Rieda edishan | 2026-11-20

REWEAVE: Tek a next look pon people work inna di age a AI

Adrian Dunkley | 2026-11

Di team first check if anybody still need di task. Two worksheet help dem agree who fi do di work, weh training dem need an when fi stop di trial. Di method still need testing inna real workplace.

Full Jamaican Patwa translation a di content inna consultation edition v0.1, November 2026. Adrian Dunkley, President a di Caribbean AI Association an creator a di framework.

Di decision di paper put forward

Approve one small trial wid di people weh do di work. Start wid a process weh happen often an weh di team can switch back: taking in a motor claim, answering hotel enquiry or receiving a licence application. Name who can stop di trial an show how fi return to di old way. Include di people weh do di work, di people weh receive it, a worker representative, an who look after training an risk. A second person need authority fi question di change an check di evidence.

Di owner haffi show weh di team stop doing, who still mek di important decision dem, who can do di changed job an weh dem do wid di hour dem weh free up. Check service, worker load an safety before expanding. REWEAVE a one method weh di paper propose. Di original edition nuh include participant record or workplace result. Outside review an workplace validation still fi happen.

Di team work pon one workflow at a time. Worker an manager identify weh di service need, remove avoidable step, share out di work weh lef, train people fi di changed role an earmark any time weh it free up. Before dem expand dem compare staff effort, service quality, load an skill weh people show dem have. Di field protocol a fi Caribbean employer, worker representative an training partner. A comparison inna real workplace coulda show if di method improve outcome over a rollout weh start wid di tool.

One claims intake queue, hotel enquiries desk or licensing inbox gi clearer feedback than redesigning a whole department at once. Write down how fi switch to di approved fallback.

Weh di research show

One job can mix routine transaction, judgement, relationship, mentoring an work weh only turn up when suppm go wrong [1–3]. Inna di ILO 2025 global estimate, bout one in four worker hold a job wid some exposure to generative AI [4]. One 2024 study estimate 26–38% a di job dem coulda expose inna fi dem Latin America an Caribbean analysis. Dominican Republic a di only Caribbean island economy inna di household-survey sample [5]. Exposure nuh tell yuh how much people a go lose dem work pon any island.

One study weh roll out a tool in stages to 5,172 support agent estimate 15% more problem solve per hour on average [6]. Result vary wid experience. A writing experiment find gain, while consultant make more mistake pon a task outside di model ability [7, 15]. One trial wid experienced developer find work tek longer, an who choose fi join complicate later estimate [8, 9]. Survey link training an worker consultation wid better outcome [10]. Local condition, equipment an access fi learn matter [11, 12, 14, 17].

Task-based economics separate work weh automation displace from di new work technology create [1]. Job-design research count how much freedom people have fi decide, weh dem know an who dem work wid as job feature worth measuring [3]. REWEAVE bring dat down to a local decision weh a team can come back to.

Di ILO exposure index measure potential at di level a task inside a occupation. Di joint ILO–World Bank study identify digital-access gap weh coulda stop worker from getting benefit. Di world an regional figure come from different population an different method. Dem nuh form a trend or a estimate fi one island [4, 5].

Inna customer support, less experienced an lower-skilled agent get di bigger gain. Track result by experience an case type where group big enough [6]. Writing participant wid AI finish quicker an get higher quality score. Test di actual document an di downstream check weh di service need [15]. Consultant get benefit pon some task but have less chance a di correct answer pon a task outside di tested capability. Put realistic exception inna di trial [7]. Di slower developer result concern di tool dem test inna early 2025. Di researcher dem call di later estimate weak evidence because a selection effect. Count checking an fixing an retest when tool, task or team change [8, 9].

Di OECD survey cover finance an manufacturing. Di reported link allow fi other explanation [10]. Di Caribbean AI Policy Roadmap put education an upskilling high pon di regional list [11]. Weh work inna each site depend pon people, language, equipment an operating condition.

Di seven REWEAVE step dem

R · Review di work: watch di task people really do, di mix a case an weh di service look like before di change. E · Eliminate waste: find out who an which control depend pon di step before testing a removal weh can reverse. W · Weigh who do weh: name an owner, test case an fallback fi each task weh stay.

E · Equip people: pay fi practice an watch how staff deal wid exception. A · Allocate capacity: put a name, activity an roster time to di hour dem weh free up. V · Verify: compare quality, workload, time an incident. E · Evolve di role: record whether fi expand, fix or reverse, update di job description an put a date pon di next review.

First decide weh fi retire, simplify or keep. Den decide who fi do di thing dem weh stay. One task can shift to a machine while di job as a whole get harder. Check workload, decision authority an di way people learn before signing off pon di task an di role.

