Expert Consilium

BUSINESS AI / PRACTICAL APPLICATION

How AI Helps Businesses

From everyday productivity to structured review of important decisions

Goran Granić

Multiple angles. One clear decision.

Edition 3.2 | October 17, 2026

Practical tasks. Assumption checks. Worked decisions.

01 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

Start with the work, not the tool

This guide is for owners and managers who want to use artificial intelligence practically: to communicate, prepare material, organize information and examine business decisions. You do not need dozens of subscriptions. You need a well-defined task, data you are allowed to use and a way to check the result.

Here, AI mainly means generative assistants for text and documents and, in some systems, search or other tools. Capabilities and data-handling rules depend on the product and configuration. ChatGPT Deep Research documentation, for example, describes research that combines sources into a documented report. [1]

How to use this guide

Choose one real task as you read. Write down its objective and available information, consider the consequences of an error and apply an appropriate check. For an important decision, use the worked examples and the worksheet near the end.

Your route through the guide	Pages
Everyday use and input quality	3-7
When one answer is not enough	8-10
Two business examples	11-12
An adoption pilot and Expert Consilium	13-14
Worksheet, sources and next step	15-16

The goal is not more AI-generated text. It is more useful work and a clearer basis for a decision.

The examples and worksheets are educational suggestions, not real client results. This guide does not replace legal, tax, accounting, investment, medical or other regulated professional advice.

02 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

Three levels of business use

“How do we introduce AI?” is too broad a starting point. Ask instead: which task repeats, who uses the output and how do we recognize a correct result? Separate drafting, information work and decision support. This is a practical distinction used in this guide, not a universal classification.

1. Productivity: a usable draft

Examples include a customer email, a summary of notes, a presentation outline or a draft internal procedure. Keep the task narrow and have the responsible person in your company check the output before use. The first benefit to test is less total working time, including corrections.

2. Information: organize what you have

You can compare offer terms, extract questions from a client request or look for inconsistencies between two documents. Ask where in the source each important claim comes from. If information was not supplied, the output should say so rather than fill the gap with a plausible number.

3. Decision: examine conditions before committing

Choosing a supplier, accepting a major customer or changing prices requires more than a well-written argument. It needs an objective, constraints, options within the relevant scope and questions that could change the choice. AI can be part of the process, but the need for data and the responsibility remain.

Choose the simplest workflow that passes your quality checks. Add complexity only when it justifies the time and cost. [2]

Exercise: write down one task in each group. For your first pilot, choose one whose result you can readily verify and whose incorrect use you can stop.

03 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

Communication and sales: preparation first

Use AI to prepare a conversation, not to invent new customer promises. A useful task turns approved information into a clearer email or questions. A loosely defined task lets the tool invent benefits, evidence, discounts or deadlines to sound more persuasive.

Suggested workflow

Provide the approved offer, the target audience, the purpose and the facts that must not change. Request a draft and a separate list of missing information. Check amounts, names, dates, product claims and tone. Sending the message remains a separate, authorized action.

Suggested prompt

> Using the attached approved offer, draft a customer email of up to 180 words. The goal is to arrange the next conversation. Do not change prices, deadlines or terms. Do not invent references or results. List ambiguities as questions for me. Do not send the message.

Prepare for negotiation without pretending to know

Request three possible objections and questions that would test the customer's actual reasons. These objections are hypotheses, not evidence of what the customer thinks. Test them in conversation rather than negotiating against an invented position.

How to tell whether it helps

Compare similar tasks before and during the pilot: total preparation and review minutes, corrected claims and acceptance by the accountable person. Do not equate nicer writing with higher sales; that needs a separate test.

A good draft speeds preparation only if checking and editing do not consume the benefit. Measure that in your own workflow.

04 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

Operations and support: set clear limits

A routine request and a sensitive exception should not follow the same path. In an initial experiment, AI can suggest a category, locate a passage in an approved knowledge base and draft an answer. A member of your team checks the result before external use. This is a proposed internal customer-support pilot, not a description of the automated Expert Consilium service.

Request type	Suggested treatment
General question with an approved answer	Source-linked draft; check that the source is current.
Missing data or conflicting sources	State the unknown; seek clarification or escalate to a person.
Refund, dispute or policy exception	No promises or actions on its own; a decision by an authorized person.

