AI Restructuring Business Case Stress Test

Use this before approving a permanent AI-linked reduction in employee roles, contractor capacity, supplier capacity or recurring operating cost.

Do not translate AI productivity directly into capacity cuts.

Before approving a permanent reduction, test what human work actually disappears, whether that creates a structural capacity block, what must remain, and whether reduction is better than the credible alternatives.

FOUR QUESTIONS BEFORE STRUCTURAL APPROVAL

01

How much human work is actually no longer required?

WHAT MUST BE ESTABLISHED

The net change in human work across the complete AI-enabled workflow, and the capacity actually released from that change on an explicit conversion basis, after remaining, new and transferred work, exceptions, review and controls are included.

TEST AGAINST

- Before-and-after workload and volumes, using observed data where available.
- Human review, exceptions, escalations, controls, rework and new AI-related work.
- Work transferred to another team, supplier or downstream process.
- The basis used to convert the supported human-work change into released capacity.

02

Is released capacity structurally addressable?

WHAT MUST BE ESTABLISHED

Released capacity forms an identifiable structural unit that can actually be changed.

TEST AGAINST

- Where the gain sits, and whether scattered released time can be consolidated into whole roles, roster positions, supplier units or another addressable block.
- For discrete structures, use feasible packages or tranches, not continuously adjustable percentages.

03

What capacity must remain to protect performance, coverage, skills and resilience?

WHAT MUST BE ESTABLISHED

The operating floor: the capacity the future operating model must retain to protect performance, coverage, skills and resilience.

TEST AGAINST

- Peak demand, coverage, service and quality requirements, controls and compliance.
- Scarce skills, resilience, AI or vendor failure, fallback capability and expected demand growth.
- Include capacity required by binding legal, regulatory, licence or contractual minimums.

04

Is the proposed reduction, at this amount and timing, economically better than the credible alternatives?

WHAT MUST BE ESTABLISHED

The proposed structural reduction, at the proposed amount and timing, is economically better than the credible alternatives.

TEST AGAINST

- Compare removal now or later, a smaller or staged reduction, attrition/non-backfill, redeployment, growth, service/resilience and temporary retention.
- Compare value, feasibility, timing and reversibility over a common decision horizon where needed.
- Material legal, regulatory, service or strategic requirements may operate as constraints rather than being forced into monetary values.

Progression: Stop where the evidence no longer provides a defensible basis for the next question. Record the supported conclusion or gap; do not manufacture downstream answers.	Iteration: If an option could materially change workload, AI performance, service demand or another earlier assumption, rerun the affected earlier questions for that option.	Sensitivity: Test whether plausible assumption changes alter the amount, timing, option or status.	Do not invent the missing number: If the evidence supports only a range, state the range. If no defensible amount is established, say so.

WHAT DOES THE EVIDENCE CURRENTLY SUPPORT?

Statuses interpret the evidence from the questions responsibly reached and any required reruns; they are not boxes to tick. Different tranches may legitimately have different statuses.

01	**Support the proposed reduction now**	Evidence supports the proposed amount and timing.
02	**Choose a different structural option**	A different amount, timing, mechanism or use of capacity is better supported, including zero structural reduction.
03	**Require specific evidence before structural approval**	Material evidence gaps still prevent a defensible structural decision.
04	**Move to a broader resource-allocation decision**	Use only after material evidence gaps that could change the ranking are closed, when adequately evidenced choices remain competitive and the answer depends on broader priorities, constraints or risk appetite.

This diagnostic identifies what must be established before structural approval. It does not provide the underlying evidence, calculate the right capacity number, document the complete case or constitute approval.

Need to work the case through? The full Execution Pack provides the Word analysis template, User Guide and executive summary: transparentchoice.com/ai-restructuring-stress-test/execution-pack