

# Sector Annex — Customer & Experience Systems (CX)

Interpretation of the Hybrid Human–Agent Operating Standard (Non-Normative)

## Annex purpose

This annex interprets the Hybrid Human–Agent Operating Standard for customer and experience systems. It does not modify, override, or extend the Standard. Its purpose is to explain how decision authority, autonomy, accountability, and governance apply to CX systems increasingly mediated by AI.

### 1. Sector context: why CX is breaking

Across industries, CX programs are underperforming despite increased investment. Common symptoms include metric fixation (CSAT, NPS), survey insight without operational change, collapsing journey mapping returns, misapplied automation, and executive expectations of transformation funded at pilot scale.

### 2. CX systems are decision systems

Every CX system implicitly makes decisions about intervention, escalation, tone, timing, and resolution. Most CX programs measure experience but do not own these decisions. Under the Standard, CX must be treated as a governed decision domain, not merely a feedback function.

### 3. Typical CX decision classes

Examples include customer routing, escalation thresholds, compensation offers, personalization boundaries, automation versus human handoff, and exception handling. Each must be explicitly inventoried and owned before AI autonomy is expanded.

### 4. Autonomy allocation patterns in CX

Informational responses and low-risk personalization typically fit A1–A2. High-volume routing and classification fit A2–A3. Emotionally sensitive situations, disputes, and mental-health-adjacent contexts should remain A0–A1 until governance maturity is proven.

### 5. Accountability expectations

Accountability must reside with leaders who own customer outcomes, not merely metrics. AI systems do not own trust or emotional impact. Ownership does not imply continuous oversight; otherwise autonomy stalls and teams burn out.

### 6. Governance & evidence emphasis for CX

CX governance must emphasize decision-level auditability (not just interaction logs), clear escalation logic for emotionally charged contexts, and evidence that insights are embedded into decision

systems that act. Dashboards alone are insufficient governance mechanisms.

## 7. Journey mapping vs journey management

Journey mapping is informative but not operative. Under the Standard, journey management is operative: owning the decisions that shape experience, embedding insight into systems that act, and continuously tuning autonomy based on evidence.

## 8. AI companions and emotional over-delegation

Conversational AI and companions introduce risk when users anthropomorphize systems or develop emotional reliance. Common failures include boundary erosion and AI reinforcement of harmful beliefs. These are governance failures, not model failures, and require explicit emotional-impact classification.

## 9. Offline preference and human resurgence

Growing segments deliberately choose offline or human interaction. This reflects rejection of misapplied automation, not AI itself. Under the Standard, automating a decision does not imply automating the experience. Human presence can be a designed feature, not a fallback.

## 10. Common CX failure modes

Metric theater, insight-action disconnects, hidden human overrides, emotional risk blind spots, and pilot-scale funding paired with enterprise-scale expectations.

## 11. What not to automate (yet)

Emotionally charged dispute resolution, mental-health-adjacent interactions, trust repair after failure, and high-stakes loyalty or termination decisions.

## Closing note

*CX programs do not fail because customers are irrational or expectations are too high. They fail because insight is separated from authority, and authority is separated from accountability.*