Demonstration Case Study: Delegating Email Management Without Losing Control

Scenario

A founder receives a large number of emails every day and decides to use artificial intelligence to reduce the time required to manage them. AI is used to classify incoming messages and prepare draft responses.

The founder, however, reviews, corrects or partially rewrites every draft before it is sent. As a result, the new process creates additional material to review instead of delivering the expected time savings.

At the heart of this need for control is a key factor: **the founder remains ultimately responsible for the organisation's communications**. An inaccurate or inappropriate email, or one sent to the wrong recipient, can damage a professional relationship, affect the organisation's reputation, cause financial loss or create operational and legal consequences.

The issue to be examined is therefore:

How can the founder save time through the use of AI while maintaining control over communications that genuinely involve their responsibility, judgement and reputation?

Analysis of the Objective

The analysis begins by defining the exact outcome the founder wants to achieve:

- Which types of email take up the most time?
- How much time is currently spent managing them?
- Which activities should AI support: classification, summarisation, drafting or completion of a response?
- What specific result would make the use of AI worthwhile?
- Which aspects of communication must continue to reflect the founder's own voice and judgement?

"Saving time" is therefore translated into a specific, observable and measurable objective.

Analysis of Responsibility

The next step is to examine the potential consequences associated with different types of email:

- impact on the organisation's reputation;
- financial or operational responsibility;
- decisions, promises or commitments made through the communication;
- sensitivity of the information involved;
- importance of the relationship with the recipient;

- consequences of an error in the content, tone, recipient or timing of the message.

This stage identifies **what the founder is ultimately responsible for and needs to protect**.

Analysis of the Review Process

The founder’s review process is then observed in practice:

- Which elements of each email are checked?
- Which corrections are repeatedly made?
- Which types of output generate the greatest lack of trust?
- Which information is consistently missing from the instructions given to the AI?
- How much time does each review require?
- Which emails are substantially or completely rewritten?
- Which checks are connected to a genuine communication risk?
- Which checks are required because a sufficiently reliable process has not yet been established?

Analysis of the Instructions Given to AI

The requests and instructions used to generate responses are also examined:

- Is the objective of the communication clearly stated?
- Is the recipient and their relationship with the organisation adequately described?
- Are the context, tone and desired outcome specified?
- Are the limits within which the AI can operate clearly defined?
- Is it clear when the AI should flag uncertainty rather than generate a definitive response?
- Which information does the founder repeatedly need to add, correct or clarify?

This stage helps determine whether an unsatisfactory output is connected to the technology, the instructions provided or the wider process in which AI is being used.

Diagnostic Outcome

The diagnostic produces a map of email activities based on:

- the objective of the communication;
- the founder’s level of responsibility;
- reputational risk;
- the need for human judgement;
- the type and level of AI support that may be appropriate;
- the level of review required;
- the conditions that require the founder’s direct involvement.

The intended outcome is a process in which **the founder's time and attention are concentrated on the communications where their responsibility, judgement and personal voice create genuine value**.

About This Demonstration Case

This demonstration case illustrates one example of how the method can be applied to a realistic scenario.

Every founder, professional and organisation has different objectives, responsibilities, priorities and ways of working. The need for control, the level of trust, the concerns involved and the perception of risk also vary from one person and organisation to another.

For this reason, the analysis and any resulting interventions are always tailor-made. They are developed through direct observation of the specific context and of how the work is actually carried out.