

From research request to reviewed briefing.

A worked example of the decisions behind an AI-assisted workflow. September 2026.

01 / CURRENT STATE

The draft is fast. The reviewer starts again.

A fictional team prepares recurring research briefings. Source links sit in chat, the request is in an email and the reviewer reconstructs both before checking the draft. First inspect one request, its sources, draft, review comments and handoff. The actual frequency, burden and allowed tools are unknown.

02 / ARCHITECTURE

Keep the source attached to the claim.

Evaluate one request record with approved source links, an assisted draft and a review state. Configure or connect the existing workspace if it can support access, traceability and ownership. A custom build needs a specific gap to justify it.

PROPOSED OPERATING PATH

Request + sources / Assisted draft / Named review

Resolved exceptions / Recorded handoff

Make the boundary clear. Then test the workflow.

No savings, accuracy improvements or adoption outcomes are assumed in this example.

03 / HUMAN REVIEW

No source. No automatic handoff.

If a claim has no supporting source, keep the item in review. A named reviewer resolves the exception before the approved handoff. The reviewer checks support, relevance and completeness; AI assistance does not approve the final briefing.

04 / PILOT DECISION

Continue, change or stop with evidence.

Test one briefing workflow with an agreed sample set. Measure review time, missing-source exceptions, rework and whether the next owner can continue without reconstructing context. Agree the baseline, review criteria and acceptance thresholds before testing.

BEFORE A REAL ENGAGEMENT

What still needs to be agreed

Workflow owner and boundaries; sample material and permitted access; existing stack; confidentiality requirements; acceptance criteria; commercial scope and delivery window. This example shows an approach, not a fixed deliverable promise.

Explore founder-led systems work at aivortex.io/consulting/