomous agents to assign sub-tasks, negotiate resource allocation, and resolve execution conflicts collaboratively.

As organizations transition from experimental AI deployments to operationalized agentic ecosystems, the convergence of these autonomous agents with incumbent digital infrastructures exposes critical readiness gaps [2]. Fragmented approaches to adoption, focusing narrowly on

algorithmic capability while ignoring architectural interoperability, workforce competency, or risk governance, persistently fail to achieve sustained transformational outcomes [3]. To resolve these challenges, this literature review presents an integrative, seven-dimensional readiness framework that treats technological, strategic, and socio-technical capability dimensions as interdependent capabilities required for autonomous AI integration [4-7].

Systematic Literature Review Methodology

To ensure methodological transparency and rigor, this study followed a structured Systematic Literature Review (SLR) protocol based on PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines.

A. Search Strategy and Database Selection

A comprehensive search was executed across five primary electronic databases: IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, and arXiv (for emerging preprints on agentic frameworks between 2024–2026). The temporal window covered publications from January 2015 to March 2026. Search strings combined Boolean operators with domain-specific keywords across three primary clusters:

1. Agentic AI Keywords: "agentic AI" OR "autonomous AI agents" OR "multi-agent orchestration" OR "autonomous decision-making".
2. Enterprise Transformation Keywords: "digital transformation" OR "enterprise architecture" OR "strategic alignment" OR "organizational readiness".
3. Integration & Governance Keywords: "technology stack interoperability" OR "AI governance" OR "data readiness" OR "technology convergence velocity".

B. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were evaluated based on the following explicit criteria:

1. Inclusion Criteria (IC): (1) Peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, or technical foundational preprints published between 2015 and 2026; (2) Studies focusing directly on enterprise-level AI adoption, autonomous agent architectures, governance frameworks, or cyber-physical integration; (3) Research providing empirical, conceptual, or architectural insights into organizational preparedness.
2. Exclusion Criteria (EC): (1) Studies focusing purely on narrow algorithmic optimizations without enterprise architecture or organizational context; (2) Non-English publications; (3) Short extended abstracts, editorials, or non-peer-reviewed trade magazine columns.

C. Quality Assessment and Synthesis

An initial pool of 1,552 records was identified. Following duplicate removal and title/abstract screening, 322 full-text articles were evaluated for eligibility. Each paper was scored across three quality criteria: methodological clarity, theoretical grounding, and applicability to enterprise agentic systems. The final synthesized corpus comprises 84 core publications that directly inform the seven-dimensional framework.

Agentic AI Strategy Alignment

Strategic readiness for agentic AI integration manifests through the formalization of developmental roadmaps that align autonomous agent capabilities with enterprise transformation objectives [2-4]. Current literature frequently relies on Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) paradigms and ordinal digital maturity scales to evaluate this readiness [8-10]. However, equating strategic alignment solely with organizational maturity presents conceptual limitations. Maturity models offer diagnostic snapshots of operational evolution, but they often lack explanatory power regarding how strategic choices synchronize technology capabilities with competitive positioning.

A. Theoretical Foundations: SAM, Dynamic Capabilities, and Enterprise Architecture

To provide a rigorous theoretical grounding, strategic alignment for agentic AI must be conceptualized through three complementary management and architectural theories:

1. Strategic Alignment Model (SAM): Henderson and Venkatraman's SAM posits that value creation requires alignment across four domains: Business Strategy, IT Strategy, Organizational Infrastructure, and IT Infrastructure. In agentic AI contexts, strategic alignment requires harmonizing autonomous economic delegation (Business Strategy) with multi-agent control-plane architectures (IT Strategy).
2. Dynamic Capabilities Theory: Teece's framework defines enterprise capacity to sense opportunities, seize value, and transform operational structures. Agentic AI acts as a meta-dynamic capability, an autonomous engine that continually senses environmental signals, orchestrates workflow reconfiguration, and executes real-time adaptation.
3. Enterprise Architecture Frameworks (e.g., TOGAF, Zachman): EA frameworks provide the structural blueprints bridging strategic vision and technical implementation. They ensure that agentic workflows map directly to defined business capability increments without creating architectural drift.

Integrative maturity models should therefore be understood as diagnostic measurement instruments nested within these broader strategic frameworks, rather than as standalone theoretical foundations [11, 12].

B. Measurement Approaches and Strategic Roadmapping

Ordinal maturity scales stratify organizations from initial ad-hoc experimentation (Level 1) to autonomous optimized orchestration (Level 5). Recent studies combine dynamic capabilities metrics with adoption frameworks to quantify readiness, emphasizing metrics such as executive

sponsorship, board-level AI literacy, and dedicated resource allocation for control-plane infrastructure. However, quantitative alignment metrics face generalizability challenges due to variations in capital intensity and regulatory burdens across industry sectors [13-16].

