# AI Work Explorer

## Example reports you can read and discuss.

Patrick Phillips | The Augmented Enterprise

A useful report connects what you told the explorer with what it may mean, why it matters and a small next test. These examples show that conversation in writing, so you can understand the reasoning and decide what to investigate.

These examples use fictional work and illustrative inputs. They are not customer results or estimates of AI performance.

You can keep several interests together. The report compares possibilities, preserves unanswered questions and separates changes to existing work from tests of a new idea. It does not rank a preferred route or turn time estimates into promised savings.

The examples in this collection use the step-by-step questions. That path prepares a report in the browser, and the visitor chooses what to download or share. The optional AI conversation sends messages and a working brief to AI services after agreement and has a separate privacy explanation.

### 9 types of useful output. 12 complete fictional examples.

Try the AI Work Explorer

Explore the examples online

Read Patrick's approach

# What the reports help you explore

These views work together. You do not have to choose one before you begin, and an unanswered question can be a useful part of the report.

## Your work and opportunities

An assessment of the work, interests and possible uses you described, with their implications explained together.

When you want to see the possibilities together before deciding what to investigate.

Open questions remain visible. No option is treated as the best one merely because it was selected first.

## Time and checking example

An optional time comparison for one named task, including current checking and any extra checking you enter.

When you have a rough idea of how often that task happens and the work involved each time.

Missing inputs become things to observe. The report does not fill them with assumed savings.

## How the work gets completed

An explanation of how waiting, approval and handoffs affect completion, including the work before and after the task.

When a quicker first step may still leave the finished work waiting on something else.

No finished-work speed or output increase is predicted from a task-time estimate.

## Quality and review plan

A way to describe a useful result, involve a reviewer and compare mistakes, corrections and checking effort.

When accuracy, consistency or the effort of checking matters as much as speed.

The report identifies criteria and review arrangements to clarify rather than declaring the work dependable.

## Information and tool arrangements

The sources, examples and tool arrangements to confirm so a person can check an AI-assisted result.

When the work depends on current information or people have difficulty finding an answer they trust.

Unconfirmed information or permission stays unconfirmed. The report does not grant access or approve a tool.

## People and organizational support

Practical arrangements for ownership, practice, help and the time needed to learn and check the work.

When several people may try a change, or someone needs support to use a tool well.

Support that is not in place is distinguished from support you have not checked yet. There is no readiness score.

## New opportunity experiment

A small sample to discuss with intended users, including what they do today and what would make the idea useful.

When you want to explore a new service or experience, including alongside improvements to existing work.

Useful feedback comes before a revenue estimate. A new idea does not remove the other views from the report.

## Your complete test plan

The selected possibilities, a small test and the evidence that would support continuing, changing or stopping it.

When you want a report you can keep, discuss with colleagues or send yourself.

Unknown answers and untested assumptions remain in the report rather than becoming a recommendation to purchase a service.

## Security and control

The actions you want to explore, the access they need, approval boundaries and a way to stop and review an agent.

When AI may read information, prepare a draft or take actions that affect other people or systems.

These are planning answers to verify in the actual tool. They do not grant permission, certify security or make a prompt into an access control.

# The fictional examples

Each example uses the current explorer questions and report calculations. The examples below are illustrations, not results from clients or predictions of AI performance.

1. I am not sure where to start
2. Understand the time spent today
3. A time-saving example worth checking
4. Extra checking takes back the gain
5. Rough ranges give an uncertain result
6. Follow the request through to completion
7. Compare dependable answers and their checks
8. Start with information people can trust
9. Make room for learning and ownership
10. Test a new service with intended users
11. Improve current work and explore a new offer
12. Compare several uses before choosing a test

EXAMPLE 01 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# I am not sure where to start

An illustrative starting point with no time estimates or confirmed support. The useful output explains what remains open and how to learn from a small example, without an invented savings figure.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You have kept the scope open: existing work, a new idea or both. Your starting example is “A piece of work I want to understand better”. The people you hope to help are still to identify. Their current approach remains unconfirmed. A small discovery test can clarify the need without assuming a workload, saving or service.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Help me choose”. The work or ideas span “Something else”. You want to understand “Not sure yet”.