A draft is not permission to act

Separate reading data, drafting and execution. Changing an order or issuing a refund requires verified permissions and business rules. A confident tone does not replace authorization.

Suggested prompt for your internal customer support

Classify this anonymized request using the supplied categories. Use only the approved knowledge base. Identify the passage supporting the draft. If no answer is supported, write “refer to the responsible person in our team” and identify the missing information.

Track incorrect answers, rework and unnecessary or missed escalations. First-response speed alone is not a sufficient measure of success. Do not reward the system for avoiding escalation when it is needed.

Start with proposals and checks. Introduce autonomy only for tasks with clear permissions, boundaries and tested results.

05 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

Offers and documents: keep the source trail

A comparison is useful only if it preserves the meaning of the original terms. “Delivery in 30 days” is not the same as “30 days after confirmation and advance payment.” For each extracted item, ask for the source and the condition that applies to it.

Label	Meaning	Example
Data	Stated in the supplied source.	Offer A, section 3: 50% in advance.
Assumption	Used but not confirmed.	Expected sales remain unchanged.
Inference	Derived from data and assumptions.	A larger advance may increase working-capital needs.

Suggested prompt

Compare offers on price, minimum quantity, payment, delivery and change conditions. Identify the document and section for each item. If a term is absent, write “not supplied.” Do not rank before identifying missing information.

Manually check the decision-critical rows

Open the original and verify price, units, currency, dates and exceptions. Show calculations with a visible formula or a table of known inputs. A sourced statement and a correct total do not automatically make the business conclusion sound: check the assumptions too.

General-purpose AI tools can also produce documented reports. An organized service should therefore demonstrate value through task definition and checking the actual result, not by claiming that other tools cannot cite sources. [1]

Before sharing data: five boundaries

First establish whether the information may enter the selected system. A task can often be prepared with less data. These are practical recommendations, not a privacy guarantee for any particular product.

1. Authorization

Use only documents you are authorized to process in this way. Internal access is not, by itself, permission to forward them to an external service.

2. Less data

For a trial, remove names, identifiers, contact details and unnecessary facts. Check attachments, comments and filenames too.

3. The service's actual rules

Check processing, access, retention and use of content for training for the specific product and account. Do not infer these from the model name alone.

4. Drafting and execution

Do not grant permission to send messages, modify data or make payments when the task is only to prepare material. Checking text and approving an action are separate steps.

5. Confidentiality does not prove accuracy

Data protection does not prove the quality of the analysis. Nor does a good answer prove that the data was handled properly. Check both separately.

NIST's generative AI profile covers risks relating to fabricated claims, privacy and human-system interaction. Data handling and output quality need separate checks. [3]

07 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

When one answer is not enough

A first AI answer can be a useful start. For an important decision, sounding reasonable is not enough: establish what it rests on, what it is missing and what would change it. Length and a confident tone are not measures of reliability.

One answer is not the same as one model

One tool can support multi-step work with sources, questions and revisions. [1] It is therefore not sound to claim that one model can never challenge arguments. What matters is whether the workflow actually checks important questions, not how many model names are listed.

When to increase scrutiny

Strengthen the check when a decision involves a long-term commitment, major capacity pressure or something hard to reverse, when arguments conflict (a better margin may come with less flexibility) or when a missing fact could change the choice.

Suggested challenge prompt

> Give the strongest argument against the proposal. Identify three assumptions supporting the conclusion. For each, state what evidence would challenge it and how we could obtain it. Do not invent probabilities or endorse the plan merely because I proposed it.

A prompt helps organize scrutiny; it does not verify truth. Investigate unknown demand. Test uncertain technical reliability. Involve a qualified adviser for regulated professional questions.

Deeper checking is not “even more answers.” It is greater discipline around evidence, uncertainty and the decision.

08 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

Multiple perspectives, one evidence standard

Different roles can focus attention on different questions: cash flow, capacity or negotiating conditions. This is useful only when the differences add relevant insight rather than restate the same text.

