VeroAI × FI

How Should Leaders Evaluate AI Automation Opportunities?

Developed by Vero AI and Fractional Insights AI

How Should Leaders Evaluate AI Automation Opportunities?

Leaders face intense pressure to “do something with AI” yet lack a clear framework for evaluating automation opportunities. Recent research suggests that most AI pilots fail to deliver measurable business value, often because organizations treat AI as a purely technical upgrade rather than an adaptive, human-centered transformation (GigeNET, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025). This white paper argues that the most durable gains come from using AI as a force multiplier for human judgment, not as a substitute for it.

Using examples from compliance and workforce analytics, including the Vero AI platform and Fractional Insights research, the paper outlines a practical, human-centric approach to evaluating AI opportunities. It proposes an action-oriented path for executives: start with small, strategic pilots; select platforms built for breadth, flexibility, and secure integration; invest heavily in workforce readiness; and adopt a human-centric AI maturity model to guide long-term progress (Glance.cx, 2025; AI Tool Report, 2025).

Executive Summary

Organizations are investing heavily in AI yet seeing disappointing returns. A 2025 analysis of corporate AI pilots found that most failed to demonstrate profit-and-loss impact, with root causes centered on poor integration, weak change management, and unrealistic expectations (GigeNET, 2025; Fortune, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025). Leaders frequently misunderstand what AI actually does: it is less an artificial "mind" than a powerful statistical engine for pattern recognition, summarization, and prediction across large datasets.

This misunderstanding leads to two recurring errors:

- Over-indexing on flashy use cases that automate low-value "performative" work like drafting emails, producing status decks, and summarizing meetings without redesigning underlying workflows (Chamorro-Premuzic & Fink, 2025)
- Treating AI primarily as a way to cut headcount instead of expanding capacity, compressing cycle times, and enabling higher-value strategic work

This white paper proposes a human-first AI evaluation framework built on four principles:

- Treat AI as a tool for information synthesis, not synthetic cognition
- Prioritize empowerment over displacement; use AI to enhance expert capacity
- Invest in workforce skills that harness AI's force-multiplying effect while deepening uniquely human capabilities
- Govern AI adoption in alignment with a maturity model that balances technical readiness, ethics, and culture (Glance.cx, 2025; AI Tool Report, 2025)

Two case examples illustrate this approach:

- **Vero AI's Analytics Platform:** an AI auditing and evaluation platform that lets organizations load large volumes of heterogeneous data and evaluate them against formal frameworks (e.g., SOC 2, ISO 9001, SOX, procurement criteria), compressing hundreds of hours of expert review into minutes while keeping human auditors in the loop
- **Fractional Insights Workforce Research:** research that shows productivity gains from AI correlate strongly with psychological safety and experimentation culture, not just with tooling choices (Fractional Insights, 2025)

The paper concludes with concrete action steps: use targeted pilots, evaluate platforms for adaptability and secure data control, formalize human-in-the-loop practices, and adopt a Human-Centric AI Maturity Model (Fractional Insights; Waters & Eatough, 2025) to track progress.

The Promise and Challenge of AI

AI is now a strategic necessity rather than a speculative experiment. Yet, enterprise results remain uneven. A 2025 synthesis of MIT and industry research showed that most corporate AI projects fail to deliver meaningful business outcomes or P&L impact (GigeNET, 2025; Fortune, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025). These failures are not primarily due to immature models; rather, they stem from poor problem framing, weak integration, and lack of organizational readiness.

Many leaders still frame AI as a technology procurement question - "What model or vendor should we buy?" - instead of asking, "How must our processes, culture, and skills evolve to capture value from this capability?" This is the essence of an adaptive challenge: success depends on people changing how they work, not just on installing new tools (GigeNET, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025). Organizations that treat AI as a bolt-on quickly discover that adding expensive technology to broken processes simply produces an expensive broken process (George, 2025).

> *The first rule of any technology used in a business is that automation applied to an efficient operation will magnify the efficiency. The second is that automation applied to an inefficient operation will magnify the inefficiency."*
>
> *(Gates, 1996)*

The Measurement Gap

A critical but overlooked driver of failure is incomplete measurement. Standard ROI metrics such as time saved, tasks automated, and cost reduction capture efficiency but miss the human and organizational factors that determine whether AI adoption becomes sustainable. Organizations that measure only productivity gains often create what researchers call a "measurement blind spot": they can demonstrate that AI makes work faster, but cannot explain why employees resist it, why adoption stalls, or why initial gains plateau (AI Tool Report, 2025).