Technology Stack Interoperability

Technology stack interoperability determines whether agentic AI components can dynamically exchange data, invoke services, and coordinate actions with incumbent enterprise systems. Current literature frequently conflates various technical integration mechanisms under the generic label of "interoperability". To establish clear conceptual boundaries, interoperability must be structured across four distinct operational layers:

A. Layered Conceptualization of Interoperability

1. Technical Interoperability: Covers the underlying transport protocols, hardware interfaces, API gateways, and communication channels (e.g., RESTful APIs, gRPC, service buses) that enable raw byte exchange between agentic runtimes and legacy applications [17-19].
2. Semantic Interoperability: Ensures that the exchanged information carries a shared, precise meaning across heterogeneous systems. Agentic AI relies heavily on semantic ontologies (e.g., JSON-LD, RDF schemas) to interpret unstructured legacy output correctly and avoid hallucinated action parameters.
3. Organizational Interoperability: Encompasses the alignment of business processes, contractual service-level agreements (SLAs), and operational objectives between disparate organizational units or external partners hosting interacting agentic systems.
4. Process Interoperability: Refers to the real-time orchestration and state synchronization of multi-step business workflows executed concurrently by human workers, legacy RPAs, and autonomous AI agents [20-25].

B. Legacy System Integration and Architectural Bottlenecks

Encapsulating legacy mainframe logic via Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) and microservice wrappers provides a viable interface for agentic tool selection. However, legacy systems frequently present hard constraints, including lack of statefulness, strict rate-limiting, and rigid schema configurations. Uncontrolled API calls from autonomous agents can overwhelm legacy transaction processing engines, necessitating intelligent middleware that implements message queue throttling, state caching, and automated schema translation [26].

Autonomous Decision-Making Governance

The deployment of goal-directed agents capable of independent multi-step action introduces systemic operational risks, most notably "agent sprawl," where uncoordinated autonomous agents proliferate across enterprise networks [27]. Establishing robust governance requires delineating clear conceptual boundaries between governance and related organizational control constructs [28].

A. Disambiguating Governance, Control, Risk Management, and Compliance

1. AI Governance: The overarching steering framework defining decision rights, ethical principles, policy boundary definitions, and accountability structures for autonomous systems [27-28].
2. Risk Management: The systematic process of identifying, assessing, and mitigating operational, adversarial, and systemic hazards (e.g., agent drift, cascading tool failures) within established risk appetite thresholds [29].
3. Regulatory Compliance: Adherence to external legal mandates, statutory requirements, and industry standards (e.g., EU AI Act, NIST AI RMF, ISO/IEC 42001) [30-36].
4. Organizational Control: The real-time technical and managerial execution mechanisms (e.g., runtime guardrails, rate limits, action approvals) that enforce governance policies during live operations.

B. Critical Tensions in Governance and Human Oversight Frameworks

A central tension in agentic governance lies in the trade-off between autonomous efficiency and meaningful human oversight. Mandating Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) approval for every discrete agent action creates severe operational bottlenecks and human cognitive fatigue, often resulting in superficial "rubber-stamping". Conversely, pure Human-on-the-Loop (HOTL) or Human-in-Command (HIC) architectures risk unmitigated failure propagation before human intervention occurs. Modern frameworks address this through Pre-Action Governance Reasoning Loops (PAGRL) and dynamic risk-tiered escalation protocols, where human intervention is triggered conditionally based on real-time transaction value, confidence scores, and policy boundaries [37-41].

Data Accessibility and Quality for Agentic Workflows

Data serves as the operational environment in which autonomous agents reason and execute actions. While conventional analytics systems utilize data passively, agentic workflows query, manipulate, and generate data dynamically. Data readiness must be explicitly conceptualized alongside established data disciplines.

A. Disambiguating Data Readiness from Related Constructs

1. Data Readiness for Agentic AI: A holistic, runtime measure evaluating whether enterprise data assets are accessible, machine-interpretable, contextually contextualized via metadata, and safe for autonomous

agent consumption without human validation buffers [42].

2. Data Quality: The degree to which data values satisfy technical criteria such as accuracy, completeness, consistency, and freshness. (Data can be of high quality yet unready for AI if it lacks semantic schemas).
3. Data Accessibility: The physical and programmatic availability of data via APIs, low-latency databases, and secure network protocols [43-45].
4. Data Governance & Management: The organizational policies, data stewardship, lineage tracking, master data management (MDM), and ingestion architectures that maintain enterprise data assets over time [46].

B. Data Readiness Taxonomies and Dynamic Freshness

Data Readiness for AI (DRAI) taxonomies evaluate data across structured, semi-structured, and unstructured domains. Key evaluation metrics include semantic schema coverage, temporal freshness (vital for real-time edge agents), data provenance transparency, and dynamic context windows. Unstructured enterprise knowledge stores require specialized preparation-including vector embeddings, semantic metadata indexing, and automated deduplication to prevent agent hallucination and decision corruption [47-50].

Organizational Adaptability and AI Literacy

Integrating autonomous agents into enterprise workflows alters socio-technical structures, shifting human roles from task execution to strategic direction and exception handling [7, 51]. Evaluating human capital preparedness requires disambiguating organizational adaptability from related constructs.