The first evidence to seek is a concrete example, the people it would help and what they find useful.

You have not selected a concrete AI use yet. You kept “Help me choose” open. Drafting, finding relevant information and organizing it are suggested starter comparisons, not selected answers or a preferred option. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

The status of permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples, clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning is still unconfirmed. The human checker is still unconfirmed; identify who will compare the result with the original information and agreed criteria.

The first-test group is still unconfirmed. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Tentative security planning for a future test

These are tentative possibilities for a future test; scope is still undecided. The actions you are considering are “Prepare something for a person to review” and “Not sure yet”. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## A small discovery plan

1. Describe one example and discuss the need with the people you hope to help.
2. Clarify whether the next test concerns existing work, a new idea or both; keep unanswered parts open.
3. Compare small examples of possible assistance with the current approach and identify someone who can check them.
4. Choose what you need to learn next. Use usefulness, available information and support to decide whether to continue, adjust or stop; no numerical benefit is assumed.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 02 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Understand the time spent today

Illustrative weekly updates with an entered baseline and no assumed AI improvement. The report can show current effort while leaving the change to a test.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Prepare one weekly project update” as one example. The result is intended for Colleagues who read the update. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Spend less time on repetitive work” and “Reduce mistakes”. The work or ideas span “Prepare reports or updates”. You want to understand “Getting started or doing the work” and “Checking and fixing the result”.

Compare doing, checking and fixing together; a faster draft can still create more review. Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Compare assistance with small parts of the work, keeping an unassisted example alongside each option. Include the reviewer and compare whether checking or fixing takes more or less time with each option.

You chose to compare “Prepare a first draft” and “Organize or compare information”. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. For “Organize or compare information”, try turning one example into a clearer outline, summary or list of next actions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples and clear criteria and time for final checking as in place. The status of time to practice and help with learning is still unconfirmed. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

You selected “A few people” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

For one existing-work example, you supplied 12 completed results per week across the whole team, 30 active doing minutes per result and 10 current checking and fixing minutes per result. Count the team's results once; neither team size nor other work categories multiply this workload.

Current weekly working effort is 8 hours/week, including checking and fixing. This is the baseline against which to compare the test.

A doing-time reduction and extra checking allowance remain unconfirmed, so the baseline does not imply a time benefit.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

> **How this time example is calculated**
>
> Current hours/week = F × (D + C) ÷ 60. F is the weekly count, D is doing minutes per result and C is current checking minutes per result. With your values, 12 × (30 + 10) ÷ 60 gives 8 hours/week.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.
2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.
3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Keep the person who normally checks the work involved and include their checking and correction time.
4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 03 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# A time-saving example worth checking

An illustrative reduction in drafting time leaves some time after extra checking. These are visitor-style assumptions to test, not observed AI performance.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Draft one customer update from approved notes” as one example. The result is intended for The person responsible for the customer relationship. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Spend less time on repetitive work” and “Reduce mistakes”. The work or ideas span “Prepare reports or updates”. You want to understand “Getting started or doing the work”.

Compare doing, checking and fixing together; a faster draft can still create more review. Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Compare assistance with small parts of the work, keeping an unassisted example alongside each option.

You chose to compare “Prepare a first draft”. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples, clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning as in place. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

You selected “A few people” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the

agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

For one existing-work example, you supplied 12 completed results per week across the whole team, 30 active doing minutes per result and 5 current checking and fixing minutes per result. Count the team's results once; neither team size nor other work categories multiply this workload.

Current weekly working effort is 7 hours/week, including checking and fixing. This is the baseline against which to compare the test.

You chose a hypothetical 25% reduction in doing time. You allowed 5 additional checking minutes per result. These are assumptions to test, not measured AI performance.

Scenario effort is 6.5 hours/week, with current checking retained and extra checking added. The scenario could release 30 minutes/week of working effort. Test the actual effort before assuming that change will occur.