Research from Fractional Insights' Future of Work Signals research program reveals the scale of this challenge:

- 49% of employees are worried about AI's impact on their work, including role elimination
- 45% who use AI are concealing it from their managers, creating "shadow innovation" that cannot be scaled
- 70% cite clarity barriers - lack of guidelines, training, or role definitions - as obstacles to confident AI use

When measurement focuses solely on efficiency while ignoring these human realities, leaders lack the data needed to address resistance, build trust, and sustain transformation.

Over the next decade, firms that fail to adapt their operating models around AI will see their differentiation erode as competitors rebase their cost structures and decision-making speed on AI-augmented workflows (GigeNET, 2025).

What AI Really Is (and Isn't)

Successful evaluation of automation opportunities begins with the right mental model of AI. Contemporary AI systems, including large language models, are probabilistic pattern engines, not synthetic humans. They excel at:

- Synthesis: condensing volumes of unstructured data into summaries or structured outputs
- Pattern recognition: detecting correlations, clusters, or anomalies that humans might miss
- Prediction: estimating likely next steps, outcomes, or classifications based on historical data (GigeNET, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025)

They are far weaker at tasks that require deep context, novel framing, embodied experience, or emotional attunement. This means AI is well suited for:

- Document classification and tagging
- Risk scoring and anomaly detection
- Drafting and summarizing structured content where humans remain editors

It is far less suited for:

- Sensitive negotiations
- Complex, novel strategy formation
- Rich interpersonal leadership and coaching

Recent commentary by Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic and Alexis Fink highlights that AI is rapidly automating the performative layer of knowledge work: emails, status reports, slide decks, and meeting notes that signal activity but may not create genuine value (Chamorro-Premuzic & Fink, 2025). This is both a risk and an opportunity. It is a risk if organizations simply produce more low-value output more cheaply. It is an opportunity if leaders use this automation to reclaim human attention for higher-order work such as problem definition, decision-making, and relationship building.

> *AI can optimize how work is done, but it cannot tell us what work should be done, or why it matters. That's still a human responsibility. And it's where the opportunity lies."*
>
> *(Chamorro-Premuzic & Fink, 2025)*

A Human-First Approach to AI

A central design choice for leaders is whether AI will be deployed to magnify people or to marginalize them. Research and practice from human-centered AI initiatives emphasize that sustainable value arises when automation is explicitly aligned with worker empowerment and growth (AI Tool Report, 2025).

Psychological Ergonomics: Designing for Human Needs

Fractional Insights developed a useful framework for evaluating AI opportunities. Psychological Ergonomics—the practice of designing work systems that align with human psychology rather than forcing humans to adapt—provides a lens for assessing whether an AI implementation will create sustainable value or trigger resistance.

When evaluating AI opportunities, leaders should consider three fundamental dimensions of the employee experience:

Security (Mitigating Risk)

AI transformation creates legitimate concerns about job safety, fair treatment, and role stability. Organizations can mitigate these risks through:

- → Explicit authorization of the learning curve and temporary productivity dips
- → Transparent communication about how roles will evolve, not disappear
- → Commitment to reskilling and redeployment before any workforce restructuring
- → Clear guardrails around data use, algorithmic decision-making, and human oversight

When security concerns are left unaddressed, employees move from creative problem-solving mode to survival mode, undermining the very innovation AI is meant to enable.

Growth (Enhancing Opportunity)

Rather than asking “Will the machine take my stepping stones?”, well-designed AI implementations should answer: “How does this create new pathways for advancement?”

Organizations can enhance growth opportunities through:

- Creating new roles focused on AI oversight, optimization, and strategic application
- Treating AI literacy as a core competency with clear skill development pathways
- Providing exposure to expert-level reasoning encoded in AI systems, accelerating capability building
- Redeploying time saved on routine tasks toward mentorship, innovation, and strategic projects

When AI expands rather than limits career trajectories, employees engage with the technology as a partner in their professional development.