A. Conceptualizing Organizational Adaptability

1. Organizational Adaptability (in Agentic Contexts): The structural, cultural, and cognitive capacity of an enterprise and its workforce to continuously reconfigure business processes, job roles, and collaborative routines in response to autonomous AI delegation.
2. Organizational Agility: The speed with which an organization responds to market changes and strategic opportunities.
3. Organizational Resilience: The operational capacity to withstand, absorb, and recover from systemic shocks or disruptions.
4. Change Readiness: The psychological and operational preparedness of employees to undergo a specific organizational restructuring.
5. Digital Literacy vs. Agentic AI Literacy: While digital literacy focuses on operating digital software tools, Agentic AI Literacy encompasses prompt design, output verification, delegation management, ethical oversight, and human-agent task co-regulation [52-53].

B. Competency Frameworks and Cultural Transformation

The Agentic AI Literacy Framework (AALF) outlines competency progression across three levels: Operational Understanding, Delegated Management, and Strategic Orchestration. A key barrier to organizational adaptability is cognitive trust calibration preventing both over-reliance (uncritical acceptance of agent actions) and under-reliance (rejection of autonomous capabilities due to lack of transparency). Cultural transformation requires continuous skill upgrading, transparent change communication, and structured human-AI collaboration protocols [54-62].

Technology Convergence Velocity

Technology convergence velocity measures the temporal rate at which agentic AI integrates with complementary technological domains-specifically Cloud-Edge Computing, the Internet of Things (IoT), and Blockchain to create unified cyber-physical ecosystems [63].

A. Theoretical Underpinnings of Convergence Velocity

Convergence velocity is grounded theoretically in Technological Paradigm Shifts (Perez) and Ecosystem Orchestration Theory. These theories posit that exponential economic value emerges when complementary technology trajectories intersect. Agentic AI acts as the primary orchestration engine across these domains:

1. IoT provides dynamic environmental sensing and physical actuation capabilities [64-65].
2. Cloud-Edge Continua provide scalable, low-latency computational execution environments.
3. Blockchain provides decentralized trust, immutable audit logs, and automated smart-contract settlement for agent transactions.

Conceptualizing convergence velocity as a readiness dimension (an input capability) rather than merely an implementation outcome is essential. An organization's baseline capacity to ingest, process, and synchronize multi-technology data streams dictates whether agentic AI can be operationalized safely. High convergence velocity enables real-time decision-making, whereas low velocity creates operational latency bottlenecks [66-69].

B. Architectural Bottlenecks and Ecosystem Limitations

Cross-technology convergence introduces complex systemic challenges. Edge computing nodes constrained by power and memory struggle to host local agent reasoning loops. Furthermore, integrating non-deterministic agent outputs with immutable blockchain smart contracts creates operational friction. Establishing standardized messaging protocols across these four domains remains a prerequisite for achieving high convergence velocity [70-72].

Agentic AI Performance in Transformation Contexts

Evaluating the performance of agentic AI deployments requires moving beyond traditional software metrics (e.g., system uptime, API response latency, simple throughput) toward outcome-oriented frameworks that account for

autonomous decision quality and adaptive goal pursuit [73-77]

A. Evaluation Frameworks: Dynamic Autonomy Balanced Scorecard (DABS)

Given the absence of universal metrics, enterprise performance evaluation is best structured through an adapted Dynamic Autonomy Balanced Scorecard (DABS) spanning four primary dimensions [77, 78]:

1. Financial & ROI Perspective: Direct cost savings, process throughput speedups, resource optimization efficiency, and return on autonomous capital [75, 77, 81.
2. Operational Process Perspective: Autonomous goal completion rates, error-recovery frequency without human escalation, and cycle-time reduction in multi-step workflows [73, 78, 80].
3. Customer & Experience Perspective: Response personalization, service latency reduction, and seamless escalation resolution.
4. Learning, Governance & Adaptability Perspective: Agent drift frequency, human oversight efficiency, policy compliance rates, and system adaptability to schema shifts [80-82].

B. Comparative Analysis: Agentic vs. Non-Agentic Automation

Unlike deterministic Robotic Process Automation (RPA) that follows fixed logical scripts, agentic AI dynamically formulates execution steps based on goal criteria. While RPA excels at static, high-volume tasks, agentic systems excel in dynamic, ambiguous environments requiring context adaptation. Performance evaluation must account for this non-deterministic flexibility, balancing performance efficiency against the governance costs of continuous runtime monitoring.

Practical Implementation and Managerial Guidance

To translate this theoretical framework into actionable organizational practice, this section provides implementation pathways, self-assessment mechanisms, and sector-specific considerations.

