Reading / EN

AI may suggest. Who decides?

Work, automation, and the responsibility behind a ranking.

Epoch AdL · Bib / 2026-10-21

AI may suggest. Who decides?

New software promises a smaller backlog. But who checks its suggestions, bears the consequences of mistakes, and may stop it? A reading about working with generative AI.

The Monday morning ranking

A team starts the week with a backlog. A new AI assistant sorts requests, suggests responses, and flags urgent cases. Management sees shorter processing times. An employee, however, notices that incomplete requests often slip to the back, even though these people in particular might need support. The example is fictional. It shows how the same process looks different from different positions.

The ranking has already set a direction before anyone approves an individual suggestion. It determines what receives attention first and which cases wait. That is why having a human press a confirmation button at the end is not enough. It is also necessary to examine who formulates the task, selects the data, sets the standards for comparison, and can receive feedback from those affected.

M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Anwendungsbeispiele, Version 1.0 · 14 July 2026 · Sections 1–14. The figures in the source are synthetic

demonstration data.M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Formale Sinnordnung, Deutsche Formalfassung 1.0 · 14 July 2026 · Especially sections 1, 3.2, 4–7, and 12. Normative stipulation and empirical assessment are read separately.

What the labor market study actually says

The ILO and the NASK research institute published a refined index of occupational exposure to generative AI in May 2025. According to this study, about a quarter of global employment is in occupations with potential exposure. This means a possible change in tasks. The figure does not measure jobs actually lost; the authors emphasize the transformation of work rather than the complete replacement of entire occupations.

For the team's question, this initially means limiting the claim. A global exposure estimate reveals neither the specific staffing needs of this workplace nor the quality of its software. The actual tasks would need to be examined for that. Which steps become easier? What additional checking tasks arise? Who benefits from the time saved, and who takes on additional responsibility? These are editorial follow-up questions prompted by the study.

ILO und NASK: Generative AI and Jobs – A Refined Global Index of Occupational Exposure · ILO Working Paper 140, 20 May 2025.

Exposure is also contextualized using the ILO announcement of the same day; checked on 21 October 2026.ILO: One in four jobs at risk of being transformed by GenAI, new ILO–NASK Global Index shows · 20 May 2025 · Exposure does not measure jobs actually lost · Checked on 21 October 2026.

Responsibility needs time and authority

The manuscripts call the assistance role Order A and the human decision-making role Order M. This is a functional distinction: suggestions, uncertainties, and alternatives are made visible; a responsible person examines them and decides. The terms themselves do not guarantee quality. Review is empty if there is no time, necessary expertise, or right to depart from the suggestion.

In the fictional team, it would therefore be necessary to establish before the trial which suggestions must be checked, who takes over difficult cases, and how incorrect sorting is corrected. Employees need a way to reject a problematic suggestion without losing the case as a result. A visible explanation of departures can help, provided it serves improvement and does not merely create additional administrative pressure.

M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Anwendungsbeispiele, Version 1.0 · 14 July 2026 · Sections 1–14. The figures in the source are synthetic demonstration data.M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Formale Sinnordnung, Deutsche Formalfassung 1.0 · 14 July 2026 · Especially sections 1, 3.2,

4–7, and 12. Normative stipulation and empirical assessment are read separately.

Compare first, then change

The source describes shadow operation: initially, the system produces suggestions without carrying out real decisions. For our example, the same completed cases, suitable for this purpose, could be compared using the existing simple sorting method and the new assistant. Data selection, access rights, and permissible purpose would need to be established beforehand. Confidential data should not be placed in arbitrary public tools as an experiment.

Review questions defined beforehand keep the evaluation honest. How often is an urgent case overlooked? How much checking work arises? Are incomplete or unusual requests disadvantaged? A faster result can still perform worse on these questions. The trial is a proposal made by this reading edition, not a tested implementation method. Its strength would be a transparent decision about whether to continue and under what conditions.

M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Anwendungsbeispiele, Version 1.0 · 14 July 2026 · Sections 1–14. The figures in the source are synthetic demonstration data.

When success has merely been

renamed

A metric can improve because the work has improved. It can also improve because difficult cases are no longer counted or a target has been lowered. The source's distinction between types of drift calls for changes in the actual process, the model, and the assessment framework to be recorded separately. This accounting does not automatically prevent deception; it allows more precise questions to be asked.

The standard for the team should therefore hold several consequences together: quality, accessible support, actual workload, and the possibility of correction. Not introducing the system remains an alternative, too. Anyone responsible for an AI assistant must be able to explain what work it makes easier and what new work it creates. A ranking becomes a defensible decision aid only when its influence is visible and its limits have practical effect.

M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Anwendungsbeispiele, Version 1.0 · 14 July 2026 · Sections 1–14. The figures in the source are synthetic demonstration data.

Questions

Who may reject a suggestion, and does that person have the time and information to do so?

What mistakes in your workflow would remain hidden behind an improved average processing time?

What simple alternative would the new assistant have to match at a minimum?

About this edition

Adapted from “ADL – Anwendungsbeispiele,” sections 7 to 9 and 13, and “ADL – Formale Sinnordnung,” section 3.2. The connection to working life and the discussion of the ILO study are editorial additions. Order A and Order M designate roles in the model; this does not claim that an operational AI system exists.

Explains assistance and decision-making through specific responsibilities.

Distinguishes potential AI exposure from actual job losses.

Describes a trial with error checking and a simple comparison method, without presenting any benefit of ADL as established.

An independent adaptation of selected passages with new examples and context. This is not a complete reprint of the source texts. Examples are fictional; ADL interpretations are editorial applications. External sources do not establish ADL’s effectiveness.

Sources

M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Anwendungsbeispiele, Version 1.0
14 July 2026 · Sections 1–14. The figures in the source are synthetic demonstration data.

M. Selman Yildizhan: ADL – Formale Sinnordnung, Deutsche Formalfassung 1.0
14 July 2026 · Especially sections 1, 3.2, 4–7, and 12. Normative stipulation and empirical assessment are read separately.

ILO und NASK: Generative AI and Jobs – A Refined Global Index of Occupational Exposure
ILO Working Paper 140, 20 May 2025. Exposure is also contextualized using the ILO announcement of the same day; checked on 21 October 2026.

ILO: One in four jobs at risk of being transformed by GenAI, new ILO–NASK Global Index shows
20 May 2025 · Exposure does not measure jobs actually lost · Checked on 21 October 2026.