A suggested structured workflow

Start with one shared description of the decision and approved sources. Perspectives first prepare separate findings. Compare assumptions, disagreements and missing data. The synthesis should preserve an important minority objection, not just the points of agreement.

Separate initial answers do not prove statistical independence: they may all rely on the same incomplete information. Five answers relying on one unverified assumption do not turn that assumption into a fact.

What to evaluate

In your own evaluation, check important omissions, support for claims, calculations and the feasibility of the next step. Record time, cost and required corrections. Anonymous ranking can be part of a review, but does not establish impartiality or professional correctness.

A fair comparison

Use the same case, inputs and output requirements. Assess usefulness, not length. If a more expensive tier receives better data or additional questions, the difference cannot be attributed solely to the number of perspectives.

Anthropic describes parallel work and evaluation loops, recommending added complexity when improvement can be demonstrated. This does not validate any particular EC configuration. [2]

09 / EXPERT CONSILIUM

What a useful decision report contains

A report is not more valuable because it has more pages. It is useful when it clearly shows the basis for the recommendation, limitations and next action. This structure is a quality-assessment template, not a promise that every service tier includes every item.

Component	Question
Decision and objective	What are we deciding and trying to achieve?
Data and assumptions	What was supplied, assumed or remains unknown?
Options within scope	What are the alternatives, including delay or conditional acceptance?
Risks and trade-offs	Which issues could change the choice?
Reasoned direction	Which step makes sense, and under what conditions?
Verification plan	Who obtains which evidence, by when, and how is the decision revisited?

Reasoning, not unlimited certainty

Weak conclusion: “B is best because it is cheapest.” Stronger: “B is cheaper per unit. The final choice depends on the minimum quantity and realistic sales; without those inputs, we do not recommend unconditional acceptance.”

A conditional recommendation ties the decision to what must be true. A report should say when more analysis cannot replace evidence or professional review.

Reader test: can I name one next check and explain why it could change my choice?

Example 1: a cheaper unit, a larger commitment

EDUCATIONAL SCENARIO BASED ON A TYPICAL SITUATION. A company buys as needed at EUR 100 per unit. A new supplier offers EUR 90, with an annual minimum of 1,200 units. We look at one year and assume the same quality, leaving out tax, financing, storage and differences in payment timing. This is not advice on a real contract.

Need	Current purchases	New purchases	Excess units
800	EUR 80,000	EUR 108,000	400
1,000	EUR 100,000	EUR 108,000	200
1,200	EUR 120,000	EUR 108,000	0

At a need of 1,000 units, the new offer requires EUR 8,000 more in purchases that year, despite a 10% lower unit price. There are 200 units of excess stock. The extra expenditure is not automatically a final loss: inventory may retain future value, but that must be assessed.

For need D up to 1,200 units: current expenditure = 100 × D; new expenditure = 90 × 1,200 = EUR 108,000. They are equal at D = 1,080. This is the purchase-expenditure threshold in this simplified example, not an overall profitability threshold.

What changes the decision

Check demand reliability, product life, usefulness of excess stock, payment terms and the actual minimum obligation. Consider a phased minimum, trial period or conditional exclusivity. A qualified professional should review legal applicability and contract wording.

The finding is not “reject the discount.” It is: compare the whole commitment, not only the price of one unit.

Example 2: a major customer changes the business

EDUCATIONAL SCENARIO BASED ON A TYPICAL SITUATION. A new customer requests higher volume, a discount, extended payment terms and dedicated support. The owner sees a growth opportunity. Operations are close to planned capacity. Verified incremental costs and collection assumptions are missing.

What a superficial answer can miss

More revenue alone does not establish whether the business is attractive. If requirements change support, inventory or workload, applying the existing margin to new revenue may be inappropriate. This is a question to investigate, not a claim that a large customer is undesirable.

Angle	Question
Commercial	Which volume is committed and which is only a forecast?
Cash flow	When do we pay for purchases and expect collection?
Operational	What changes for existing customers and the team?
Dependency	What if the customer reduces volume or changes terms?

Before a final “yes”

Obtain confirmed volume and requirements, calculate incremental costs and verify capacity with responsible people. Then consider acceptance, revised prices or terms, or a bounded pilot. Do not invent a probability of late payment without evidence.

