SECTOR DECISION BRIEF

Public Sector

AI decisions in public institutions must be explainable to more than the project team. Procurement, records, accessibility, security, and public accountability shape what can move from experiment to service.



AideDeCamp Consulting | Advisory perspective

Illustrative guidance. Scope and deliverables are agreed for each engagement.

SECTOR DECISION BRIEF / ADVISORY PERSPECTIVE

Public Sector

AI decisions in public institutions must be explainable to more than the project team. Procurement, records, accessibility, security, and public accountability shape what can move from experiment to service.



DECISION TO FRAME

Which use case can improve a defined public service while preserving accountable review?

The image is illustrative. The example below is a proposed decision design, not a completed client project.

WHY THESE CONNECT

Triage a service backlog without automating the final public decision. We will map when the signal reaches program owner and authorized case reviewer, then define the last useful point to answer: Which requests need immediate human review, a records correction, or routine processing?

An operating decision, not another alert

Public-service consequence, procurement authority, and review rights differ across federal, state, and local programs. ADC will map applicable requirements with agency counsel and identify decision owners before recommending a pilot.

EARLIER SIGNAL	DECISION	ACCOUNTABLE ACTION	PROOF
A request is aging and lacks a required item or has an exception flag.	Which requests need immediate human review, a records correction, or routine processing?	Program owner and authorized case reviewer. Route the case for review; preserve the original record and reason for escalation.	Queue age, correction effort, accessibility exceptions, and review accuracy

CONTROL BOUNDARY

No automated eligibility or benefit determination; an authorized person retains the decision.

02 / DIAGNOSTIC

Where the work gets stuck

We will test three operating friction points against the action each could change.

OPERATING FRICTION	EVIDENCE WE WILL EXAMINE	DECISION TEST WE WILL RUN
A backlog invites automation, but the exceptions carry the greatest public consequence.	Service volume, exception rates, and the present human decision path.	We will separate routine backlog from consequential exceptions and compare triage priority with reviewer judgment.
A pilot depends on records that differ across agencies or programs.	Data provenance, retention requirements, accessibility needs, and procurement boundaries.	We will trace a sample record across programs before using it in a common queue or model.
A procurement path is moving faster than the definition of who will operate and review the result.	Named policy, security, program, and frontline owners with authority to stop or change the use case.	We will require policy, security, frontline, and procurement owners to approve the operating path.

What our pilot will establish

WORKSTREAM	WHAT ADC WILL DO	DECISION-READY OUTPUT
Case consequence	Segment routine and high-consequence cases with program staff.	Case-type risk and human-review matrix.
Records lineage	Trace sample records across source systems and correction paths.	Provenance and reconciliation map.
Acquisition	Translate operating needs into acceptance, data-rights, and change tests.	Procurement acceptance gate.
Service effect	Compare queue age with correction, appeal, and access exceptions.	Disaggregated service scorecard.

DECISION GATE We will recommend whether to proceed, redesign, or stop using this test: Continue only if review quality and access controls hold while queue age improves.

Design-ready checks we will deliver

CHECK	WHAT ADC WILL VERIFY	DESIGN OUTPUT
Public review	Test accessibility, explanation, appeal, and escalation paths.	Reviewer and contestability protocol.
Sustainment	Identify post-award cost, model-change, portability, and support owners.	Lifecycle ownership and exit checklist.

03 / SECTOR EXECUTIVE AGENDA

What sector leaders will ask

A program executive will ask whether the service is fair, reviewable, accessible, procurable, and operable after the pilot team leaves.

PRIORITY	SPONSOR QUESTION	EVIDENCE TO BRING
Service consequence	Which cases affect eligibility, safety, rights, or essential service access?	Segment volume, exception severity, appeal and correction paths, and current service standards.
Records and interoperability	Can records be joined without losing meaning, provenance, retention, or access controls?	Field definitions, source authority, missingness, audit trail, and cross-program handoffs.
Acquisition and vendor control	What happens to data rights, model changes, cost, and evaluation after award?	Requirements, testing clauses, pricing assumptions, portability, and lessons from earlier procurements.
Public accountability	Who approves, explains, contests, pauses, and retires the use case?	Accessibility test, human review, documented escalation, and named policy and service owners.