Significance (Enhancing Purpose)

The most powerful question isn’t “Does my contribution still matter?” but rather “How does AI amplify the unique value I bring?” Organizations can enhance the sense of significance through:

- Redesigning workflows so AI handles volume and speed while humans focus on judgment, relationships, and strategic impact
- Measuring and communicating the irreplaceable value humans provide (creativity, contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, relationship building)
- Positioning AI as a tool that elevates professionals from task execution to advisory and leadership roles
- Celebrating the shift from “doing the work” to “designing how work gets done”

When employees see AI as amplifying their impact rather than diminishing their relevance, adoption accelerates and innovation flourishes.

Key Principles in a Human-First AI Strategy

Augmentation, not replacement

Design AI to handle high-volume, low-judgment tasks so humans can operate higher in the value chain.

Transparency and agency

Give employees visibility into how AI systems work and meaningful ability to override or improve them.

Skill development

Treat AI literacy and critical evaluation skills as core competencies for modern professionals (Glance.cx, 2025; AI Tool Report, 2025).

Balanced measurement

Track what Fractional Insights refers to as “Flourish and Flow”. This refers to both “Flow” or operational metrics (speed, accuracy, throughput) and “Flourish,” the human outcomes (experience (employee and customer), well-being, skill development, psychological safety).

Ethically and strategically, leaders can apply a simple test to any AI deployment:

Does this tool help individuals and teams become more capable, or does it erode their autonomy, dignity, or prospects for growth?

Organizations that pass this test consistently tend to see better adoption, lower resistance, and stronger innovation, because employees experience AI as a superpower, not a threat (AI Tool Report, 2025).

Job Loss vs. Job Transformation

Fears of widespread job loss are understandable, but they often conflate task automation with job elimination. Historically, technology has reconfigured jobs more than it has erased them, shifting human focus toward tasks that require judgment, empathy, or creativity.

AI will automate:

- → Summarization and first-pass analysis
- → Routine data synthesis and trend detection
- → Basic, template-driven communication

However, data from early enterprise deployments show that organizations using AI strategically tend to expand output and market reach rather than shrink their workforce (GigeNET, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025).

For example:

- → Customer support teams use AI to triage and auto-draft responses, allowing human agents to focus on complex cases and proactive outreach
- → Legal and compliance teams use AI to pre-classify documents and surface risk, allowing lawyers and auditors to concentrate on negotiation, interpretation, and advisory work

The role evolution often looks like this:

Before AI	After AI
Manually reading documents	Reviewing AI-structured summaries and flagged anomalies
Drafting from scratch	Editing AI-generated drafts with expert nuance
Searching for issues	Interpreting AI-surfaced issues and recommending actions

This shift moves professionals up the value ladder, toward judgment, counseling, and strategy. But it only happens when organizations deliberately design for it and measure both efficiency gains and human outcomes.

Compliance Example

Compliance is a domain where information volume and complexity routinely outstrip human capacity. Regulations evolve, frameworks overlap (e.g., SOC 2, ISO 27001, GDPR), and documentation demands grow. Many organizations struggle just to maintain baseline compliance, let alone design proactive controls.

AI can:

- → Parse large volumes of policies, contracts, and system descriptions
- → Map existing controls against multiple overlapping standards
- → Flag potential gaps or inconsistencies for human review (GigeNET, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025)

In practice, this means compliance professionals move from manual document review to risk interpretation and stakeholder advisory, increasing their strategic relevance to the business. Organizations that implement AI in compliance with attention to the psychological ergonomics of the transition see:

- → **Operational gains:** Reduced cycle times, improved accuracy, expanded coverage
- → **Human outcomes:** Higher job satisfaction as work becomes more strategic, accelerated skill development for junior staff, reduced burnout from information overload

Vero AI Case Study: Encoded Human Expertise at Scale

Vero AI exemplifies a platform designed explicitly for human-expert augmentation rather than generic content generation. The platform allows organizations to:

- Load large, heterogeneous data corpora (e.g., thousands of contracts, process documents, evidence files, webpages, and images)
- Evaluate these against domain-specific criteria, such as SOC 2 controls, ISO 9001 quality management, Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) requirements, or bespoke procurement standards

Unlike general-purpose tools that simply "chat" about documents, Vero AI encodes structured human expertise—the logic auditors and specialists actually use—into analytical workflows that are secure, repeatable, and transparent. An expert auditor who might spend hundreds of hours on a complex assessment can leverage Vero AI to:

- Run a full framework-aligned analysis in minutes
- Receive structured findings, evidence links, and gap analysis
- Focus time on interpreting results, advising stakeholders, and designing remediation or optimization strategies

From a workforce perspective:

Experts gain leverage: they handle more cases without diluting quality.