Each step carry forward evidence. R: observed task map, case mix, baseline an worker correction. E: checks pon dependency an control plus reversible removal trial. W: task decision, owner, test case an fallback. E: paid practice, observed skill check an support plan. A: time budget, named recipient, roster entry an outcome. V: comparison, quality an load check plus incident record. E: decision record, changed role description an next review date.

One person can do several role inna a small firm. Keep a second person wid authority fi challenge di change. Worker need a route fi report failure, challenge how dem job describe an raise overload. A favourable time estimate nuh cancel a hard check.

Watch di work, simplify it an assign authority

Set di start, finish an who get di service. Watch one regular shift an one hard one. Include junior, temporary an different-shift worker. Record call, correction, waiting, handover, disconnected branch, incomplete form an language preference. Mek staff correct di map. Ask who use a report an which check it support. If Finance only use two column, test di extract fi two reconciliation cycle before dropping di whole sheet.

Fi each task, decide whether fi retire, simplify or keep it. Fi di task dem weh stay, choose a person fi lead, AI assistance weh a person check against a source, or automation wid tight limit an a way back. Try a simple rule inna di existing system too. Record authority, limit, log, alert an fallback. An authorised person decide payment, coverage or access. Anybody affected need a way fi ask a question or appeal.

Check data permission, approved setup, wrong answer, request di system cyaan handle an interruption [13]. From di normal workstation, a colleague haffi be able fi reject a suggestion, trace weh happen an resume di service. If data, safety or accountability fail, keep di delegation on hold.

Fi claims, start when di claim come in an finish when one authorised officer confirm seh di file ready fi assessment. Keep file weh a wait pon evidence separate from file one officer can finish. Track elapsed time fi di customer an staff time fi every person weh touch di case. Record informal check, urgent request an who use each output after. Agree sample size wid pilot lead when yuh see how often each case type come in. Name di source a each observation an weh still fi verify. Ordinary work can teach judgement.

Before buying a tool, check audit, reporting an service dependency wid dem owner. If two form collect di same thing, see if one approved source can feed both. Before withdrawing a duplicate manual reminder, check di automatic one reach di right people an retain proof a delivery. Pick di cheapest option weh meet di service an control requirement. If one dependency turn up weh nobody document, hold di removal, name di owner an try a substitute wid dem. Inna di Friday spreadsheet example, keep di full record inna di source system while Finance test di extract.

Retire: confirm nobody need di output, record approver, date an weh woulda trigger restoration. Simplify: log di new rule, affected team an proof di control still work. Human-led: protect discretion, relationship, judgement an consequential approval. Name di decision-maker, escalation threshold an trainee access. AI-assisted: record permitted data, reliable source, review step, exception, maximum review time an fallback. Limited automation: insist pon low consequence, narrow specification, reversibility an errors weh people can detect. Record boundary, log, override, alert owner an rollback test.

A system can acknowledge a claim an AI can suggest a checklist. One authorised officer decide if di evidence meet di policy terms. Gi di reviewer time, source record an power fi reject a suggestion. Test change in language an format. Fi material decision pon people, payment, coverage or access, agree di control wid local risk, privacy, labour an legal adviser. If di team cyaan reconstruct weh happen, correct a record or resume service, narrow di scope or keep it manual [13].

Train staff an put di hour dem pon di roster

Set aside paid practice an arrange cover across shift. Mek di person check every field against di source, fix one error weh somebody put in fi di test, route a disputed case an finish one when di tool switch off. Watch how dem perform. Offer accessible material, coaching an another chance fi show dem ready. Keep learning opportunity open fi new starter [14].

Net hour per week = (average minute per case before − average minute inna di trial) × reference case per week ÷ 60 − added weekly overhead hour. Count checking, fixing, case weh go back to manual an case weh stay open. Use di same case mix an follow-up time. Count fallback once an keep one-off setup cost separate. Put usable hour against a named activity pon di roster an check if di receiver use dem. A positive time balance alone cyaan settle a staffing decision.

Start wid di list a decision di changed job need. A certificate can show attendance, a supervisor watching real representative case can record performance. Get staff fi match every required field to di approved source an log di correction fi di planted error. For one missing or disputed item, explain di referral inna plain language. Tool switch off, show where di record go an how fi hand it over. Provide equipment, coaching, supervised assignment an reassessment. Track progression an access separate from attendance. Put mentored case exposure in place fi newcomer who woulda learn from di old work [14].