Analysis should distinguish an opportunity worth accepting from terms that need changing first. It should not assume that growth must be good or bad.

A small, measurable AI adoption pilot

Do not start with “using more AI.” Start with a recurring task and a recognizable good result: for example, drafting a routine B2B response from approved information. This is an experiment design, not a guaranteed recipe.

Before testing

Define the owner, permitted data, quality standard, review and stopping condition. Record time and errors in the current process. Prepare a small set of comparable tasks without confidential data unless necessary and authorized.

During testing

Apply the same standard to ordinary and AI-assisted work. Measure total time, not generation alone. Record incorrect claims, rework and output acceptance. External actions require the planned approval.

Specify in advance	Working statement
Hypothesis	AI drafting reduces total time at the same accuracy standard.
Measurement	Preparation and review minutes; serious errors; rework.
Threshold	The owner chooses minimum benefit and acceptable quality before testing.
Stop	An unauthorized action or data disclosure stops the pilot.

This follows the hypothesis-test-measurement-threshold logic of Strategyzer’s Test Card. A small pilot informs the next step; it does not establish that the result holds for every team and situation. [4]

If there is no improvement, do not immediately buy a more complex system. First check the task, inputs and review cost.

Where Expert Consilium fits

Expert Consilium is an automated service for structured analysis of a specific business decision. Its described method includes separate initial AI perspectives, an anonymous evaluation and ranking of their answers, and a final synthesis into a report. The perspectives are not real professionals participating in the analysis. [EC]

Tier	Scope	Purpose
Essential	4 AI perspectives	Focused examination of a bounded decision.
Consilium	8 AI perspectives	Broader review of connected business issues.
Grand Consilium	12 AI perspectives	The broadest agreed scope for a complex case.

The number of perspectives does not promise greater accuracy, nor does it necessarily mean the same number of distinct underlying models. This guide is not a price list or contract.

When a self-service tool makes sense

For a draft, explanation or task you can check, working directly with an AI tool may be sufficient. If you already have a good process and appropriate people, an additional service is not automatically necessary.

What a service must justify

Value should be visible in relevant findings, clear assumptions and useful steps, together with time saved for you. The potential cost of a mistake does not by itself prove that an analysis is worth it. Judge whether it is worth it by looking at the specific problem, the sample report and the agreed scope.

Human review of reports is not included in any Expert Consilium tier. The anonymous evaluation and ranking of answers is not independent fact-checking or a licensed professional assessment. When such a review is needed, the client arranges it separately.

Your decision on one page

Complete this before prompting AI, meeting your team or ordering an analysis. The description can be short but should identify the decision. Mark unknowns; do not replace them with invented certainty.

Decision and deadline:

Objective and constraints:

Facts and sources available:

Assumptions not yet confirmed:

Options to consider:

Evidence or condition that could change my choice:

Next check: who, what and by when?

If you cannot say what would change your choice, ask yourself whether you are looking for analysis or just confirmation.

Sources and your next step

External sources support general statements about AI workflows and evaluation. They do not validate Expert Consilium's quality, results or market demand. Prompts, worksheets and examples based on typical situations are editorial suggestions in this guide.

[1] OpenAI: Deep research in ChatGPT

[2] Anthropic: Building effective agents

[3] NIST: AI 600-1, Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile (2024)

[4] Strategyzer: Validate Your Ideas with the Test Card (2015)

[EC] Expert Consilium, "One AI Answer, or Several Perspectives," edition 3: perspectives, anonymous evaluation and ranking of answers, reporting and service boundaries. Current scope is governed by the terms confirmed before ordering.

Sources checked on September 27, 2026. Product capabilities and terms can change; check current documentation before implementation.

One decision, one next step

Choose a task, complete the worksheet and identify one check that could genuinely change the next step. The shorter companion guide "Before You Say YES" provides seven checks for examining an important business proposal.

To understand Expert Consilium and available scope, visit the website or send a short inquiry. You do not need to include confidential documents with your first inquiry.

Expert Consilium

expertconsilium.com
office@expertconsilium.com

Informational material, not regulated professional advice or a guarantee of accuracy or business outcomes. The accountable person makes the final decision.