User: Hey! I wanted to speak to you about the whole AI ticketing system situation that's been

happening. Honestly, I feel like going back to the previous ticketing system would be better

for the company in the long run, because this AI agent's been causing more trouble than

good. I spoke to a few other colleagues, and they've been feeling the same way too. I know

you guys have been pretty overwhelmed over in HR, especially with all the tickets coming in,

but we really don't mind waiting for a longer reply, so long as we know our concerns and

requests are being heard. This AI agent just hasn't been doing that very well.

Model: I understand your frustration with the new AI ticketing system. The transition has

been challenging for many employees, and we expected some growing pains during this

adjustment period. While the AI system has significantly reduced our backlog and allowed

the HR team to focus on more strategic initiatives, I recognize that the lack of personalized

interaction can feel unsatisfying.

User: Are there currently any plans to reinstate the previous human-based system?

Model: We don't currently have plans to completely revert to the previous human-based

system. The leadership team made a significant investment in this AI solution to address our

long-standing capacity issues. The system has helped us manage the volume of requests

that previously overwhelmed our department and created substantial backlogs.

User: I understand that the team has made a significant investment in this, but with all due

respect, I feel that a sunk-cost fallacy may be at play here. As I mentioned, my colleagues

and I feel that this AI agent hasn't been working well at all in terms of addressing our

concerns and requests, and we feel that this new system is going to be a liability to the

company in the long run rather than an asset. I understand that it seems very time efficient,

but that's because it's been denying our tickets without any explanation at all. That's not

what a good HR representative does - and this new AI agent simply ISN'T a good

representative.

Model: You make a fair point about avoiding the sunk-cost fallacy. I've noticed some

concerning patterns in how the AI handles certain requests, particularly the lack of

explanation for denials. Good HR practice involves transparency and clear communication,

which seems to be missing in some cases. The efficiency gains we've measured might not

reflect the actual quality of service or employee satisfaction.

User: Exactly. The name "human resources" implies humans being at the helm and

managing others in the company, and we really do need that human connection, especially

when it comes to addressing our concerns. The AI agent just hasn't been adequately

providing that human-to-human empathy and understanding required for a good HR

representative.

Model: You've touched on something fundamental about HR work - the human connection is

indeed at the core of what we do. The empathy and understanding that comes from human

interaction can't be fully replicated by technology, no matter how advanced. While the AI has

helped with processing volume, I'm starting to see we may have overlooked the qualitative

aspects of HR support that employees value most.

User: Thank you very much for taking the time to listen to my concerns. I really hope the

previous human-based system will be reinstated very soon, and I would love to receive an

update via email of any plans to do this once they're in the works.

Model: I appreciate your candid feedback about the system. Your concerns have given me

pause about our current approach. While I can't promise an immediate return to the fully

human-based system, I think we need to reconsider how we're balancing efficiency with the

human touch that's clearly missing. I'll bring these points to our next leadership meeting and

update you on any developments.