COMPLETE FICTIONAL SAMPLE - not client work or measured results

Bounded pilot plan: two AI use cases in a small team

Two use cases, data and human-review rules, and explicit continuation and stop criteria.

Scenario data and numbers in this sample are synthetic illustrations. The sample is free to read; tailored work requires a context review and agreement on scope, timing and fees.

01 / Fictional context and decision

This fictional team prepares reports and training material. The sample is not a security audit, compliance certificate or approved institutional policy. Decision: should the team trial two bounded uses with an institution-approved tool? Approval by the authorized owner comes first.

Scope: two weeks, two user roles and a human reviewer for every output. Use public or synthetic information only. Do not upload personal files, service enquiries or private operational information.

02 / Use case 1: draft a weekly brief

Input: a synthetic list of six public activities with descriptive dates and no names. Task: draft one page separating completed actions, open questions and next steps. Inventing figures, causes or outcomes is prohibited.

Check: the preparer compares every sentence with the input, removes unsupported material and records edits. The coordinator checks wording and figures and approves outside the tool. Suggested internal disclosure: “A tool helped draft this text; the team reviewed it before approval.”

03 / Use case 2: a learning activity from a public source

Input: a public text permitted for reuse about source verification, a learning aim, audience age range and time limit. Task: propose a discussion question, exercise and participant sheet, linking every factual claim to a source passage.

Check: the facilitator reviews language, timing and accessibility, and independently checks claims and references. Rehearse instructions with a colleague before use. Do not enter learner responses, names or assessment data into the tool.

COMPLETE FICTIONAL SAMPLE - not client work or measured results

04 / Shared rules and responsibilities

Before input: the user confirms that material is public or synthetic and that the tool and use are permitted. If uncertain, stop and ask the owner. Removing a name is insufficient if context still identifies a person.

The pilot owner approves scope and stopping; the user checks inputs; the reviewer verifies outputs; the coordinator keeps a brief log of time, edits and issues without copying sensitive inputs.

Outputs trigger no automatic action or decision and are not sent externally without review and approval. The pilot is not used to evaluate people or decide their eligibility.

05 / Measurement and continuation criteria

Baseline: prepare three synthetic examples using the usual method and record drafting and review time. During the pilot, record equivalent time, checked factual claims, required edits, and accessibility or workload issues.

Fictional planning criteria: human review of every output, no unsupported claim left in approved text, no prohibited input, and acceptable total team effort. These are not achieved results or a promise of time savings.

06 / Stop, review and handover

Stop immediately if prohibited data is entered, a claim cannot be sourced, permissions exceed scope, or no human reviewer is available. Quarantine the output, inform the owner and follow institutional procedures; deleting a chat does not establish provider-side erasure.

End of week 2: review the log and three outputs from each use case. Decide whether to continue within scope, change the rules or stop. Hand over one use-case card each, input/output checklists and a decision record with evidence gaps and next steps.