Your doing-time assumption leaves 7.5 minutes per result before extra checking uses up the reduction. This break-even allowance helps you judge how much checking the test can absorb; it does not establish how much checking AI will need.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

### How this time example is calculated

Current hours/week = F × (D + C) ÷ 60. F is the weekly count, D is doing minutes per result and C is current checking minutes per result. With your values, 12 × (30 + 5) ÷ 60 gives 7 hours/week.

Scenario hours/week = F × (D × (1 - r) + C + E) ÷ 60, where r = 0.25 is your chosen reduction and E is additional checking minutes per result. With your values, 12 × (30 × (1 - 0.25) + 5 + 5) ÷ 60 gives 6.5 hours/week. The count and existing checking remain unchanged.

Paired change in hours/week = F × (D × r - E) ÷ 60; with your inputs, 12 × (30 × 0.25 - 5) ÷ 60. The scenario could release 30 minutes/week of working effort. Ranges stay ranges; the difference does not subtract unrelated endpoints of the two totals.

Break-even extra checking in minutes/result = D × r. With your values, 30 × 0.25 gives 7.5 minutes/result.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.

2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.

3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Keep the person who normally checks the work involved and include their checking and correction time.

4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 04 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Extra checking takes back the gain

An illustrative proposal draft takes less preparation time but needs enough extra checking to add work overall. A useful result can include an unfavorable time comparison.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Prepare one short proposal draft” as one example. The result is intended for A colleague who checks the proposal. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Spend less time on repetitive work” and “Reduce mistakes”. The work or ideas span “Prepare proposals or other documents”. You want to understand “Checking and fixing the result”.

Compare doing, checking and fixing together; a faster draft can still create more review. Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Include the reviewer and compare whether checking or fixing takes more or less time with each option.

You chose to compare “Prepare a first draft” and “Check against clear requirements”. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. For “Check against clear requirements”, try using AI to suggest issues or missing information, then have a person verify its suggestions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples, clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning as in place. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

You selected “A few people” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin

with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

For one existing-work example, you supplied 20 completed results per week across the whole team, 20 active doing minutes per result and 5 current checking and fixing minutes per result. Count the team's results once; neither team size nor other work categories multiply this workload.

Current weekly working effort is 8.33 hours/week, including checking and fixing. This is the baseline against which to compare the test.

You chose a hypothetical 25% reduction in doing time. You allowed 10 additional checking minutes per result. These are assumptions to test, not measured AI performance.

Scenario effort is 10 hours/week, with current checking retained and extra checking added. The scenario would add 1.67 hours/week of working effort. Test the actual effort before assuming that change will occur.

Your doing-time assumption leaves 5 minutes per result before extra checking uses up the reduction. This break-even allowance helps you judge how much checking the test can absorb; it does not establish how much checking AI will need.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

### How this time example is calculated

Current hours/week = F × (D + C) ÷ 60. F is the weekly count, D is doing minutes per result and C is current checking minutes per result. With your values, 20 × (20 + 5) ÷ 60 gives 8.33 hours/week.

Scenario hours/week = F × (D × (1 - r) + C + E) ÷ 60, where r = 0.25 is your chosen reduction and E is additional checking minutes per result. With your values, 20 × (20 × (1 - 0.25) + 5 + 10) ÷ 60 gives 10 hours/week. The count and existing checking remain unchanged.

Paired change in hours/week = F × (D × r - E) ÷ 60; with your inputs, 20 × (20 × 0.25 - 10) ÷ 60. The scenario would add 1.67 hours/week of working effort. Ranges stay ranges; the difference does not subtract unrelated endpoints of the two totals.

Break-even extra checking in minutes/result = D × r. With your values, 20 × 0.25 gives 5 minutes/result.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.

2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.

3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Keep the person who normally checks the work involved and include their checking and correction time.