Track all eligible arrival inna one fixed window. Across every team, count prompting, verification, correction an handover. Report open case an customer waiting time separate. Overhead cover recurring work outside individual case handling. Keep setup an initial training separate. Put positive hour inna di roster or backlog, record actual use an ask di receiving team weh improve. Reassign part-hour only where di shift pattern make it usable. If net capacity negative or have no recipient, revise or put forward a clear service reason to continue.

Set up one 90-day trial an decide

Day 1–15: agree di case, service promise an baseline. Observe at least two representative week an extend if needed. Day 16–30: test in parallel while di old process still in charge. Verify staff, data an fallback. Day 31–60: compare similar case volume an log incident, override an return to manual. Day 61–90: hear di worker dem an decide. Move di decision date if di evidence short.

Where safe an practical, assign case or period by chance. Assign team or shift if dem share queue or share learning. Fi a before-and-after comparison, record seasonal demand, staffing an policy change [16]. Keep training case separate from test case. Get somebody independent fi grade wid one fixed set a criteria, widout knowing which workflow when possible. Report exception separate or weight dem back to di normal mix. Limit personal data, who see it an how long it stay. Nuh use log fi rank worker or guess who might lose a job.

Agree di local threshold fi time, quality, access, workload an skill before testing. Two hour a week fi four week an a two-percentage-point maximum drop in quality a example weh need enough observation. Give denominator, missing case, slow case an uncertainty. Zero serious failure inna one small trial tell yuh little bout rare harm. Expand within di tested limit, set a deadline fi a revision when evidence short, or stop an reverse after a serious failure. Record dissent an review when model, supplier, rule, data or staff change.

Day 1–15: worker an process owner agree scope an service promise; log exception, effort, queue age, quality an feedback. Day 16–30: risk lead, supervisor an training owner approve

tool, data, performance pon difficult case, individual sign-off an tested rollback. Day 31–60: shift lead run di comparison wid a named escalation route, tracking load an reason case leave. Day 61–90: panel identify who benefit, who get new work an weh happen to di time. Extend baseline if volume low or di week unusual. Nuh start live work till staff, data an fallback check pass.

Agree comparison before rollout. Account fi clustering where team or shift assign together. If matching shift, track other difference weh could explain result. Keep eligibility rule fixed. Sample exception deliberately an record case weh go back manual. Only collect data weh di pilot need. Agree retention time, restrict identifiable record, group worker feedback fi protect confidentiality an allow concern without going through di direct manager. Nuh use di task ledger or AI log fi infer individual replacement risk [16].

Agree threshold wid staff, service owner an risk according to consequence, baseline variation an sample size. Capacity: comparable weekly hour across all team after recurring overhead; di sample minimum hold fi four comparable week. Quality: file weh pass di same review divide by number reviewed, plus count critical error. A two-percentage-point tolerable drop need a sample big enough fi judge it. Access: time to service an unresolved file including manual or assisted; investigate deterioration by channel, language an case type. Load an skill: overtime, rework, short staff check-in an demonstrated ability; trace who get extra work. Use a capacity: hour rostered an used plus outcome a di activity. Review shortfall wid di receiving team.

Show di timing distribution an compare slow case wid typical case. Size di quality review to di maximum decline di team can tolerate. Extend or keep close watch if di evidence thin. Expand when local benefit clear di threshold, risk under control, people ready an actual use a di hour clear. Revise when gain look possible but workflow, training or data incomplete; put a time limit an name di next test. Stop or revert when a hard gate fail, loss bigger than benefit or a safe operating boundary cyaan show. Publish di decision wid worker feedback an dissent internally. Set a regular review date an retest before increasing authority.

Three Caribbean example fi work through

Motor insurance: keep di authorised record, send standard receipt an mek a person verify any document list AI suggest. Send injury, fraud, payment, disputed cover an urgent case through di established process. Suppose 120 claim a week drop from 12 minute to 8 minute each. Dat free 8 hour before overhead. Tek off 2 hour fi team checks, leaving 6: three fi callback, two fi coached review an one fi complex file. At 11 minute di trial break even. At 11.5 minute it lose one hour net. Dem number a illustration.

Hotel: check rate, availability an terms before sending a draft. Send access arrangement, refund an complaint to di duty lead. Practise manual booking an track wrong rate, repeat contact an work shift to morning staff. Licensing: get record-owner agreement fi one checklist. One reviewer verify an sign any message asking fi papers. An authorised officer decide an handle appeal. Compare online, walk-in an assisted channel. Count contractor an shared-service work plus local language, equipment an outage [12, 17].