A. Resource-Constrained Prioritization Pathway

For small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs) or resource-constrained environments, attempting simultaneous advancement across all seven dimensions is unfeasible. Organizations should follow a phased, capability-dependent sequence:

B. Enterprise Self-Assessment Diagnostic Questions

Organizations can evaluate their preparedness across each dimension using targeted diagnostic queries:

1. D1 (Strategy): Is the agentic deployment mapped to formal business capabilities via TOGAF/SAM frameworks rather than isolated pilot projects? [2, 4]
2. D2 (Interoperability): Are system interfaces standardized across technical, semantic, and process layers to prevent legacy bottlenecking? [18, 25]
3. D3 (Governance): Are Pre-Action Governance Reasoning Loops (PAGRL) implemented to intercept policy-violating agent actions prior to execution? [28, 38]
4. D4 (Data Readiness): Are real-time data pipelines and semantic metadata schemas available to supply context to autonomous agents? [42, 45]
5. D5 (Adaptability): Has workforce training transitioned from basic software usage to delegated autonomy management and ethical oversight? [52, 53]
6. D6 (Convergence): Can the technical infrastructure orchestrate multi-technology events across Cloud, Edge, IoT, and distributed ledgers efficiently? [63, 67]
7. D7 (Performance): Are outcome metrics evaluated through dynamic frameworks (e.g., DABS) that measure decision quality alongside task speed? [77, 78]

C. Sector-Specific Implementation Considerations

1. Healthcare Settings: Prioritizes Dimension 3 (Governance) and Dimension 4 (Data Readiness). Zero-trust data access, strict HIPAA/GDPR regulatory compliance, zero-hallucination thresholds, and explicit Human-in-Command (HIC) protocols for clinical decision support are mandatory prerequisites.
2. Manufacturing & Industry 4.0 Settings: Prioritizes Dimension 2 (Interoperability) and Dimension 6 (Convergence Velocity). Success depends on real-time sub-millisecond edge compute integration, sensor data ingestion via IoT, and process interoperability across legacy Manufacturing Execution Systems (MES) and enterprise ERPs.

Framework Synthesis and Maturity Matrices

Table 1 consolidates the seven readiness dimensions examined throughout this review, linking each to its core definitional scope, theoretical foundations, and representative operational metrics. Table 2 extends this synthesis into a five-level maturity progression that organizations can use to benchmark current capability and plan advancement across each dimension.

Table 1. Summary of the Seven Dimensions of Agentic AI Readiness

Dimension	Core Definition & Scope	Theoretical Foundations	Key Operational Metrics / KPIs
1. Strategy Alignment	Alignment of autonomous agent capabilities with enterprise transformation roadmaps.	Strategic Alignment Model (SAM), Dynamic Capabilities, TOGAF.	Executive sponsorship index; EA capability mapping completeness.
2. Interoperability	Multilayered capacity of agent runtimes to exchange data and execute legacy operations.	Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA), Domain-Driven Design.	API coverage %; semantic schema mapping accuracy; interface latency.
3. Governance	Systemic steering, ethical boundaries, policy controls, and regulatory risk management.	Control-by-Design, NIST AI RMF, ISO 42001, PAGRL.	Policy guardrail compliance %; agent drift rate; intervention latency.
4. Data Readiness	Real-time fitness of enterprise data assets for autonomous agent reasoning.	Data Readiness for AI (DRAI), Master Data Management.	Real-time freshness latency; vector schema coverage; data provenance score.
5. Adaptability	Workforce capacity to delegate tasks, oversee agents, and reconfigure business processes.	Socio-Technical Systems Theory, Agentic AI Literacy (AALF).	Human-AI trust calibration index; AALF competency score; retrained staff %.
6. Convergence Velocity	Temporal rate of multi-technology integration across Cloud, Edge, IoT, and Blockchain.	Technological Paradigm Shifts, Ecosystem Orchestration.	Cross-technology event sync speed; edge processing latency; API throughput.
7. Performance Outcomes	Realization of adaptive business value and operational speedups over conventional systems.	Dynamic Autonomy Balanced Scorecard (DABS).	Autonomous goal completion rate; ROI multiplier; process cycle time reduction.

Table 2. Agentic AI Readiness Maturity Progression Across Dimensions

Dimension	Level 1: Ad-Hoc / Initial	Level 2: Repeatable	Level 3: Defined & Standardized	Level 4: Managed & Quantitative	Level 5: Optimized Autonomous
1. Strategy	Isolated, uncoordinated agent experiments.	Departmental pilot roadmaps established.	Strategic alignment mapped to EA frameworks.	Dynamic strategy alignment tuned to market shifts.	Continuous autonomous strategy-execution alignment.
2. Interoperability	Custom point-to-point scripts; manual data entry.	Basic RESTful wrapper APIs around legacy code.	Standardized SOA/gRPC with semantic JSON-LD.	Multi-layer interoperability across process layers.	Self-healing dynamic API discovery and negotiation.
3. Governance	No formal agent controls; unmonitored execution.	Post-hoc manual audit logging.	Standardized policy guardrails and HITL approval.	Real-time PAGRL control-plane interception.	Fully dynamic, continuous automated policy enforcement.
4. Data Readiness	Siloed, unstructured, and unvalidated data assets.	Batch data cleaning and basic vector indexing.	Enterprise Master Data Management for AI.	Real-time data streaming pipelines with provenance.	Self-correcting, autonomous semantic knowledge graphs.
5. Adaptability	Widespread user resistance or over-reliance.	Basic prompt engineering workshops.	Formal AALF training across workforce tiers.	High human-AI trust calibration and co-regulation.	Seamless socio-technical human-agent teaming.
6. Convergence	Isolated single-cloud agent deployments.	Partial cloud-edge data streaming.	Orchestrated Cloud-Edge-IoT sensor pipelines.	High-velocity sync with smart contract locks.	Autonomous cyber-physical ecosystem orchestration.
7. Performance	No performance tracking; purely anecdotal.	Basic task completion speed tracking.	KPI tracking using standard process metrics.	Quantified evaluation via adapted DABS frameworks.	Continuous self-optimizing ROI acceleration.