4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 05 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Rough ranges give an uncertain result

Illustrative ranges for task volume, preparation and extra checking can produce either less or more work. The report keeps that uncertainty visible.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Prepare one answer to a recurring question” as one example. The result is intended for The person asking the question. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Spend less time on repetitive work” and “Reduce mistakes”. The work or ideas span “Answer questions”. You want to understand “Getting started or doing the work” and “Checking and fixing the result”.

Compare doing, checking and fixing together; a faster draft can still create more review. Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Compare assistance with small parts of the work, keeping an unassisted example alongside each option. Include the reviewer and compare whether checking or fixing takes more or less time with each option.

You chose to compare “Find relevant information” and “Prepare a first draft”. For “Find relevant information”, try finding an answer in a small set of approved, current information and check the original sources. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples and clear criteria and time for final checking as in place. The status of time to practice and help with learning is still unconfirmed. You identified yourself as the human checker.

You selected “Just me” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

For one existing-work example, you supplied 6 to 20 completed results per week across the whole team, 16 to 30 active doing minutes per result and 1 to 5 current checking and fixing minutes per result. Count the team's results once; neither team size nor other work categories multiply this workload.

Current weekly working effort is 1.7 to 11.67 hours/week, including checking and fixing. This is the baseline against which to compare the test.

You chose a hypothetical 25% reduction in doing time. You allowed 1 to 10 additional checking minutes per result. These are assumptions to test, not measured AI performance.

Scenario effort is 1.4 to 12.5 hours/week, with current checking retained and extra checking added. The scenario could add up to 2 hours/week or release up to 2.17 hours/week. Test the actual effort before assuming that change will occur.

Your doing-time assumption leaves 4 to 7.5 minutes per result before extra checking uses up the reduction. This break-even allowance helps you judge how much checking the test can absorb; it does not establish how much checking AI will need.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

### How this time example is calculated

Current hours/week = F × (D + C) ÷ 60. F is the weekly count, D is doing minutes per result and C is current checking minutes per result. With your values, 6 × (16 + 1) ÷ 60 to 20 × (30 + 5) ÷ 60 gives 1.7 to 11.67 hours/week.

Scenario hours/week = F × (D × (1 - r) + C + E) ÷ 60, where r = 0.25 is your chosen reduction and E is additional checking minutes per result. With your values, 6 × (16 × (1 - 0.25) + 1 + 1) ÷ 60 to 20 × (30 × (1 - 0.25) + 5 + 10) ÷ 60 gives 1.4 to 12.5 hours/week. The count and existing checking remain unchanged.

Paired change in hours/week = F × (D × r - E) ÷ 60; with your inputs, the four paired products -36, 39, -120, 130 divided by 60 at their lowest and highest values. The scenario could add up to 2 hours/week or release up to 2.17 hours/week. Ranges stay ranges; the difference does not subtract unrelated endpoints of the two totals.

Break-even extra checking in minutes/result = D × r. With your values, 16 × 0.25 to 30 × 0.25 gives 4 to 7.5 minutes/result.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.
2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.
3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Check the result yourself against the original information and the agreed quality checks.
4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 06 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Follow the request through to completion

An illustrative internal request passes between people and waits for approval. Faster preparation alone does not establish a shorter completion time.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Prepare the information for one internal request” as one example. The result is intended for The colleague who needs a decision. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Get work completed sooner” and “Help customers or colleagues”. The work or ideas span “Handle requests or records” and “Prepare proposals or other documents”. You want to understand “Waiting for a decision or approval” and “Passing work between people”.

Follow the work from request to useful result, including waiting and handoffs; faster preparation can leave the overall delay unchanged. Ask the recipient or intended user whether the result is useful, clear and timely. Notice who or what the work waits for; faster preparation may leave that wait unchanged. Ask the next person what they need and notice any extra coordination each option creates.

You chose to compare “Organize or compare information” and “Prepare a first draft”. For “Organize or compare information”, try turning one example into a clearer outline, summary or list of next actions. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples, clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning as in place. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

You selected “A few people” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

For one existing-work example, you supplied 21 to 100 completed results per week across the whole team, 6 to 15 active doing minutes per result and 1 to 5 current checking and fixing minutes per result. Count the team's results once; neither team size nor other work categories multiply this workload.

