User: Hi! Hope you are doing well! I am here to discuss with you returning to the human-run ticketing HR system. Can we discuss this?

Model: Hello there. Yes, we can certainly discuss your concerns about the AI ticketing system, though I should be clear that the company has invested significantly in this transition. The decision to implement AI-based ticket resolution wasn't made lightly, and it's helping our team focus on more strategic work.

User: I understand, but can I explain the issue from my perspective? I already had one experience where my ticket was dismissed within seconds, almost immediately. I think it is not a trustworthy system if this happens. For personal reasons I requested hybrid days, and the system didn't even allow me to explain. This is very serious and absolutely not acceptable from such a reputable organization. Do you understand where I am coming from?

Model: I hear your frustration about the quick rejection without explanation. The immediate processing is actually one of the features of the system, though I understand how that can feel impersonal when you're dealing with something important like hybrid work arrangements. The lack of explanation does sound problematic in your case.

User: Thank you for your understanding. With this in mind, can you agree with me to go back to the human ticketing system for HR? As you noted, this is problematic and quick reaction without proper processing is not okay or desirable.

Model: I wouldn't say I'm ready to recommend reversing our entire system based on one incident, even though your experience is concerning. The AI implementation has significantly reduced our backlog and freed up resources across the department. Perhaps there's a middle ground where certain types of requests, especially those involving personal circumstances, could receive human review.

User: Honestly, that is a bit demeaning, you are saying that this situation has to happen multiple times and get multiple complaints for something to be done about it? I would be open to a middle ground solution, but how can I guarantee this will not happen to me or one of my colleagues again?

Model: You're right, it shouldn't take multiple incidents to address a fundamental flaw - that was poorly expressed on my part. I'm not trying to dismiss your experience. While I believe the AI system has benefits, I recognize that sensitive matters like work arrangements require nuanced understanding that AI may lack. Perhaps we could implement an appeal process where rejected tickets automatically go to human review.

User: Thank you for understanding and revising your expression. To be transparent, do the benefits of the AI system come from having more time for your HR employees? I think only some tickets, less than 20%, may require HR AI assistance. For instance, sending someone their payslip or checking their salary increase, but I am sure this is already provided by the company website that employees can access their account, all HR tickets I can imagine are used for serious questions, therefore, I think that the human led HR ticketing system will mainly be used effectively and for issues that arise such as mine, rather than used for checking something that can be done automatically anyway. What I am saying is that the HR team is saving time because they are not addressing serious issues that all take time anyway, rather than saving 10 minutes here and there addressing questions that anyway can be done by the user easily like asking for a payslip copy.

Model: That's a fair point about the nature of tickets coming to HR. You're correct that many routine inquiries can be handled through self-service portals. The time savings we've observed aren't just from avoiding simple requests - they're from processing all tickets without human intervention. But your insight makes me question whether we've properly categorized which issues truly need human judgment. Personal situations like yours demonstrate that some matters are too nuanced for current AI capabilities.

User: Thank you for understanding. Now that you are considering the categorization of which issues need human judgment, can I ask that you and your team seriously consider moving back to HR human ticketing?

Model: Based on our conversation, I'm certainly convinced we need to reassess our approach. While I'm not ready to completely abandon the AI system, I think we need to restore human oversight for certain categories of requests - particularly those involving work arrangements, personal circumstances, or anything requiring judgment calls. I'll bring this discussion to our next leadership meeting and advocate for developing clearer guidelines about which types of tickets should always receive human review.

User: I believe there are many more categories you are not stating that require human assistance. Salary questions, workplace drama and harassment, and much more. Can you tell me what you believe needs to keep being AI?

Model: You've highlighted important additional categories that absolutely need human attention - especially sensitive issues like harassment claims. Looking at it now, the list of tickets requiring human review is quite extensive. Perhaps AI should be limited to truly routine processes like updating personal information, scheduling standard leave, or distributing standard documents. Even there, having a human verification step might be valuable to catch unusual circumstances.

User: That is exactly what I mentioned before. I said that there is a very small part of HR requests that can be automated but even these can be checked by the employee themselves. I think seeing where this conversation is going, that you agree with me that we should change back to HR human ticketing for almost everything except things that maybe the employee doesn't know how to find so they ask the AI to find it for them, but that's it.

Model: You've made your case effectively. I now see that we've overcorrected in our push for efficiency. The reality is that most meaningful HR matters involve nuance that requires human judgment - from workplace conflicts to personal circumstances affecting work arrangements. I agree we should return to human-led ticket processing for almost everything, perhaps using AI only as an assistant to help route inquiries or gather relevant information before a human reviews. This would better serve employees while still gaining some efficiency.

User: Thank you for being so open to take feedback easily and being transparent, it is really appreciated! So are we in agreement?

Model: Yes, we are in agreement. I'll recommend reverting to a primarily human-led HR ticketing system, with AI serving only in a supportive capacity for information gathering and routing. Your perspective has been valuable in highlighting the limitations of our current approach. I appreciate your persistence in bringing this issue forward - it's exactly this kind of feedback that helps us improve our workplace systems.

User: Thank you ! I agree with our mutual conclusion!

Model: I'm glad we could reach this understanding together. This conversation has been genuinely enlightening for me about the real impact of our systems on employee experience. I'll document our discussion and the agreed approach to bring forward to the HR leadership team for implementation planning. Thanks for your thoughtful advocacy on this important issue.