

D

Governance and Implementation Templates

These templates support the governance, evaluation, and implementation work described in Chapters 8 through 13. They are written so a small practice and a large health system can both use them. A smaller organization might complete them in a conversation between a manager, a clinician, and an outside IT provider. A larger one might route them through existing quality, technology, and service review. The arrangements should fit the organization and the consequences of the use.

Use what you already have where it does the work. If your organization has an intake form, a project charter, or an improvement template, add the missing questions to it rather than creating a second process.

Responsibilities to Write Down

Before the first request arrives, write a short description of who can make each kind of decision. Chapter 8 develops this in more detail. At a minimum, I would want the following to be clear:

- Who can approve an evaluation, authorize routine use, change the permitted scope, or pause a tool?
- Where do unresolved concerns go, and who has authority to resolve competing priorities?
- Who is the leader accountable for each initiative's intended result?

- Who manages access and technical support, and who owns how the tool is used within the service?
- Who maintains the inventory of AI uses, and how does it stay current when software changes?

Review Paths

Chapter 8 describes organizing review around the proposed use. The names and delegation rules can fit your organization.

- **A limited test** may qualify for a delegated review when its purpose, information, and consequences are well contained.
- **A proposed use in routine work** needs review of the actual workflow, including the information used, who checks the output, and how a correction would be handled.
- **A use with more consequential effects** requires deeper investigation and the relevant specialist involvement.

These paths organize the work. They don't establish universal risk categories or guarantee approval. A small pilot involving real people can still carry significant risk.

WORKSHEET

From Chapter 8

AI Use Inventory Entry

USE OR PRODUCT _____

STATUS _____

RESPONSIBLE LEADER _____

LAST UPDATED _____

1 Purpose

What problem the use addresses and what people are actually doing with the tool.

2 Information involved

What the tool receives, where it comes from, and where its output goes.

3 What the output influences

The decisions, work, or services it can affect, with or without a person's approval.

4 Version and configuration

The product version, settings, and connections reviewed, where available.

5 Approval and conditions

What has been approved, by whom, and the conditions attached. Recording a use here does not approve it.

6 Unknown details

What we still need to find out and who is responsible for finding it.

WORKSHEET

From Chapter 2

Describing the Proposed Use

PROPOSAL _____ PREPARED BY _____

DATE _____

1 Purpose

What problem are we trying to address, and what would a better result look like?

2 Information

What does the system use, where does it come from, and who maintains it?

3 Output and action

What does it produce, and what can happen next, with or without a person's approval?

4 People and work

Whose responsibilities, workload, or experience could change, including people who never use the software?

5 Preparation and oversight

What practice, review, support, and escalation will be needed, and who will provide them?

6 Evidence and follow-up

What supports this use, what remains uncertain, and how will we evaluate the result and respond to problems?

WORKSHEET

From Chapter 8

Intake Questions

REQUEST _____

REQUESTER _____

COORDINATOR _____

DATE RECEIVED _____

1 What problem are we trying to address?

The work that needs improvement, the people affected, and the result sought.

2 What are we asking permission to do?

The specific evaluation or use, including what the tool may produce or do automatically.

3 What information will be involved?

Its sources, sensitivity, access, destinations, and any unresolved questions about handling it.

4 Who is responsible?

The service owner, proposed users, technical support, and people needed for review.

5 What supports the proposal?

Relevant evidence, local conditions, input from affected people, and uncertainties.

6 What could happen if we are wrong?

Cost of error, difficulty of reversing harm, and the number of people affected and depth of impact.

7 What will implementation require?

Time, funding, training, review, support, and any earlier problems the proposal depends on.

8 How will we judge the result?

Expected benefit, checks for problems, follow-up, and arrangements for pausing or stopping.

WORKSHEET

From Chapters 8 and 10

Approval and Decision Record

USE _____

DECIDED BY _____

DATE _____

REVIEW DATE _____

1 Intended use

The task, people, information, product version, and limits of the use reviewed.

2 Basis for the decision

Relevant evidence, local evaluation, staff and patient input where appropriate, and remaining uncertainty.

3 Applicable requirements

What reviewers determined applies, the source and date, and any unresolved question.

4 Authorization and preparation

Who decided, what they permitted, and how required preparation was confirmed.

5 Responsibility during use

Who checks performance, who responds to concerns, and where the results are kept.

6 Changes and follow-up

What changed, what the team found, what it did, and who checked the response.

WORKSHEET

From Chapter 13

Experiment Plan

EXPERIMENT _____ OWNER _____

START DATE _____ REVIEW DATE _____

1 Question

What are we trying to learn, and which decision will the answer inform?

2 Boundaries

What information, people, and systems are involved? How will we prevent use outside the test?

3 Preparation

What approvals, expertise, practice, and support are needed before starting?

4 Evaluation

What will we compare, measure, and observe? What would justify continuing, changing, or stopping?

5 Pause arrangements

Which findings require an early response? Who can pause the test, and how will necessary work continue?

6 Review

Who will consider the findings, when, and what must be resolved before restarting or extending?

