



Human-in-the-Loop Review Map

A worksheet for defining where people approve, edit, reject, escalate, or audit AI outputs.

STRUCTURE - CLARITY - BETTER DECISIONS

Practical architecture for accountable AI-enabled work.

What this template is for

Design the human role around judgment, accountability, exception handling, and quality improvement instead of vague oversight. Use this guide to make the operating choice explicit, test it with evidence, and record who owns the next decision.

BEST USED WHEN

Teams turning architecture work into a reusable operating artifact.

WHO SHOULD BE IN THE ROOM

Include the workflow owner, a person who performs the work, a reviewer with authority to approve or stop it, and the relevant data or tool owner.

CANADIAN CONTEXT

Confirm applicable federal, provincial, territorial, sector, professional, contractual, accessibility, and bilingual-service requirements. Use this workbook as operational preparation, not legal advice.

A five-step working rhythm

01

Approve

Which outputs can move forward after review?

02

Edit

When should a reviewer improve the output rather than reject it?

03

Reject

Which defects require the output to be stopped?

04

Escalate

Which topics, customers, or decisions require a higher-authority reviewer?

05

Audit

Which outputs should be sampled later for quality and pattern detection?

Build the working record

Complete one record for one workflow. Write enough to support a decision, not a generic technology wish list.

PROMPT	YOUR WORKING NOTES
01 AI output being reviewed	
02 Reviewer role	
03 Risk of no review	
04 Approve	
05 Edit	
06 Reject	
07 Decision, owner, evidence, and review date	

Review an AI-drafted proposal

STARTING FRICTION

An apparently polished proposal includes scope language the consultant has not approved.

WORKFLOW MAP



AI-SUPPORTED ROLE

Prepare a review packet with sources, uncertainties, exceptions, and the proposed next action. Flag uncertainty around approve.

HUMAN AUTHORITY

The designated reviewer approves, edits, rejects, escalates, or samples outputs based on risk. Resolve the approve question for this case.

PILOT MEASURE

Track review time, rejection reasons, missed escalations, and corrections after approval. Record approve exceptions separately.

DISCUSSION PROMPT

What evidence would the reviewer need to trust, correct, reject, or escalate this output?

Review customer commitments

STARTING FRICTION

Routine answers can be fast, but refunds or allergy questions need a staff checkpoint.

WORKFLOW MAP



AI-SUPPORTED ROLE

Prepare a review packet with sources, uncertainties, exceptions, and the proposed next action. Flag uncertainty around edit.

HUMAN AUTHORITY

The designated reviewer approves, edits, rejects, escalates, or samples outputs based on risk. Resolve the edit question for this case.

PILOT MEASURE

Track review time, rejection reasons, missed escalations, and corrections after approval. Record edit exceptions separately.

DISCUSSION PROMPT

What evidence would the reviewer need to trust, correct, reject, or escalate this output?

Review a client-facing summary

STARTING FRICTION

A source-linked draft still needs a professional to confirm figures and interpretation.

WORKFLOW MAP



AI-SUPPORTED ROLE

Prepare a review packet with sources, uncertainties, exceptions, and the proposed next action. Flag uncertainty around reject.

HUMAN AUTHORITY

The designated reviewer approves, edits, rejects, escalates, or samples outputs based on risk. Resolve the reject question for this case.

PILOT MEASURE

Track review time, rejection reasons, missed escalations, and corrections after approval. Record reject exceptions separately.

DISCUSSION PROMPT

What evidence would the reviewer need to trust, correct, reject, or escalate this output?

Before the pilot grows

Use these prompts to test whether the proposed workflow can operate responsibly in its Canadian business context.

01

Approve

Review is required for high-impact outputs. Name the owner and the operating decision before selecting a tool.

02

Edit

Reviewers can see source context and model rationale. Record the approved sources, permissions, and missing information.

03

Reject

Approval or rejection is captured as evidence. Test this boundary with representative and adverse cases.

04

Escalate

Rejected outputs improve future workflow rules. Preserve review, escalation, and correction evidence.

05

Audit

Escalations have a named owner and response time. Set a measurable stop condition and the next review date.

06

Readiness to proceed

Human-in-the-loop design should make judgment more effective, not turn every output into manual rework.

CANADIAN REFERENCE POINTS

Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada - Privacy and artificial intelligence
priv.gc.ca/en/privacy-topics/technology/artificial-intelligence/

Government of Canada - Artificial Intelligence guidance, principles, and policy
canada.ca/en/services/science/innovation/artificial-intelligence.html

General operational guidance only. Confirm applicable legal, privacy, cybersecurity, professional, contractual, and regulatory requirements with qualified advisors.