Junior staff gain learning opportunities: they see how expert criteria map to the data, accelerating their development.

Clients gain value: they receive faster, more consistent, and better-documented insights.

> *Savvy, growth-oriented businesses use AI to let their best people focus on the hardest problems—not to reduce their headcount."*

Preparing the Workforce for the AI Era

Infrastructure and platforms are only half the story. The other half is workforce readiness. High-performing organizations invest systematically in two development tracks:

AI enablement skills: how to prompt, interpret, and integrate AI outputs into daily work

Uniquely human skills: creativity, emotional intelligence, critical thinking, and complex communication that AI cannot replicate reliably (AI Tool Report, 2025)

The Learning Curve Challenge

Organizations typically experience a short-term efficiency dip when adopting new tools. When you adopt a new capability, performance initially drops as people learn. The dip happens because of upskilling needs, process re-engineering, data preparation, change resistance, and experimentation time.

Most employees are terrified of this dip. They think if they slow down to learn, they will be punished for missing KPIs. Leaders must explicitly authorize the learning curve. During times of uncertainty, implicit permission isn't enough.

Research shows that when leaders model AI use without also providing enablement—training, time, and explicit permission to experiment—they don't inspire adoption; they intimidate teams. Employees see the gap between the leader's capability and their own and experience it as threat, not opportunity.

The most effective approach combines:

- → Explicit authorization to slow down temporarily for learning
- → Protected time for experimentation
- → Psychological safety to share both successes and failures
- → Leaders modeling their own learning journey, including mistakes

How Employees Should Evaluate Automation Technologies

Knowledge workers often greet AI with skepticism or fear because it appears to target precisely the activities that have historically defined their roles: reading, synthesizing, writing, and communicating. Leaders can help reframe this by giving employees a practical evaluation checklist for AI tools:

- → Does this tool increase my throughput on low-value tasks?
- → Does it improve the objectivity or consistency of my analysis?
- → Does it shift my time toward reviewing and recommending rather than merely reading and summarizing?
- → Do I retain final decision-making authority?
- → Am I learning from how the AI approaches problems, building my own capability?

When AI is understood as enhanced statistical capability—a way to process more data faster and with fewer errors—employees can see it as a way to achieve “superhuman” scale and speed, not as a rival (GigeNET, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025).

Common Concerns About AI

Hallucinations and Reliability

AI "hallucinations" - confidently wrong outputs - are a legitimate concern for leaders. However, reliability can be substantially improved by:

- Restricting AI systems to domain-specific knowledge bases through retrieval-augmented generation (RAG)
- Implementing guardrails and validation rules that prevent certain classes of unsafe or unverified output
- Keeping humans in the loop for high-stakes decisions (Complex Discovery, 2025)

Many enterprise AI platforms, including Vero AI, now combine LLMs with deterministic rules, audit trails, and human approval workflows to reduce operational risk (GigeNET, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025).

The "AI Bubble"

Some analysts argue current AI valuations and hype levels are unsustainable, suggesting a looming correction. Even if investment is in a speculative phase, the underlying capabilities - classification, summarization, anomaly detection - have already crossed into durable utility (GigeNET, 2025). Leaders should distinguish between:

- **Speculative expectations** ("AI will solve everything")
- **Operational realities** ("AI can materially improve specific processes when integrated thoughtfully")

AI tools are unlikely to "go away" even if funding cools; the question is which platforms will maintain robust, secure, and well-governed offerings over time.

Runaway AI and AGI Fears

Public discourse sometimes conflates today's narrow AI with hypothetical artificial general intelligence (AGI). Current systems remain highly domain-bound and data-dependent. Their failure modes (hallucination, bias, data leakage) are governance problems, not signs of emergent consciousness (AI Tool Report, 2025; Complex Discovery, 2025).