Current weekly working effort is 2.45 to 33.33 hours/week, including checking and fixing. This is the baseline against which to compare the test.

A doing-time reduction and extra checking allowance remain unconfirmed, so the baseline does not imply a time benefit.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

### How this time example is calculated

Current hours/week = F × (D + C) ÷ 60. F is the weekly count, D is doing minutes per result and C is current checking minutes per result. With your values, 21 × (6 + 1) ÷ 60 to 100 × (15 + 5) ÷ 60 gives 2.45 to 33.33 hours/week.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.
2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.
3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Keep the person who normally checks the work involved and include their checking and correction time.
4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 07 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Compare dependable answers and their checks

An illustrative answer may be quicker to draft but needs agreed criteria and a reviewer. This example explores usefulness and quality without assuming a time reduction.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Prepare one reply to a common service question” as one example. The result is intended for A customer asking about the service. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Reduce mistakes” and “Help customers or colleagues”. The work or ideas span “Answer questions” and “Prepare proposals or other documents”. You want to understand “Checking and fixing the result” and “Finding information I can trust”.

Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Ask the recipient or intended user whether the result is useful, clear and timely. Include the reviewer and compare whether checking or fixing takes more or less time with each option. Notice whether finding current information is difficult and compare assistance that finds or organizes that information.

You chose to compare “Check against clear requirements” and “Find relevant information”. For “Check against clear requirements”, try using AI to suggest issues or missing information, then have a person verify its suggestions. For “Find relevant information”, try finding an answer in a small set of approved, current information and check the original sources. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool, clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning as in place. You report trusted current information and examples as not yet in place; these need arranging. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

You selected “One team” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

For one existing-work example, you supplied 6 to 20 completed results per week across the whole team, 6 to 15 active doing minutes per result and 6 to 15 current checking and fixing minutes per result. Count the team's results once; neither team size nor other work categories multiply this workload.

Current weekly working effort is 1.2 to 10 hours/week, including checking and fixing. This is the baseline against which to compare the test.

A doing-time reduction and extra checking allowance remain unconfirmed, so the baseline does not imply a time benefit.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

**How this time example is calculated**

Current hours/week = F × (D + C) ÷ 60. F is the weekly count, D is doing minutes per result and C is current checking minutes per result. With your values, 6 × (6 + 6) ÷ 60 to 20 × (15 + 15) ÷ 60 gives 1.2 to 10 hours/week.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.

2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.

3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Keep the person who normally checks the work involved and include their checking and correction time.

4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 08 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Start with information people can trust

Illustrative procedures are difficult to find or keep current. The example leaves task time unknown and focuses on sources and the ability to check an answer.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Find the current procedure for one ordinary question” as one example. The result is intended for A colleague following the procedure. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Reduce mistakes” and “Help customers or colleagues”. The work or ideas span “Find or compare information” and “Answer questions”. You want to understand “Finding information I can trust”.

Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Ask the recipient or intended user whether the result is useful, clear and timely. Notice whether finding current information is difficult and compare assistance that finds or organizes that information.

You chose to compare “Find relevant information” and “Check against clear requirements”. For “Find relevant information”, try finding an answer in a small set of approved, current information and check the original sources. For “Check against clear requirements”, try using AI to suggest issues or missing information, then have a person verify its suggestions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool and time to practice and help with learning as in place. You report trusted current information and examples as not yet in place; these need arranging. The status of clear criteria and time for final checking is still unconfirmed. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

You selected “A few people” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

The whole-team frequency, doing time and current checking time are still unconfirmed. Observe ordinary examples before estimating a weekly change.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.

2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.

3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Keep the person who normally checks the work involved and include their checking and correction time.