Insurance: get complete file to assessor earlier an tell customer which evidence missing. Limit trial to one predefined standard queue. Reconcile open claim from di approved record before dropping di second tracker. Check customer an claim identifier inna di standard receipt, log delivery an offer another channel. Before contacting customer, officer check each suggested document against current approved list. Named officer record di ground fi

coverage, payment or fraud referral an follow escalation policy. Reserve human time fi explain complex case. Review callback an sample if customer understand di next step.

Di weekly net-hours figure mark 8, 9, 10, 11, 11.5 an 12 minute per claim. Di formula give +6, +4, +2, 0, −1 an −2 hour respectively. At 11.5 minute, di gross gain a just 1 hour before di 2 hour a team monitoring an fallback drill. Look at correction time an handover before deciding if service benefit worth di extra effort. Compare completeness, repeat contact an case age inna both queue, including any extra work weh customer haffi do.

Hotel: answer routine booking enquiry promptly an keep a reliable route fi guest wid access need. Remove double entry only when approved booking system can supply di detail. Leave unverified rate or room type outta di response. Practise handover when connection drop an test after-hours an multilingual enquiry before extending service hour. Measure reply time an missed accessible arrangement. Roster usable time fi guest follow-up or training. Count work push over to morning shift as a cost.

Licensing: gi resident clearer direction pon incomplete application. Compare online an paper form before removing duplicate field. An approved system can send standard receipt. One reviewer can draft a clear message wid AI from approved checklist, den confirm di required paper an sign. Compare completed application an repeat visit by channel, including assisted an paper access. Agree how fi work when network down. If online service better but di walk-in queue get longer, check capacity an access before expanding.

Before copying another pilot, confirm language, volume, channel an reliability a device an connectivity. Di Eastern Caribbean digital transformation project point to access an skill as priority [12]. Di ILO platform-work study show how employee-only mapping can leave out people weh do digital work. Include contractor an shared-service effort an di handover weh dem own [17].

How fi test di framework

Compare REWEAVE wid one pilot weh start wid di tool. Keep tool access, delivery time an mandatory safety control equal. Add a group weh keep di old workflow if possible. Record who get invitation an who decline. Assign team where people share learning. Register eligibility, minimum useful effect, quality margin, missing-data rule, sample size an stop condition before looking pon result.

Estimate di difference between group inna change in net staff hour per 100 eligible case, adjusted fi case mix. Keep di original assignment inna di analysis when possible. Give uncertainty, deviation, whether people really carry out di step dem, service quality, workload, skill an weh di capacity go. One serious control failure stop di trial. No meaningful difference after enough measurement woulda weaken di case fi di extra work. One small inconclusive trial call fi a better test. Mek two reviewer classify di same task separately an compare when one delegate an di other keep a person in charge [16].

Main question: across Caribbean workplace wid comparable low-risk workflow, do REWEAVE free more net staff time than one tool-first rollout while meeting di agreed service quality, worker load an safety threshold? Di proposed contribution combine retiring avoidable work before delegation, paying fi readiness inna di changed role an tracing recovered time to one named activity before expansion. It build pon task-based economics, job redesign an evaluation guidance [1–3, 16]. Di protocol an example show how fi use it. Dem cyaan establish cause or prove it travel across organisation.

Recruit across sector an condition where people can follow di same definition an report complete baseline. Record who decline an who cyaan participate. A current-workflow group help separate tool adoption from work redesign. If assignment infeasible, describe di comparison an limit causal interpretation. Register primary an secondary measure before looking pon outcome. Size di test fi di main contrast an quality margin, allowing fi between-team difference an incomplete observation.

Use every assigned cluster inna di main analysis where possible. Report change by original assignment, how closely people follow each stage an uncertainty. Examine variation by site an case type only when enough observation deh deh. Separate setup, tool an training cost from recurring hour. Time gain fail di joint rule where quality, access or load breach di limit. A serious control failure outweigh di average. When reviewer dem compare decision, look specially where one delegate an di other keep a person in charge.

One card fi each task

Fill out di card wid who do di task an who receive di result. Bring one ordinary case an one exception. Record ID, date, site, task, service outcome, trigger, output, recipient, period, case volume an staff minute. Separate waiting from handling. Add dependency, control, exception, judgement an weh a new worker learn.

Write di decision, alternative, owner weh can sign or reverse it, allowed source, access, quality check, fallback trigger, last fallback test, open question an next review. Ask weh woulda break if di task disappear. One worker can try a shortcut pon public or practice material within permission an carry di checking time an failed case to di supervisor.