Conclusion

This systematic review synthesizes research on enterprise agentic AI integration into a unified seven-dimensional readiness framework. By explicitly disambiguating core constructs, including strategic alignment, interoperability layers, governance limits, data readiness, and organizational adaptability, this work addresses theoretical gaps in existing digital maturity literature. Effective agentic AI deployment requires synchronized maturity across all seven dimensions, with governance guardrails and data readiness serving as foundational boundaries for autonomous operation. Future empirical research should validate these maturity matrices across diverse industry verticals and establish standardized long-term benchmarks for measuring human-agent collaboration outcomes.

Author Contributions

S.W.: Conceptualization, methodology, framework design, systematic literature review execution, primary writing and editing. A.G.: Technical validation of enterprise architecture, interoperability layers, and multi-technology convergence velocity. B.S.: Review of governance frameworks, risk control structures, performance scorecards, and project supervision.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their appreciation to the peer reviewers for their insightful feedback, which significantly enhanced the rigor, structural clarity, and theoretical depth of this manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing financial or personal interests.

References

[1] S. Alvarez-Telena and M. Diez-Fernandez, "Advances in agentic AI: Back to the future," arXiv:2512.24856, 2025.

[2] J. Holmström, "From AI to digital transformation: The AI readiness framework," *Business Horizons*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 329–339, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2021.03.006.

[3] D. Dey and D. Ghose, "Integrating AI adoption frameworks with digital maturity models: Strategic pathways in a rapidly evolving technological landscape," *Journal of Contemporary Business Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 156–170, 2025.

[4] M. Kumar, M. G. Taj, A. Zevalov, R. Bhetwal, K. V. Kanani, and M. Rahman, "Maturity model taxonomy for digital transformation," in *Proc. 2023 IEEE 12th International Conference on Intelligent Data Acquisition and Advanced Computing Systems: Technology and Applications (IDAACS)*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/IDAACS58523.2023.10348792.

[5] S. Berghaus and A. Back, "Gestaltungsbereiche der digitalen Transformation von Unternehmen: Entwicklung eines Reifegradmodells," *Die Unternehmung*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 98–123, 2016, doi: 10.5771/0042-059X-2016-2-98.

[6] M. Palade and G. Carutasu, "Organizational readiness for artificial intelligence adoption," *Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnica University of Timisoara, Transactions on Engineering and Management*, vol. 7, nos. 1–2, 2021, doi: 10.59168/FDMS6321.

[7] P. Frangos, "An integrative literature review on leadership and organizational readiness for AI," in *Proc. 4th European Conference on the Impact of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2022, pp. 145–152, doi: 10.34190/icair.4.1.834.

[8] R. B. Sadiq, N. Safie, A. H. A. Rahman, and S. Goudarzi, "Artificial intelligence maturity model: A systematic literature review," *PeerJ Computer Science*, vol. 7, Art. no. e661, 2021, doi: 10.7717/peerj-cs.661.

[9] T. Schuster, L. Waidelich, and R. Volz, "Maturity models for the assessment of artificial intelligence in small and medium-sized enterprises," in *Digital Transformation*. Springer, 2021, pp. 22–36.

[10] F. Rego, J. Rodrigues, and P. Ruivo, "Evaluating enablers for digital transformation readiness and resulting benefits," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 239, pp. 307–313, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2024.06.176.

[11] M. Zohaib, M. A. Akbar, S. Hyrynsalmi, and A. A. Khan, "Agentic AI in 6G software businesses: A layered maturity model," in *Proc. 2025 International Conference on Frontiers of Information Technology (FIT)*, 2025, pp. 1–6, doi: 10.1109/FIT67061.2025.11333593.

[12] S. Zhou, "AI empowerment and measurement: Reconstructing the enterprise digital maturity model and its implications for service ecosystem," *Frontiers in Sustainable Development*, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 173–180, 2025, doi: 10.54691/tt5b9s51.

[13] S. M. Hosseininasab, "A maturity-driven selection model for effective digital transformation governance mechanisms in large organizations," *Kybernetes*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 5106–5132, 2025, doi: 10.1108/K-10-2023-2136.