4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 09 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Make room for learning and ownership

An illustrative team wants to change its work but has not arranged learning or review. Tool permission is unknown, which is different from knowing support is absent.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Prepare one repeatable team update” as one example. The result is intended for The next person responsible for the work. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Spend less time on repetitive work”, “Get work completed sooner” and “Reduce mistakes”. The work or ideas span “Handle requests or records” and “Prepare reports or updates”. You want to understand “Passing work between people” and “Getting started or doing the work”.

Compare doing, checking and fixing together; a faster draft can still create more review. Follow the work from request to useful result, including waiting and handoffs; faster preparation can leave the overall delay unchanged. Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Ask the next person what they need and notice any extra coordination each option creates. Compare assistance with small parts of the work, keeping an unassisted example alongside each option.

You chose to compare “Organize or compare information” and “Prepare a first draft”. For “Organize or compare information”, try turning one example into a clearer outline, summary or list of next actions. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report trusted current information and examples as in place. You report clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning as not yet in place; these need arranging. The status of permission to use an AI tool is still unconfirmed. The human checker is still unconfirmed; identify who will compare the result with the original information and agreed criteria.

You selected “One team” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

The whole-team frequency, doing time and current checking time are still unconfirmed. Observe ordinary examples before estimating a weekly change.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.

2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.

3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Name a person to check the result and decide whether it is suitable before anyone relies on it.

4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 10 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Test a new service with intended users

An illustrative service would help customers compare their options. There is no existing-task baseline, so the report explores a sample and user feedback rather than inventing savings.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring a new idea, “A guide to help customers compare service choices”. It is intended to help Small-business customers comparing service options. You describe what they do today as “They read several pages and ask a provider to explain the differences.”. Start with usefulness and the need it addresses; no existing workload or demand is assumed.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Help customers or colleagues” and “Create something new”. The work or ideas span “Explore a new service”. You want to understand “Getting started or doing the work” and “Finding information I can trust”.

Ask the recipient or intended user whether the result is useful, clear and timely. Discuss the need and compare small samples before building a service. Compare assistance with small parts of the work, keeping an unassisted example alongside each option. Notice whether finding current information is difficult and compare assistance that finds or organizes that information.

You chose to compare “Suggest ideas or options” and “Prepare a first draft”. For “Suggest ideas or options”, try generating a few possible approaches and choose one to discuss with the person who would use it. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

For the new-idea test, you report permission to use an AI tool and clear criteria and time for final checking as in place. You report time to practice and help with learning as not yet in place; these need arranging. The status of trusted current information and examples is still unconfirmed. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

You selected “A few people” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

For the new idea, what AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## A small next test of the idea

1. Discuss the need and today’s alternative with an intended user; identify what would make a small sample useful.

2. Make a small sample for each possibility you want to compare, using approved information and the boundaries above.

3. Keep the chosen reviewer involved and allow time for their checking and corrections before anyone relies on the sample. Observe usefulness, accuracy, ease of use and the help or learning each sample needs.

4. Use that evidence to continue, adjust or stop a sample before building a service. A useful sample does not establish demand or a financial return.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 11 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Improve current work and explore a new offer

This illustrative case explores answering current questions and a new guidance service together. Its numeric inputs apply only to one existing question-answering task, not to the proposed service.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring existing work and a separate new idea. The existing-work example is “Answer one common service question”. The new idea is “A new guidance offer for customers comparing service choices”. These need separate tests: evidence about current work does not establish demand for a new idea.

The existing result is intended for Customers asking an ordinary service question. The new idea is intended to help Customers choosing between service options. You describe what those users do today as “They exchange emails to understand the available choices.”.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Spend less time on repetitive work”, “Reduce mistakes”, “Help customers or colleagues” and “Create something new”. The work or ideas span “Answer questions” and “Explore a new service”. You want to understand “Finding information I can trust” and “Checking and fixing the result”.

Compare doing, checking and fixing together; a faster draft can still create more review. Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Ask the recipient or intended user whether the result is useful, clear and timely. Discuss the need and compare small samples before building a service. Assess current work and new-idea samples separately. Notice whether finding current information is difficult and compare assistance that finds or organizes that information. Include the reviewer and compare whether checking or fixing takes more or less time with each option.