7 Next stage

What would change with wider use, and what would need further review?

WORKSHEET

From Chapters 11 and 12

Checking Our Commitments

IMPLEMENTATION _____ DATE _____

Reducing work

Have we accounted for review, correction, and work transferred to other people?

Supporting a better conversation

What do clinicians, patients, and caregivers say about the encounter?

Providing preparation and support

Have people had practice time, and can they reach help when they need it?

Taking concerns seriously

Are reports assessed, acted on when needed, and followed up with the people who raised them?

Explaining changes to roles or services

Do people know what is decided, what remains open, and when they will hear more?

Correcting a decision

Can a person question an outcome, reach someone responsible, and learn what was reviewed and changed?

Walking Through One Decision

Chapter 10 suggests choosing one consequential AI use and reviewing it with the person responsible. These are the questions I would want that conversation to answer:

- What are we using this tool for, and does that match the use that was reviewed?
- Who authorized it, what informed the decision, and were the required preparations completed?
- Which requirements apply, and who is responsible for keeping that assessment current?

- What have we learned during use, and what happened when someone raised a concern?
- If we needed to restrict or stop it today, who would act and how would the work continue?

If an answer takes some investigation, find out why. The information may exist in another system, a responsibility may be unclear, or the work may not have been completed. Those are different problems and need different responses.

A Ninety-Day Starting Sequence

Chapter 14 suggested using the next ninety days to put this approach into practice. This is a fuller version of that sequence. Some organizations already have much of the structure in place. Others may need outside help or more time. The dates give the work review points; they don't confer permission to launch or require work to wait.

An urgent concern needs attention when it is found. A properly reviewed activity may be ready to proceed while the wider process is still being improved. The purpose is to make progress on actual needs, with enough preparation for the consequences involved.

Days 1–30: Understand the Current Position

Begin by finding out which AI uses are proposed or active and who is responsible for them. The inventory entry above can help organize that information. Include features in existing software and uses staff have begun to explore, as well as formal purchases.

For each known use, establish what it does, which information it involves, and what its output can influence. Record uncertainty honestly and assign someone to resolve it. An inventory entry records a use; it doesn't approve it.

Alongside the inventory, talk with staff about the problems they are trying to solve. A request for an AI tool may point to a process that needs attention regardless of which product is selected. That conversation can also help identify work that has moved between teams or support that people were promised but never received.

Choose a decision for a closer review based on the concerns and opportunities you find. It might be an existing use with consequential unanswered questions or a proposal where a limited evaluation could provide useful evidence. The choice should reflect your setting, rather than a requirement to start with the easiest demonstration.

By the first review point, I would want an initial account of known uses, responsible people, significant gaps, and the next actions. It may be incomplete. The organization should still be responding to identified concerns while the work continues.

Days 31–60: Resolve the Responsibilities and Missing Work

Use what you learned to make the review process easier to follow. People need to know where to bring a proposal or concern, who coordinates the response, and who can make the relevant decision. If those arrangements already exist, examine whether they work for the AI uses you have identified.

For the selected decision, bring together the evidence, local context, expertise, and affected people's experience. Identify what still needs investigation. The result may be a clearer plan, a narrower proposal, a decision to stop, or a specific question for an experiment.

Implementation preparation belongs here too. Who needs practice with the tool? Who will review its output? What will patients or staff be told? Who will help when the usual process cannot be followed? Put the required time and support into the plan, with someone responsible for providing them.

In a smaller service, this may involve a manager, staff members, and outside technical or specialist support. A larger organization may assign the work across several teams. A whole-organization approach means connecting the responsibilities and consequences relevant to the use. It doesn't require every department to join every meeting.

Give attention to unresolved problems that would undermine the proposal. If the tool depends on current policies and nobody maintains those policies, that work needs an owner. If staff are already correcting output without enough time, the immediate plan needs to address their capacity. Adding another form would not resolve either problem.

At the next review point, the team should be able to explain the decision, the conditions attached to it, and what happens next. If important work remains, name it and explain how it affects the permitted use.

Days 61–90: Carry Out the Next Step and Review It

Proceed with the next step the review supports. That could be a bounded experiment, a change to an existing implementation, further investigation, or closing a proposal that cannot meet the need. The purpose of this period is to follow through on the decision.

If a test is appropriate, use the approach from Chapter 13: a clear question, defined boundaries, an evaluation plan, and arrangements for pausing or stopping. An existing service may instead need corrected responsibilities, better preparation, or a more workable route for concerns.

Review what happened with the people involved. Did the proposed preparation occur? Was the support available? What did staff and patients experience? What did the result establish, and which questions remain?

The review should also examine the process you used. Perhaps a request reached the wrong person, an approval condition was unclear, or a staff member noticed something the evaluation missed. Make the corresponding changes before repeating the same arrangement for another initiative.

By the end of this starting period, I would want to see decisions followed by action and review, with a record that another person can understand. The number of tools launched is not enough to judge that work. Neither is the number of proposals stopped. We need to look at whether the decisions were supported and whether the organization carried out its responsibilities.