[14] I. Krakovskaya, J. Korokoshko, and Y. Slushkina, "Digital maturity of industrial enterprises: Evaluation experience," *St. Petersburg University Journal of Economic Studies*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 433–459, 2024, doi: 10.21638/spbu05.2024.305.

[15] C. Uba, T. Lewandowski, and T. Böhmann, "The AI-based transformation of organizations: The 3D-model for guiding enterprise-wide AI change," in *Proc. 56th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*, 2023, pp. 6129–6138, doi: 10.24251/HICSS.2023.182.

[16] A. Landeta Echeberria, "AI integration in the digital transformation strategy," in *Artificial Intelligence for Business*. Springer, 2022, pp. 115–140.

[17] X. An-Ping, W. Hua-Jing, and Q. Zhong, "Research on integration method of legacy systems based on service-oriented architecture," *Computer Engineering and Applications*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 80–83, 2008.

[18] G. A. Lewis and L. Wrage, "Approaches to constructive interoperability," Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, Tech. Rep. CMU/SEI-2004-TR-020, 2004.

[19] S. Kuppuraju, A. Kumar, and G. P. Kumari, "Case study to verify the interoperability of a service oriented architecture stack," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Services Computing (SCC)*, 2007, pp. 678–679, doi: 10.1109/SCC.2007.39.

[20] J. Pękala, "Some aspects of interoperability of enterprise and manufacturing systems," *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, vol. 613, pp. 368–375, 2014.

[21] X. Xiang-rong, G. Xin-jian, and Y. Zuo-liang, "Research on interoperability of enterprise system integration and application in distributed parts library," *Manufacturing Automation*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 12–16, 2006.

[22] N. Maddukuri, "The transformative impact of AI on modern system integration," *International Journal of Scientific*

Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 229–236, 2025, doi: 10.32628/CSEIT25111218.

[23] P. K. Chakilam, "Interoperability in healthcare: Leveraging enterprise integration architecture for seamless data exchange," *European Modern Studies Journal*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 652–661, 2025, doi: 10.59573/emsj.9(4).2025.63.

[24] D. Chanda, "AI based data architecture impact analysis," *EasyChair Preprint Series*, no. 1124, 2019.

[25] A. Liapis, S. Christiaens, P. De Leenheer, and R. Meersman, "Collaboration across the enterprise: An ontology based approach for enterprise interoperability," in *Semantic Enterprise Application Integration for Business Processes*. IGI Global, 2010, pp. 1–18, doi: 10.4018/978-1-60566-804-8.ch001.

[26] C. Gaie, "From secured legacy systems to interoperable services: The careful evolution of the French tax administration to provide new possibilities while ensuring the primary tax recovering objective," *International Journal of Computational Systems Engineering*, 2020, doi: 10.1504/IJCSYSE.2020.111204.

[27] V. Acharya, "Governing the agentic enterprise: A governance maturity model for managing AI agent sprawl in business operations," arXiv:2604.16338, 2026.

[28] K. Huang, J. Huang, Y. Mehmood, H. Atta, M. Z. Baig, and M. A. U. Haq, "AAGATE: A NIST AI RMF-aligned governance platform for agentic AI," arXiv:2510.25863, 2025.

[29] P. S. Nwachukwu, O. K. Chima, and C. H. Okolo, "The artificial intelligence governance framework for finance: A control-by-design approach to algorithmic decision-making in accounting," *Finance & Accounting Research Journal*, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 350–379, 2025, doi: 10.51594/farj.v7i8.2016.

[30] G. Falco *et al.*, "Governing AI safety through independent audits," *Nature Machine Intelligence*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 566–571, 2021, doi: 10.1038/s42256-021-00370-7.

[31] M. Sloane and E. Moss, "Assessing the assessment: Comparing algorithmic impact assessments and AI audits," SSRN, 2023, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4486259.

[32] E. P. Goodman and J. Trehu, "AI audit washing and accountability," SSRN, 2022, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4227350.

[33] V. Damen, M. Wiersma, G. Aydin, and R. van Haasteren, "Explainable AI for EU AI Act compliance audits," *Maandblad voor Accountancy en Bedrijfseconomie*, vol. 99, no. 4, pp. 231–242, 2025, doi: 10.5117/mab.99.150303.

[34] M. Dokumacı, "Legal frameworks for AI regulations," *Human Computer Interaction*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2024, doi: 10.62802/ytst2927.

[35] E. Kazim, D. M. T. Denny, and A. Koshiyama, "AI auditing and impact assessment: According to the UK information commissioner's office," *AI and Ethics*, vol. 1, pp. 301–310, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s43681-021-00039-2.

[36] D. Dey and D. Bhaumik, "APPRAISE: A governance framework for innovation with artificial intelligence systems," *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 328–340, 2024, doi: 10.1609/aies.v7i1.31640.

[37] L. Kandikatla and B. Radeljic, "AI and human oversight: A risk-based framework for alignment," arXiv:2510.09090, 2025.