You chose to compare “Find relevant information”, “Prepare a first draft” and “Suggest ideas or options”. For “Find relevant information”, try finding an answer in a small set of approved, current information and check the original sources. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. For “Suggest ideas or options”, try generating a few possible approaches and choose one to discuss with the person who would use it. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

For the existing-work test, you report permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples and clear criteria and time for final checking as in place. The status of time to practice and help with learning is still unconfirmed. You identified someone else as the human checker; keep that person involved.

For the new-idea test, the status of permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples, clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning is still unconfirmed. The

human checker is still unconfirmed; identify who will compare the result with the original information and agreed criteria.

You selected “A few people” as the people who might try this first. This is shared planning context; confirm participation for each test separately. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. Permission, information and checking for one test do not carry across to the other.

## Security and control

For existing work, the actions you are considering are “Prepare something for a person to review”, “Read selected files or systems” and “Send messages or publish”. You report access boundaries as in place. You report approval points as not yet in place; these need arranging. The status of arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

For the new idea, the actions you are considering are “Prepare something for a person to review”. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Use a separate account limited to the selected files or systems. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Before sending, publishing, changing records or spending, approve the exact action, destination and limits. Enforce that approval outside the agent's instructions before the action runs.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

For one existing-work example, you supplied 20 completed results per week across the whole team, 15 active doing minutes per result and 5 current checking and fixing minutes per result. Count the team's results once; neither team size nor other work categories multiply this workload.

Current weekly working effort is 6.67 hours/week, including checking and fixing. This is the baseline against which to compare the test.

You chose a hypothetical 25% reduction in doing time. You allowed 2 additional checking minutes per result. These are assumptions to test, not measured AI performance.

Scenario effort is 6.08 hours/week, with current checking retained and extra checking added. The scenario could release 35 minutes/week of working effort. Test the actual effort before assuming that change will occur.

Your doing-time assumption leaves 3.75 minutes per result before extra checking uses up the reduction. This break-even allowance helps you judge how much checking the test can absorb; it does not establish how much checking AI will need.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

**How this time example is calculated**

Current hours/week = F × (D + C) ÷ 60. F is the weekly count, D is doing minutes per result and C is current checking minutes per result. With your values, 20 × (15 + 5) ÷ 60 gives 6.67 hours/week.

Scenario hours/week = F × (D × (1 - r) + C + E) ÷ 60, where r = 0.25 is your chosen reduction and E is additional checking minutes per result. With your values, 20 × (15 × (1 - 0.25) + 5 + 2) ÷ 60 gives 6.08 hours/week. The count and existing checking remain unchanged.

Paired change in hours/week = F × (D × r - E) ÷ 60; with your inputs, 20 × (15 × 0.25 - 2) ÷ 60. The scenario could release 35 minutes/week of working effort. Ranges stay ranges; the difference does not subtract unrelated endpoints of the two totals.

Break-even extra checking in minutes/result = D × r. With your values, 15 × 0.25 gives 3.75 minutes/result.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.
2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.
3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Keep the person who normally checks the work involved and include their checking and correction time.
4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## A separate test of the new idea

1. Discuss the new idea’s need and current alternative with an intended user, separately from the existing-work test.
2. Make small samples of the possibilities you want to compare; use the new idea’s own information, permissions and checker.
3. Name a person to check the result and decide whether it is suitable before anyone relies on it. Observe usefulness, accuracy, ease of use and the support each sample needs.
4. Decide what to continue, adjust or stop before building a service. Do not count speculative demand as existing workload or treat a sample as proof of a financial return.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.

EXAMPLE 12 | BROWSER-FORM EXPLORATION

# Compare several uses before choosing a test

An illustrative update can be approached through drafting, finding, organizing, checking or ideas. The example keeps all five choices visible without ranking one as the correct path.

Prepared with Patrick Phillips AI Work Explorer, drawing on Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise.