Leaders add more value by:

- → Investing in model governance, transparency, and auditability
- → Clarifying boundaries between automated suggestion and human decision
- → Educating teams about what current AI can and cannot do

Measuring What Matters: Beyond Efficiency Metrics

Organizations that succeed with AI adopt measurement frameworks that track both operational and human outcomes. One approach, developed through research with over 1,000 employees, uses a balanced scorecard with two complementary dimensions:

Flow (Operational Excellence)

Flow measures AI's impact on the speed, quality, and efficiency of operations - the traditional ROI metrics leaders already track:

- → Cycle time reduction
- → Error rates and accuracy improvements
- → Throughput and output volume
- → Task completion speed
- → AI tool adoption and usage rates

Flourish (Human-Centric Outcomes)

Flourish measures the human experience of working with AI - the factors that determine whether initial productivity gains become sustainable:

- Employee well-being and engagement
- Psychological safety (e.g., safety to experiment, to fail, to share concerns)
- Skill development and learning trajectory
- Team collaboration patterns and quality
- Sentiment on creativity, innovation, and meaningful work

Triangulating Impact Through Multiple Data Sources

The most rigorous measurement approaches combine:

Behavioral data: Usage patterns from AI tools themselves—what people are doing, how often, which features drive engagement

Sentiment data: Employee feedback through pulse surveys—how people feel about AI, where they see value, what barriers they encounter

Business outcomes: Core operational KPIs from existing systems—actual impact on cycle times, customer satisfaction, quality metrics, retention

By triangulating these three sources, organizations can make statements like: "When our sales team uses the AI summary feature more than 3x daily, their self-reported well-being improves by 15%, and their deal close rate increases by 5%."

This comprehensive measurement enables leaders to:

- Identify which AI use cases drive both efficiency and engagement
- Diagnose early warning signs of resistance before they become organizational drag
- Build compelling narratives that address both CFO concerns and employee anxieties
- Optimize implementations for sustainable transformation

The Human-Centric AI Maturity Model

To assess organizational readiness and chart a course for improvement, leaders need a structured framework. The Human-Centric AI Maturity Model evaluates three critical dimensions:

Strategy & Governance

At the lowest levels of maturity, AI efforts are fragmented, siloed, and lack leadership oversight. At the highest levels, AI strategy is integrated into decision-making, and governance policies continuously balance speed with responsibility.

Key progression: From ad-hoc initiatives → Defined strategy → Integrated decision-making with continuous policy refinement

Systems & Work Design

In the early stages, AI is treated as an add-on with little thought about how it changes roles or workflows. At maturity, AI becomes a true partner in the design of work, freeing people to focus on collaboration, service, and innovation.

Key progression: From AI as bolt-on → Formal role/workflow consideration → Cohesive framework for AI-human integration

Support & Culture

At the starting point, employees are left to figure out AI adoption on their own, with little training or guidance. At the most advanced level, organizations create cultures where experimentation is encouraged, training is continuous, and innovation is supported by data and feedback.

Key progression: From “figure it out” culture → Proactive training → Adaptive, innovative culture with continuous support

Dimension	Initial State	Optimized State
Strategy & Governance	AI efforts ad-hoc, siloed; policies non-existent	AI integrated into all decisions; policies continuously improved; balances business and people outcomes
Systems & Work Design	AI viewed as add-on; no formal consideration of role changes	Cohesive framework for AI-human integration; AI as co-pilot freeing humans for collaboration and strategy
Support & Culture	No information or training; employees expected to "figure it out"	Enterprise-wide embrace; adaptive culture; continuous, proactive support based on data

By assessing themselves against these dimensions, organizations can:

- → Establish a baseline of current strengths and gaps
- → Prioritize investments (e.g., more in training vs. more in governance)
- → Track progress over time using consistent criteria
- → Communicate a clear roadmap to stakeholders

Action Steps for Leaders

To translate these insights into practice, leaders can follow a staged, human-centric roadmap:

1. Start with Small, Strategic Pilots

Target specific processes where information overload or repetitive analysis constrains performance (e.g., policy review, vendor due diligence, contract abstraction, compliance mapping).

Define balanced success metrics from the outset:

- → Flow metrics: time saved, error reduction, expanded coverage, throughput improvements
- → Flourish metrics: employee satisfaction with the change, skill development, psychological safety, collaboration quality

Track both dimensions throughout the pilot to understand total impact.

2. Evaluate Platforms for Adaptability and Governance

When assessing AI platforms, prioritize:

Breadth and flexibility: Ability to ingest varied data types and map to multiple frameworks (e.g., SOC 2, ISO, SOX, procurement criteria)

Data control and security: Robust access controls, encryption, and clear data residency policies

Integration: APIs and workflows that fit into existing systems (e.g., document repositories, ticketing, GRC platforms)

Human-in-the-loop design: Systems that keep experts in control of high-stakes decisions

3. Build Human-in-the-Loop Systems

Design workflows where:

- AI performs first-pass analysis or drafting
- Human experts review, approve, and refine AI outputs, especially in regulated or high-stakes contexts
- Decisions and rationales are logged to create auditable trails that support continuous improvement (Complex Discovery, 2025)

Measure both operational gains and human experience to ensure the system is sustainable.