[38] E. Bandara *et al.*, "Think before you act: A neurocognitive governance model for autonomous AI agents," arXiv:2604.25684, 2026.

[39] B. H. Kang, W. Yang, and M. B. Amin, "Trustworthy orchestration artificial intelligence by the ten criteria with control-plane governance," arXiv:2512.10304, 2025.

[40] R. Abulibdeh *et al.*, "Who's really in the loop? Rethinking oversight in AI-assisted health care," *The Lancet*, vol. 407, no. 10545, pp. 2340–2344, 2026, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(26)00204-7.

[41] Z. Engin, "Human-AI governance (HAIG): A trust-utility approach," *Journal of Responsible Technology*, vol. 26, Art. no. 100167, 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.jrt.2026.100167.

[42] K. Hiniduma, S. Byna, and J. L. Bez, "Data readiness for AI: A 360-degree survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 57, no. 9, Art. no. 219, pp. 1–39, 2025, doi: 10.1145/3722214.

[43] F. Alborzi, R. Chirkova, J. Doyle, and Y. Fathi, "Determining query readiness for structured data," in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 9263. Springer, 2015, pp. 3–14, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-22729-0_1.

[44] M. Y. Ng *et al.*, "Perceptions of data set experts on important characteristics of health data sets ready for machine learning," *JAMA Network Open*, vol. 6, no. 12, Art. no. e2345892, 2023, doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.45892.

[45] B. J. Douthit, G. Del Fiol, C. J. Staes, S. L. Docherty, and R. L. Richesson, "A conceptual framework of data readiness: The contextual intersection of quality, availability, interoperability, and provenance," *Applied Clinical Informatics*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 675–685, 2021.

[46] S. P. Singh, "The critical role of master data management in AI readiness," *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1516–1532, 2025, doi: 10.30574/wjaets.2025.15.1.0353.

[47] W. Brewer, P. Widener, V. Anantharaj, F. Wang, T. Beck, A. Shankar, and S. Oral, "Data readiness for scientific AI at scale," arXiv:2507.23018, 2025.

[48] S. Afzal, A. Chaudhary, N. Gupta, H. Patel, C. Spina, and D. Wang, "Data-debugging through interactive visual explanations," in *Trends and Applications in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Springer, 2021, pp. 133–142.

[49] S. Afzal, R. C, M. Kesarwani, S. Mehta, and H. Patel, "Data readiness report," arXiv:2010.07213, 2020.

[50] F. Olsson and M. Sahlgren, "Data readiness for natural language processing," arXiv:2009.02043, 2020.

[51] J. Jöhnk, M. Weißert, and K. Wyrtki, "Ready or not, AI comes: An interview study of organizational AI readiness factors," *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 5–20, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s12599-020-00676-7.

[52] R. Nama, "From evaluator to principal: The agentic AI literacy framework (AALF) for delegated autonomy," *AI and Ethics*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 415–430, 2026, doi: 10.1007/s43681-026-01167-3.

[53] Y. Yoo, Y. H. Cho, and J. Choi, "A systematic review on the competences of human-AI collaboration," in *Proc. International Conference on Computers in Education*, 2023, pp. 478–487, doi: 10.58459/icce.2023.4788.

[54] B. Moore, "What competencies will be needed to manage artificial intelligence in the workplace? (An AI perspective)," *Assessment and Development Matters*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 4–8, 2024.

[55] A. Benlian and M. Pinski, "The AI literacy development canvas: Assessing and building AI literacy in organizations," *Business Horizons*, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2025.10.001.

[56] K. Hölzle, R. Rose, and V. L. Kaschub, "The interplay of humans, technology, and organizations in realizing AI's productivity promise," *The Economists' Voice*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 357–362, 2024, doi: 10.1515/ev-2024-0053.

[57] M. Khumalo *et al.*, "The integration of artificial intelligence in higher education institutions' workforce: A literature review," *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 393–399, 2025, doi: 10.20525/ijrbs.v14i6.4046.

[58] P. Chandra, A. Dubey, S. K. Sharma, and S. Karsoliya, "A novel conceptualization of AI literacy and empowering employee experience at digital workplace using generative AI and augmented analytics: A survey," *Journal of Electrical Systems*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 2582–2603, 2024, doi: 10.52783/jes.2031.

[59] A. Suhara, "Human capital strategies to address artificial intelligence challenges in the contemporary work environment," *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 3793–3802, 2025, doi: 10.37641/jimkes.v13i5.3907.

[60] G. S. Sunkar, "Professional adaptation and success in the artificial intelligence era: A paradigm shift in workforce evolution," *European Modern Studies Journal*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 291–298, 2025, doi: 10.59573/emsj.9(4).2025.30.

[61] I. Nodiyarjo, "21st century labor challenges: The relationship of competence and organizational culture," *Adpebi Science Series*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2024, doi: 10.54099/icemat2023.v1i1.268.