Three opportunities we will compare

CANDIDATE	VALUE HYPOTHESIS	PROOF BEFORE INVESTMENT
Intake triage	Shorten routine queue time	Check exception consequences and reviewer overrides
Records reconciliation	Reduce avoidable handoff errors	Verify source authority and cross-program definitions
Procurement review	Compare proposals on real operating needs	Test data rights, total cost, and acceptance evidence

Measures we will put on the scorecard

MEASURE	WHAT A DECISION MAKER SHOULD SEE
Service result	Time to a correct and reviewable disposition, by case type.
Consequence	Appeals, reversals, inaccessible paths, and high-severity exceptions.
Operating burden	Reviewer effort, override reasons, vendor cost, and unresolved queue age.

Risks we will surface early

- A procurement starts before the agency can state the decision and acceptance test.
- Aggregate accuracy hides error in a high-consequence case type.
- No program owner can stop the workflow or explain a contested result.

04 / ADVISORY APPLICATION

How we will turn evidence into a decision

ADC will lead the work; exact outputs are agreed before kickoff.

SERVICE	WHAT ADC WILL DO
AI Strategy & Roadmap	ADC will rank opportunities by service value and feasibility, then document the public-facing consequence of error before a pilot is selected.
AI Adoption & Integration Advisory	ADC will design review and appeal paths alongside the workflow. We will keep staff judgment and exception ownership visible.
Cloud Transformation	ADC will test hosting and integration choices against records, access, procurement, and continuity constraints before committing to a platform path.

The sequence leading to your decision

STAGE	WHAT ADC WILL DO	WHAT YOU WILL RECEIVE
Frame	We will select one service decision and its authorized reviewers.	Decision boundary and case-type map.
Examine	We will trace records, exceptions, and applicable acquisition terms.	Evidence and vendor-control record.
Test	We will replay representative cases with program staff.	Quality, access, and appeal findings.
Recommend	We will present a proceed, redesign, or stop recommendation.	Decision gate and accountable handoff.

What you will receive

- Use-case shortlist with consequence and feasibility criteria
- Decision-rights map for policy, technology, and service owners
- Pilot gate with review, accessibility, and escalation checks

A focused first engagement

We will map one public-service intake path and deliver a decision-rights map with accessibility and escalation gates.

Independent sector reading

GAO: Artificial Intelligence acquisitions

GAO: Federal AI requirements and oversight

Sources inform context; ADC is not affiliated with their publishers. Examples are illustrative, not completed client work. Scope and deliverables are agreed before kickoff.

05 / ILLUSTRATIVE ENGAGEMENT

A first engagement in practical terms

This is an example work package, not a completed client assignment. The actual scope, data access, and acceptance criteria would be agreed with the sponsor.

WORKFLOW IN SCOPE	One public-service intake queue, from receipt through reviewer disposition and correction or appeal.

The evidence we will request

- De-identified case types, receipt dates, missing-item flags, and queue age
- Policy-defined exception classes, accessibility needs, and reviewer override reasons
- Current routing rules, source-record authority, and correction or appeal path

Work products and the decisions they support

WORK PRODUCT	WHAT ADC WILL PRODUCE	HOW THE CLIENT USES IT
Case-flow map	Map case types, handoffs, aging points, and who may decide or correct each case.	Identify a narrow triage step that changes queue work without automating eligibility.
Exception and access test	Build a reviewed set of routine, incomplete, contested, and accessibility-sensitive cases.	Check whether the proposed routing improves timeliness without burying consequential cases.
Pilot control charter	Specify permitted data, reviewer action, override log, access checks, and stop triggers.	Approve a bounded test with a named program owner and reviewable public-service safeguards.

SPONSOR GATE	Sponsor chooses pilot, redesign, or stop after comparing queue age, reviewer correction effort, accessibility exceptions, and contested-case handling.

How the gate changes the next step

DIRECTION	EVIDENCE-BASED NEXT STEP
PROCEED	Pilot if routine routing is faster and consequential cases still reach authorized review.
REVISE	Revise if source fields or accessibility paths produce inconsistent exception handling.
STOP	Stop if eligibility is effectively automated or contested cases cannot be explained.

The example describes a proposed diagnostic and pilot design. It does not claim access to a named client's data, a completed engagement, or a guaranteed result.