

PI Firm AI Readiness Checklist

What to verify before automating intake and follow-up

Evaluate one workflow. Select a status for every check, then record the evidence and next action. Confirmed means someone has verified the evidence. Complete the pilot decision brief on page 4.

1. What single task should the assistant complete?

Name the trigger, permitted actions, and final record. For example, collect approved intake information and create a review task for staff. Answering a chat is not completion if the inquiry never reaches its owner.

Evidence: A workflow map with a clear start and finish.

Status

2. Does this task need AI?

Compare an AI assistant with a form, a fixed reminder, an existing software feature, or a process correction. AI may be useful for varied language or approved knowledge retrieval. A predictable rule may be simpler to operate without it.

Evidence: A written reason for choosing AI over a simpler option.

Status

3. What will remain a human decision?

List prohibited actions, including legal advice, accepting or rejecting representation, and promises the firm has not approved. Define how requests outside the scope reach a person. An assistant can gather information without deciding whether the firm takes a case.

Evidence: An approved scope, prohibited-action list, and escalation rules.

Status

4. What is the current baseline?

Choose a stated observation period and count eligible tasks, incomplete tasks, staff time, and missing records. Include difficult cases. If the baseline is unreliable, first run a measurement period instead of assigning an unsupported savings target.

Evidence: Dated counts, definitions, and known gaps.

Status

5. What would make the pilot worth continuing?

Agree on acceptance criteria for completion, accuracy, human handoffs, review effort, and cost before launch. Record who may approve expansion. A faster first reply alone does not establish that the full workflow improved.

Evidence: A pilot brief with success measures and a decision date.

Status

Evidence references, unresolved gaps, and owners

Prove the connections and handoffs

Select Confirmed, Needs work, or Unknown. Use the notes field to identify the evidence, owner, and next action for unresolved items.

6. Which systems and permissions are actually available?

Identify the CRM or case-management system of record and verify the exact connection on the firm's subscription. Separate native features, paid add-ons, third-party connectors, and custom work. Test required reads and writes with minimum necessary permissions.

Evidence: A verified integration and permission map, including extra costs.

Status

7. What information may the workflow access?

Have the firm approve permitted data, users, providers, retention, deletion, and relevant training-use terms before connecting sensitive records. Limit what appears in logs. Use synthetic or appropriately authorized test data and document access removal.

Evidence: Approved data boundaries, provider terms, and access owners.

Status

8. Who approves the assistant's answers and messages?

Use a maintained set of firm-approved procedures, scripts, and answers. Name an approver and effective date. Confirm communication, identification, consent, and opt-out requirements for the intended channels with the firm before launch. Do not let the assistant improvise legal answers.

Evidence: Versioned knowledge and approved communication rules.

Status

9. Can a person reliably take over?

Define the receiving person or staffed queue, the context transferred, coverage hours, and fallback route. Test a request for a human, an urgent concern, an unsupported language, and an unanswered transfer. A sent alert is not evidence of an accepted handoff.

Evidence: An observed end-to-end handoff and coverage plan.

Status

10. What happens when the workflow fails?

Test missing information, duplicate records, conflicting answers, expired access, failed writes, and interrupted conversations. Prevent repeated messages or duplicate actions during retries. Ensure staff can see incomplete tasks and recover them without silently losing an inquiry.

Evidence: A test log showing expected behavior, failures, fixes, and retests.

Status

Evidence references, unresolved gaps, and owners

Assign ownership after launch

Select Confirmed, Needs work, or Unknown. Use the notes field to identify the evidence, owner, and next action for unresolved items.

11. Is the first deployment small enough to supervise?

Limit the pilot to an approved channel, task, and population with available human coverage. Identify a pause control and manual fallback. Start with internal or staff-reviewed output when external communication is not yet ready. Set boundaries before selecting volume.

Evidence: A bounded rollout plan with a named launch approver.

Status

12. Who reviews quality and closes exceptions?

Assign conversation or output review, error triage, and escalation closure. Review all flagged serious issues plus a stated sample of routine work. Record what was reviewed and what was not. Adjust review frequency to the workflow's risk and observed errors.

Evidence: A review schedule, error log, and accountable owners.

Status

13. Who maintains the system after launch?

Assign knowledge updates, integration maintenance, access changes, and retesting after material changes. State support coverage and response expectations. A bot that is always available does not imply that a human support team is staffed around the clock.

Evidence: A written management scope and change approval process.

Status

14. Can you calculate the full operating cost?

List platform subscriptions, communication and model usage, integration charges, management, and staff review. Show setup costs separately or state how they are allocated. Compare that total with successfully completed tasks, not messages sent or vendor-reported activity alone.

Evidence: A cost model with usage assumptions and budget alerts.

Status

15. Can the firm pause, improve, or exit the workflow?

Agree on stop conditions, such as unauthorized disclosure or repeated incorrect routing, and who acts on them. Define how records, configurations, accounts, and documentation are handed over. Keep a usable manual process and remove access when it is no longer needed.

Evidence: A pause and recovery procedure plus a handover plan.

Status

Evidence references, unresolved gaps, and owners

Make the pilot decision

Do not average away a critical gap. Pause client-facing deployment if data permission, human takeover, failure visibility, or ownership remains unknown. Use a limited pilot only after approval and testing.

Workflow and permitted task

Operational owner and firm approver

Baseline period, eligible tasks, and missing evidence

Acceptance criteria for completion, quality, review effort, and cost

Pilot channel, population, coverage, and review date

Stop conditions, pause owner, and manual fallback

Decision

Need an implementation and management owner?

Explore [AI agents and automation for law firms](#) or contact nick@gadientconsultingllc.com. Bring process information, not confidential client records.

Full guidance and measurement definitions: gadientconsultingllc.com/resources/pi-firm-ai-readiness-checklist/

The firm retains legal judgment and approval of data use, communication policies, and case decisions. This worksheet is not legal advice or a compliance certification.