[62] M. Santana and M. Díaz-Fernández, "Competencies for the artificial intelligence age: Visualisation of the state of the art and future perspectives," *Review of Managerial Science*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 1971–2004, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11846-022-00613-w.

[63] F. Firouzi, M. Daneshmand, J. Song, and K. Mankodiya, "Guest editorial special issue on empowering the future generation systems: Opportunities by the convergence of cloud, edge, AI, and IoT," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 3681–3685, 2023, doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2022.3232084.

[64] P. Sandner, J. Gross, and R. Richter, "Convergence of blockchain, IoT, and AI," *Frontiers in Blockchain*, vol. 3, Art. no. 522600, 2020.

[65] K. D. S. Vyshnavi, "Integration of blockchain, internet of things and AI," *International Journal of Research in Science & Technology*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 31–36, 2022, doi: 10.37648/ijrst.v12i04.006.

[66] E. Muhati, D. B. Rawat, and B. M. Sadler, "A new cyber-alliance of artificial intelligence, internet of things, blockchain, and edge computing," *IEEE Internet of Things Magazine*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 104–107, 2022, doi: 10.1109/IOTM.001.2100181.

[67] F. Firouzi, S. Jiang, K. Chakrabarty, B. Farahani, M. Daneshmand, J. Song, and K. Mankodiya, "Fusion of IoT, AI, edge-fog-cloud, and blockchain: Challenges, solutions, and a case study in healthcare and medicine," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 3686–3705, 2023, doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2022.3191881.

[68] S. P. J, A. S, U. L, T. F. A, M. S, and M. S, "Revolutionizing industries through IoT, blockchain and AI integration," in *Proc. 3rd International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Social Networking (ICPCSN)*, 2023, doi: 10.1109/ICPCSN58827.2023.00166.

[69] A. Mehmood, M. Arif, and F. Mehmood, "Towards a unified digital ecosystem: The role of platform technology convergence," *Electronics*, vol. 14, no. 24, Art. no. 4787, 2025.

[70] S. Li, W. Ma, X. Wang, X. Zhang, H. Xu, E. Garces, and T. Daim, "Technology convergence and its influence on innovation networks: An assessment of emerging trends," in *Proc. PICMET '24: Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering and Technology*, 2024, pp. 1–9.

[71] S. Saha, K. Banerjee, S. Ghosh, S. Mitra, and D. Pal, "AI-driven edge computing for IoT: A comprehensive survey and future directions," *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2023, doi: 10.48175/IJARSCT-12921.

[72] M. V. Chowdary, "The convergence of artificial intelligence, cloud computing, and edge computing: Transforming the tech landscape," *Research and Analysis Journal*, vol. 3, no. 12, pp. 365–391, 2020, doi: 10.18535/raj.v3i12.211.

[73] P. D. Sawant, "Agentic AI: A quantitative analysis of performance and applications," *Journal of Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 132–140, 2025, doi: 10.18178/JAAI.2025.3.2.132-140.

[74] D. Thillaivasan and C. N. Wickramasinghe, "Conceptualizing the impact of AI and automation on leadership, human capital and organizational performance," *Journal of Business and Technology*, vol. 4, nos. 1–2, pp. 1–19, 2020, doi: 10.4038/jbt.v4i1-2.37.

[75] K. R. Kotte, L. Thammareddi, D. Kodi, V. R. Anumolu, A. K. K, and S. Joshi, "Integration of process optimization and automation: A way to AI powered digital transformation," in *Proc. 2025 First International Conference on Advances in Computer Science, Electrical, Electronics, and Communication Technologies (CE2CT)*, 2025, doi: 10.1109/CE2CT64011.2025.10939966.

[76] G. U. Parab, "Agentic AI in data analytics: Transforming autonomous insights and decision-making," *International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 1752–1759, 2024, doi: 10.32628/CSEIT241061220.

[77] W. AlShikh, M. S. Ali, B. Kennedy, and D. Mozolevskyi, "Towards outcome-oriented, task-agnostic evaluation of AI agents," arXiv:2511.08242, 2025.

[78] P. T. Bryant, "Evaluation of performance," in *Augmented Humanity*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021, pp. 199–223.

[79] K. I. Meutia, "Aligning AI impact with strategy: Cross sector metrics for sustainable business model transformation," *Novatio: Journal of Management Technology and Innovation*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 174–188, 2024, doi: 10.61978/novatio.v2i3.850.

[80] E. S. Mityakov and V. V. Yatsenko, "Metrics for evaluating the results of digital transformation," *Regional and Branch Economy*, no. 4, pp. 116–121, 2024, doi: 10.47576/2949-1916.2024.4.4.014.

[81] S. Sethi, "Bridging KPI gaps: A scalable approach to cross-vertical performance alignment," *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, vol. 4, no. 6, 2022, doi: 10.36948/ijfmr.2022.v04i06.40776.

[82] N. Alsufyani and A. Q. Gill, "Digitalisation performance assessment: A systematic review," *Technology in Society*, vol. 68, Art. no. 101894, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101894.