4. Foster a Culture of Responsible Experimentation

Normalize the learning curve: Explicitly authorize the time and temporary productivity dip for skill development

Encourage sharing: Create channels for teams to share both successes and failures from AI experiments

Recognize learning: Reward employees who surface experiments that yield insight, even if the experiment "failed"

Address shadow innovation: Ask employees to share where they're using AI and celebrate those efforts as strategic innovation, not policy violations

Provide ethics training: Equip teams to identify bias, evaluate model outputs critically, and understand AI's limitations (AI Tool Report, 2025)

5. Use AI for Growth, Not Contraction

Explicitly state that AI is being deployed to expand capacity—serve more customers, tackle more complex work, improve quality—not simply to cut costs.

Align incentives so leaders are rewarded for redeploying freed capacity to new value-creating initiatives rather than headcount reductions.

Track both efficiency gains and human outcomes to ensure the transformation is creating value, not just extracting it.

6. Apply the Human-Centric AI Maturity Model

Use the maturity model to:

- → Assess current state across strategy, systems, and culture
- → Identify the most critical gaps to address
- → Prioritize investments based on where the organization needs the most development
- → Track progress over time and communicate evolution to stakeholders

The model provides a common language for discussing AI readiness that goes beyond technology to encompass the organizational factors that determine success.

Conclusion

AI alone will not rescue organizations from the challenges of today's fast-moving world. But it does provide a powerful catalyst for change. The technology is forcing companies to confront weaknesses in their structures, cultures, measurement systems, and leadership practices.

The key is to stop treating AI transformation as a technical project and embrace it as the adaptive challenge it truly is. It demands that leaders:

Design for Psychological Ergonomics by addressing core human needs for security, growth, and significance

Measure comprehensively by tracking both operational excellence and human outcomes

Build trust through transparency, skill development, and alignment of incentives

Progress systematically using maturity models that balance technical capability with cultural readiness

The organizations that rise to this challenge will unlock real value from AI. They will sprint ahead not because they found the perfect tool but because they built the adaptive capacity to use technology wisely. And in doing so, they will set themselves apart as leaders in a business world that demands both speed and humanity.

References

AI Tool Report. (2025). *Humanity AI: Human-Centric Solutions for 2025.* Retrieved from https://www.theaireport.ai/articles/humanity-ai-human-centric-solutions-for-2025

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Fink, A. (2025, August 27). How AI is exposing the BS economy. *Fast Company.* Retrieved from https://www.fastcompany.com/91391631/how-ai-is-exposing-the-bs-economy-ai-work-productivity

Complex Discovery. (2025). *Why 95% of Corporate AI Projects Fail: Lessons from MIT's 2025 Study.* Retrieved from https://complexdiscovery.com/why-95-of-corporate-ai-projects-fail-lessons-from-mits-2025-study/

Fortune. (2025). *MIT report: 95% of generative AI pilots at companies are failing*. Retrieved from https://fortune.com/2025/08/18/mit-report-95-percent-generative-ai-pilots-at-companies-failing-cfo/

Gates, B. (1996). *The road ahead.* Viking.

George, J. (2025). *The Great Agentic AI Shakeout: Why 40% of Projects Fail. Can the Middle East Defy the Odds?* MIT Sloan Management Review. Retrieved from https://www.mitsloanme.com/article/the-great-agentic-ai-shakeout-why-40-of-projects-fail-can-the-middle-east-defy-the-odds/

GigeNET. (2025). *AI Project Failure Rate: 95% Fail - MIT Study Reveals Why.* Retrieved from https://www.gigenet.com/blog/ai-project-failure-rate-mit-study-95-percent/

Glance.cx. (2025). *New AI + Human CX Maturity Model Guides Enterprise Strategy for 2025.* Retrieved from https://www.glance.cx/blog/new-ai-human-cx-maturity-model-guides-enterprise-strategy-for-2025

Waters, S., & Eatough, E. (2025). *The Adaptive Challenge Undermining Your AI Transformation.* Fractional Insights White Paper.