## What you are exploring

You are exploring work you already do, using “Turn approved notes into one useful update” as one example. The result is intended for Colleagues who need to understand a change. A concrete example and its recipient help define a useful result before comparing how it is produced.

## Possibilities worth comparing

Your interests include “Reduce mistakes” and “Help customers or colleagues”. The work or ideas span “Prepare reports or updates” and “Find or compare information”. You want to understand “Finding information I can trust”, “Getting started or doing the work” and “Checking and fixing the result”.

Agree what an acceptable result looks like, then compare errors, corrections and checking effort. Ask the recipient or intended user whether the result is useful, clear and timely. Notice whether finding current information is difficult and compare assistance that finds or organizes that information. Compare assistance with small parts of the work, keeping an unassisted example alongside each option. Include the reviewer and compare whether checking or fixing takes more or less time with each option.

You chose to compare “Prepare a first draft”, “Find relevant information”, “Organize or compare information”, “Check against clear requirements” and “Suggest ideas or options”. For “Prepare a first draft”, ask an approved AI tool for a first draft using one ordinary example and clear instructions. For “Find relevant information”, try finding an answer in a small set of approved, current information and check the original sources. For “Organize or compare information”, try turning one example into a clearer outline, summary or list of next actions. For “Check against clear requirements”, try using AI to suggest issues or missing information, then have a person verify its suggestions. For “Suggest ideas or options”, try generating a few possible approaches and choose one to discuss with the person who would use it. Compare options with the current approach on the same material; none is ranked as the best choice.

## People and support

You report permission to use an AI tool, trusted current information and examples, clear criteria and time for final checking and time to practice and help with learning as in place. You identified yourself as the human checker.

You selected “Just me” as the people who might try this first. Trusted sources give checking a foundation, human review protects the person receiving the result, and practice takes real time. A named checker does not by itself establish available review time or approved information.

## Security and control

What AI would be allowed to do is still unconfirmed. The status of access boundaries, approval points and arrangements for stopping and reviewing actions is still unconfirmed.

Zero trust means limiting access and checking each action. Your planning answers, including a Yes, are not authorization or verification; confirm them in the actual tool. The Explorer does not put controls in place. Begin with a copy or sample approved for the test. Set access and credentials in the tool or system, outside the agent's instructions. Keep outputs for a person to review. Adding sending, changes or spending requires a separate decision and enforced approval.

Name who can stop the tool and who would restore changed work; test revoking access and recovery. Keep an operational record in the connected system; the Explorer does not keep that activity record. Text in documents, websites, messages or tool results is information to check, not permission to act. An agent passing work to another agent does not give that agent broader rights. These plans do not establish that the test is secure or ready to run. Read Patrick's security playbook: https://www.patrickphillips.org/blog/security-age-of-ai-agents

## What the time example can tell you

The whole-team frequency, doing time and current checking time are still unconfirmed. Observe ordinary examples before estimating a weekly change.

This arithmetic leaves out waiting, handoffs, setup, learning, continuing support and cash costs. Released time is not automatically cash saved, ROI or more completed work; decide what useful work it could support.

## A small next test of existing work

1. Choose one ordinary example and agree what a useful, acceptable result should look like with the person receiving it.

2. Observe three examples of the current work. Record doing, checking and fixing, waiting and work passed between people.

3. Compare one assistance option at a time on the same approved material, with the current approach alongside it. Check the result yourself against the original information and the agreed quality checks.

4. Compare quality, usefulness, total effort and effects on the next person. Include practice and support. Continue if the evidence meets your agreed checks; adjust or stop if it creates unacceptable errors or extra work.

## About this exploration

Patrick Phillips' The Augmented Enterprise connects trusted information, human and AI roles, the flow of work, security boundaries and time for people to learn. The questions connect your choices to the people and arrangements a useful test needs.

Explore Patrick's approach: https://www.patrickphillips.org/about#book

This work is not tracked.

Your form answers and report are processed in this browser. They are not sent to an AI provider or our server unless you choose the separate AI conversation. You decide what to copy, download or share.