Fi a ready-to-use card, name di task wid a verb an object. Add service outcome, site, version an date. Include frequency, team, system, channel an control dependent pon di output; who can sign off, review exception an order a return; permitted input, who can see it an how dem check quality. Fi fallback, name trigger, who act, where di manual instruction live an last test date. Assign somebody to di open question an di check a weh woulda break if di task vanish, wid a date fi review. Decision record: Task ID ___ Owner ___ Review date ___.

Fi a first individual session, list repeated task, one weh teach judgement an one weh yuh put off when di queue full. Try an approved shortcut before changing shared work, an bring di proposed use a di time saved to di supervisor too.

Di decision sheet an di changed job

Before launch, agree who can pause, which case in or out, di date, team, case-count checker, quality an access limit, paid practice, reference volume an weh di hour dem ago go. Pick who hear concern an when dem ago review it.

At di meeting, record review count, quality, incident, repeat contact, slow case an channel difference. Record net hour, overtime, work weh shift to somebody else, hour actually use, skill demonstration an access to learning. Write down expand, revise or stop, di group weh still outside di decision, sign-off by owner, worker representative an risk reviewer where needed, an di reopening trigger. Describe di new job, authority, roster, paid practice, how new staff learn, progression, disagreement an next review.

Before live use, name which case stay pon di established process, dates an team fi comparison an who verify di count. State di event weh stop di test, tolerable loss in quality or access an evidence fi di limit. Identify who need cover fi practice, who sign off routine work, exception an fallback, which case-level an recurring work count, who hear feedback an when fi reopen after change.

At di meeting, record critical event, review count, slow case, repeat contact an channel difference. Write down overtime, work transferred, skill demonstration, access to practice an change in entry-level learning. Name which group an scenario still outside di decision. Fi di job description give purpose, work gained or given up, who can take each material decision an di roster change. Record reassignment or progression option, worker feedback an disagreement. Name di role owner an next review date.

How fi cite di paper an weh it stand

Dunkley, A. (2026). REWEAVE: Reassessing jobs in the age of AI. Caribbean AI Association. Consultation edition v0.1.

Dis publication propose a method fi test. Di three case dem use illustrative assumption. External peer review an validation inna workplace still pending.

Suos dem

[1] Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). Automation and new tasks: How technology displaces and reinstates labor. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 33(2), 3–30. doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.2.3

[2] Jesuthasan, R., & Boudreau, J. W. (2022). Work without jobs: How to reboot your organization’s work operating system. MIT Press. doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/13930.001.0001

[3] Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(6), 1321–1339. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321

[4] Gmyrek, P., Berg, J., Kamiński, K., Konopczyński, F., Ładna, A., Nafradi, B., Rosłaniec, K., & Troszyński, M. (2025). Generative AI and jobs: A refined global index of occupational exposure. ILO Working Paper 140. DOI 10.54394/HETP0387. ILO publication and full text

[5] Gmyrek, P., Winkler, H., & Garganta, S. (2024). Buffer or bottleneck? Employment exposure to generative AI and the digital divide in Latin America. ILO Working Paper 121, joint ILO–World Bank publication. DOI 10.54394/TFZY7681. ILO publication and full text

[6] Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2025). Generative AI at work. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 140(2), 889–942. doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjae044

[7] Dell’Acqua, F., et al. (2026). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of artificial intelligence on knowledge worker productivity and quality. Organization Science, 37(2), 403–423. doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2025.21838

[8] Becker, J., Rush, N., Barnes, E., & Rein, D. (2025). Measuring the impact of early-2025 AI on experienced open-source developer productivity. Preprint. doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2507.09089

[9] METR. (2026, 24 February). We are changing our developer productivity experiment design. Research update. METR

[10] Lane, M., Williams, M., & Broecke, S. (2023). The impact of AI on the workplace: Main findings from the OECD AI surveys of employers and workers. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 288. doi.org/10.1787/ea0a0fe1-en

[11] UNESCO. (2024). Caribbean Artificial Intelligence Policy Roadmap. UNESCO

[12] World Bank. (2020, 22 June). First-time financing by World Bank for digital economy in the Eastern Caribbean approved for US$94 million. Caribbean Digital Transformation Project announcement. World Bank

[13] Autio, C., et al. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile. NIST AI 600-1. doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1

[14] International Labour Organization. (2023). Quality Apprenticeships Recommendation, 2023 (No. 208). ILO Recommendation No. 208

[15] Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. Science, 381(6654), 187–192. doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586

[16] HM Treasury. (2026). Magenta Book: Central Government guidance on evaluation. GOV.UK

[17] International Labour Organization. (2025). Decent work in the platform economy in the Caribbean. International Labour Organization

Inglish edishan (PDF)