AI Accountability Readiness Checklist

For healthcare, Medicaid, and public-sector leaders evaluating AI-supported workflows.

Use this before scaling an AI pilot.
A tool can create better signals and still create more burden if the operating model is not ready to carry the work. This checklist helps pressure test ownership, validation, workflow impact, evidence, exceptions, monitoring, and audit readiness before speed turns into cleanup.

1. Governance and human ownership

Readiness question	Status	Owner	Evidence / notes
A named human owner is accountable for each AI-supported output or workflow change.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
Decision rights are clear: who can accept, reject, override, or escalate the output.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
Leadership has defined where AI can support work and where human judgment must remain primary.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
There is a documented review cadence for governance, risk, and operational impact.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		

2. Validation and evidence

Readiness question	Status	Owner	Evidence / notes
The team knows how AI outputs will be checked before they affect a member, patient, provider, claim, notice, or decision.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
Evidence standards are defined: what must be saved, who saves it, and where it lives.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
There is a way to trace an output back to the source data, rule, workflow, or policy basis used.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
Staff know what to do when an output is incomplete, questionable, biased, outdated, or wrong.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		

AI Accountability Readiness Checklist

Continue pressure testing the operating model before scaling.

3. Workflow impact and burden

Readiness question	Status	Owner	Evidence / notes
The AI-supported output has a clear entry point into the real workflow.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
The team has identified any new review work, documentation work, meetings, trackers, or handoffs created by the tool.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
The workflow has been tested with the people closest to the work, not only leadership or vendor teams.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
There is a plan to reduce side spreadsheets, manual trackers, and workaround meetings rather than create new ones.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		

4. Exceptions, monitoring, and audit readiness

Readiness question	Status	Owner	Evidence / notes
Exception handling is defined: what happens when the AI-supported process fails, conflicts, or creates extra work.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
The team knows which metrics will show whether burden is decreasing or being moved downstream.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
Monitoring includes quality, timeliness, equity, user burden, rework, and compliance risk.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		
The organization can explain how the AI-supported process works to leadership, auditors, regulators, and affected stakeholders.	■ Yes ■ No ■ Not sure		

Readiness interpretation

Score	Readiness signal	Recommended action
Mostly Yes	Likely ready for controlled scaling.	Proceed with governance checkpoints and evidence review.
Mixed / Not sure	Useful pilot, but readiness risk is present.	Clarify owners, workflow entry points, validation, and exceptions before expanding.
Mostly No	Likely to create burden or compliance exposure.	Pause scaling. Build the operating model before adding volume.

Simple operating question: What unofficial work did people have to create around the system to make it usable?

If the answer is side spreadsheets, extra meetings, manual trackers, or email chains, the issue may not be the tool alone. It may be the operating model around the tool.

Ono Logic helps healthcare, Medicaid, and public-sector teams turn complex policy, compliance, and AI readiness into executable systems with clear ownership, workflows, evidence, and audit-ready execution.